

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Journal Club location	Flinders Medical Center
JC Facilitator	Brianna Davey
JC Discipline	Speech Pathology

Background

Club Selected

Clinical Scenario

NA

Review Question/PICO/PACO

P: NA

E: NA

C: NA

O: NA

Article/Paper

Alty, J., Robson, J., Duggan-Carter, P., & Jamieson, S. (2016). What to do when people with Parkinson's disease cannot take their usual oral medications. *Practical neurology*, 16(2), 122-128.

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).

Article Methodology:

Literature Review/Opinion Piece



University of
South Australia

iCAHE

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute



University of
South Australia

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
RELEVANCE of sources				
1				<p><i>The relevance of information source relates to how useful the source is for your particular practice.</i></p> <p>To decide the relevance, you will need to consider some of the following questions:</p> <p>What type of audience is the information produced for?</p> <p>Is the information specialised enough for your needs?</p> <p>Is the information detailed enough for your needs?</p> <p>Does the information cover your topic in terms of time and place? (Decide if you need historical information, current information or both; Decide if you need information that is local, regional, national or international.)</p>
QUALITY of sources				
2	✓			<p><i>To decide the quality of information source, you will need to consider questions such as:</i></p> <p>How <i>reliable</i> is the information source?</p> <p>The lead author of the paper holds a PhD and specialises in neurology making this quite reliable.</p> <p>How <i>accurate</i> is the information source?</p> <p>Accuracy of the information is likely to be high due to the publication's authors backgrounds in academics. Alongside this, all authors wrote and reviewed the information prior to publication</p> <p>How <i>recent</i> is the information source?</p> <p>The paper was published in late 2015/early 2016. As this is quite recent (>5yrs old), the chance that this is up-to-date information and research is quite high.</p>



3	✓		<p>Reliability of information</p> <p>Is the author of the information identified?</p> <p>Yes – The authors of the information are identified (Alty, J, PhD; Robson, J, Duggan-Carter, P, & Jamieson S</p> <p>Does the author of the information have the qualifications or experience to write on this topic?</p> <p>Yes – the leading author has a PhD in neurology which examines anatomy, functions, and organic disorders of the nerves and nervous system.</p> <p>Does the information come from an 'authoritative source'?</p> <p>Yes</p>
4	✓		<p>Accuracy of information</p> <p>How is the information presented?</p> <p>If the information is presented as fact, can it be checked?</p> <p>Yes – All information presented as fact can be cross-checked with the provided list of references used by the authors</p> <p>Is the information biased?</p> <p>Information has been peer-reviewed but as with literature reviews, there is an increased risk of bias. The authors list their conflicts of interest to guide this decision making. Three authors are employed by Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS, which has the potential to alter outcomes as a result of bias.</p>
5			<p>Timeliness of information (how recent is the information)</p> <p>The information was published less than 5 years ago. In an area where research is conducted often, anything more than 5 years old should potentially be considered as outdated. However this does not fit into the 'old' category and is assumed to be quite recent.</p>



6	<h2>Journal Club to Discuss</h2>	<p>What do the study findings mean to practice (i.e. clinical practice, systems or processes)?</p>
7		<p>What are your next steps? (e.g. evaluate clinical practice against evidence-based recommendations; organise the next four journal club meetings around this topic to build the evidence base; organize training for staff, etc.)</p>
8		<p>What is required to implement these next steps?</p>
9		<p>Can the results be applied to the local population?</p> <p>CONTEXT ASSESSMENT (please refer to attached document)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Infrastructure – Available workforce (? Need for substitute workforce?) – Patient characteristics – Training and upskilling, accreditation, recognition – Ready access to information sources – Legislative, financial & systems support – Health service system, referral processes and decision-makers – Communication – Best ways of presenting information to different end-users – Availability of relevant equipment – Cultural acceptability of recommendations – Others
10		<p>Were all important outcomes considered?</p>
11		<p>Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?</p>
12		<p>What do the study findings mean to practice (i.e. clinical practice, systems or processes)?</p>
13		<p>What are your next steps?</p> <p>ADOPT, CONTEXTUALISE, ADAPT</p> <p>And then (e.g. evaluate clinical practice against evidence-based recommendations; organise the next four journal club meetings around this topic to build the evidence base; organize training for staff, etc.)</p>
14		<p>What is required to implement these next steps?</p>