

Author's response to reviews

Title: Interventions Aimed at Increasing Research Use in Nursing: A Systematic Review

Authors:

David S Thompson (dst3@ualberta.ca)

Carole A Estabrooks (carole.estabrooks@ualberta.ca)

Shannon Scott-Findlay (shannon.scott-findlay@ualberta.ca)

Katherine Moore (katherine.moore@ualberta.ca)

Lars Wallin (lwa@du.se)

Version: 3 **Date:** 26 January 2007

Author's response to reviews: see over

January 26, 2007

Dr Martin Eccles
Editor-in-Chief
Professor of Clinical Effectiveness
University of Newcastle upon Tyne
Centre for Health Services Research
Newcastle upon Tyne
United Kingdom

Dear Professor Eccles,

Thank you for the thorough review of our manuscript entitled *Interventions Aimed at Increasing Research Use in Nursing: A Systematic Review (MS: 1549361720112728)*. The reviewers' comments have strengthened the reporting of our research. As requested, we have revised our manuscript based on the reviewers' comments and provided a point-by-point response.

Compulsory Revisions

1. The reviewer commented that previous reviews of interventions to promote research use were referred to rather briefly in the introduction.
 - We increased our discussion of previous reviews in the Introduction (pg 5, 6)
2. The reviewer commented that we dismissed existing reviews on the grounds that they focused on physicians and pointed out that some reviews were broad and focused mainly on nurses
 - We expanded our argument on page 5 to demonstrate that most reviews (but not all) focused on physicians and physician outcomes and that nurses are generally not well represented
 - We expanded our argument to illustrate that existing reviews, even those that included mainly nurses, relied upon provider behavior change to capture research use and we argue (pg 6, 7, 17) that this approach is problematic
3. The reviewer questioned why our search strategy did not capture nursing studies included in a review of educational workshops (O'Brien et al)and/or guideline dissemination (Thomas et al)
 - Our search strategy did include these studies and we made it more clear in the Methods (pg 7) that these reviews were included in our ancestry search
 - We have illustrated more clearly in the Introduction (pg 5, 6) and in the Discussion (pg 16) as to why studies that used changes in provider behavior and/or patient outcomes were not included
4. The reviewer asked that we make our inclusion criteria surrounding the interventions and outcomes more clear
 - We increased our description of our inclusion criteria on page 8 and 9
 - We provided more description in the Introduction (pg 5 and 6) which makes our choice of inclusion criteria more clear
 - We provided a discussion of conceptualizations of research utilization (pg 6) and why studies that measured a provider behavior and/or patient outcome change were not included
5. The reviewer asked for a table of excluded studies
 - We added a table of excluded studies (Table 1)

6. The reviewer pointed out that we don't provide justification that self-rated research use is a valid surrogate of research utilization
 - We discuss a common conceptualization of research utilization on page 6 and provide references to research illustrating that research utilization can be measured using a self-rated questionnaire
7. The reviewer commented that we could provide more discussion about the interventions and their style
 - We provided a description of the style of educational interventions on page 13 and 14
 - We refer the reader to Table 5 (Characteristics and Detailed Description of Interventions) throughout the Findings (Table 5 includes the 'dose' and other details of the interventions)
8. The reviewer requested we distinguish more clearly in our findings about whether we are dealing with a lack of evidence or evidence of no effect
 - We added a sentence in the Abstract referring to the lack of evidence
 - We added a sentence in the Findings (pg 15,16) about the lack of evidence
 - We added a sentence in the Conclusion (pg 25) about the lack of evidence

Discretionary Revisions

1. The reviewer suggested we provide some sense of conclusions from previous reviews in the introduction
 - In the interest of space we have elected not to discuss findings in the introduction because our primary argument is that these findings are not readily transferable to nursing
2. The reviewer suggested that we discuss the potential impact of including only studies published in English
 - We have discussed this in the Limitations section (pg 22)

In summary, the reviewer asked that we determine whether there was a problem with our search strategy or illustrate why we did not include studies from existing reviews. We are confident that our search strategy is adequate as it included studies the reviewer referred to. We have attempted to illustrate, in our Introduction, Methods, and Discussion, why we did not include studies that relied upon provider behavior change and/or patient outcomes to measure research use. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

David S Thompson, BScN, RN
Knowledge Utilization Studies Program
Masters Student, Faculty of Nursing
5-112 Clinical Sciences Building,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T6G 2G3 (780) 492-6836
e-mail: dst3@ualberta.ca