

WOUND HEALING AND MANAGEMENT COLLABORATIVE EVIDENCE SUMMARY

CONSIDERATIONS FOR PEER REVIEWERS

- The title describes and reflects the content and identifies the work as an evidence summary.
- There are clear recommendations that are supported by the evidence presented in the evidence summary (or notes that there was insufficient evidence to make a recommendation).
- The recommendations have been assigned appropriate Grades of Recommendation according to the JBI method where Grade A is “strong” (based on good evidence) Grade B is “weak”(based on some evidence), and the vocabulary reflects the Grade (e.g. strong: SHOULD do; weak: COULD do).
- The background provides a brief overview of the issue/field/topic and the interventions/phenomena of interest that be discussed and how it might work.
- The summary includes a brief search strategy, including search terms and databases and any limits put on the inclusion criteria (e.g., limited search date or limited to specific study designs).
- There is a summary of the evidence that indicates the quantity of studies identified, and their level of evidence using the Joanna Briggs Level of Evidence for Intervention Studies.
- The summary of evidence includes a brief report of the studies, including their size and the intervention they are exploring.
- The summary of evidence indicates the risk of bias for particular studies (e.g. high. moderate or low risk).
- The summary of evidence indicates the outcome measures reported in studies, and they are relevant for evaluating the intervention.
- The comparisons made in studies are clear.
- The findings clearly support and underpin the recommendations made.
- Effect estimates from meta-analyses or results from individual included studies are included, as appropriate.
- If included, the consideration for use are relevant and implementable. **Do you have any additional relevant considerations for use that could be included?**
- The evidence summary includes declaration of funding, conflict of interest and reports that the WHAM Collaborative uses JBI methods that the reader could access.
- The evidence summary is written clearly and is accessible to most readers of wound journals.
- No important studies that have been missed, considering that studies reported in systematic reviews/meta-analyses will generally not be reported individually.

All WHAM Collaborative evidence summaries receive peer review from at least three (and usually more than ten) external peer reviewers, as well as from the WHAM Collaborative team, prior to publication.