



Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem
ISSN: 1518-8345
Escola de Enfermagem de Ribeirão Preto /
Universidade de São Paulo

The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews

Santos, Wendel Mombaqué dos; Secoli, Silvia Regina; Püschel, Vilanice Alves de Araújo

The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews

Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem, vol. 26, 2018

Escola de Enfermagem de Ribeirão Preto / Universidade de São Paulo

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=281458425096>

DOI: 10.1590/1518-8345.2885.3074

The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews

El enfoque del Joanna Briggs Institute para revisiones sistemáticas

A abordagem do Joanna Briggs Institute para revisões sistemáticas

Wendel Mombaque dos Santos¹

Empresa Brasileira de Serviços Hospitalares, Brazil

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1943-4525>

Silvia Regina Secoli²

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Vilanice Alves de Araújo Püschel²

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem, vol. 26, 2018

Escola de Enfermagem de Ribeirão Preto / Universidade de São Paulo

Received: 23 May 2018
Accepted: 21 August 2018

DOI: 10.1590/1518-8345.2885.3074

© 2018 Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem
CC BY

In the last decades, systematic and integrative review studies have occupied important space in high impact journals. Reviews, in theory, offer the best evidence on certain topics; are original studies; and do not require approval in Research Ethics Committees (REC). The need to support practices, especially clinical and educational, in contrast to the dispensation of the REC, and the limited knowledge of International Centers Specialized in Revisions guidelines have favored the dissemination of questionable quality works.

In 2017, a published article reported-on the basis of an integrative review using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) method-the gains perceived by health students and professionals in the use of clinical simulation using dramatization¹. These scholars used the term “integrative review”; however, a close examination of their work reveals that they began it as a “comprehensive review” (using both quantitative and qualitative questions) and completed it as a rudimentary “scoping review.”

The term “integrative review” has been used loosely, and certain authors have considered reviews of any kind (including those of variant study designs; such as, experimental, observational, and descriptive) to be integrative². However, other authors suggest that integrative review requires a synthesis of theoretical studies, i.e., something more than mere empirical evidence². JBI provides formal guidance for ten types of reviews; however, none of them refer to how an integrative review should be performed³.

The systematic reviews of the JBI are based on the model of evidence-based healthcare, which does not concern exclusively with effectiveness, rather focuses on basing practice on the best available evidence, and is adaptable to the diverse origins of problems in health care, using a

diverse range of research methodologies to generate evidence appropriate to the issue³. JBI considers that health professionals require evidence to substantiate a wide range of activities and interventions, and while making clinical decisions, they must examine whether their approach is feasible, appropriate, meaningful, and effective³⁻⁴.

JBI systematic reviews are aimed at providing a comprehensive and unbiased synthesis of large numbers of relevant studies within the confines of a single document by using rigorous and transparent methods⁴. Such a systematic review seeks to synthesize and summarize existing knowledge rather than to create new knowledge⁵. This produces decision-making that considers the feasibility, appropriateness, meaningfulness, and effectiveness of healthcare practice⁴⁻⁵. The best available evidence, the context in which care is delivered, the individual patient, and the expertise and professional judgment of the health professionals play a role in this process⁴⁻⁶.

Thus, we recommend using JBI methodology to conduct systematic reviews of the following items: effectiveness, experiential (qualitative), cost/economic evaluation, prevalence and/or incidence, diagnostic test accuracy, etiology and/or risk, expert opinion/policy, psychometric, prognostic, and methodology⁶.

The credibility of the knowledge produced and the usefulness of the product generated, based on the review studies, according to the epidemiological delineations, is closely related to methodological rigor, an aspect that can be qualified through the guidelines of the Review Centers.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance of Associate Professor Edoardo Aromataris.

References

- Negri EC, Mazzo A, Martins JCA, Pereira GAJ, Almeida R, Pedersoli CE. Clinical simulation with dramatization: gains perceived by students and health professionals. *Rev. Latino-Am. Enfermagem*. 2017;25:e2916. doi: 10.1590/1518-8345.1807.2916.
- Hopia H, Latvala E, Liimatainen L. Reviewing the methodology of an integrative review. *Scand J Caring Sci*. 2016;30(4):662-9. doi: 10.1111/scs.12327.
- Institute TJB. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual: 2014 Edition. [Internet]. Adelaide: Joanna Briggs Institute; 2014. [cited Ago 23 2018]. Available from: <http://joannabriggs.org/assets/docs/sumari/ReviewersManual-2014.pdf>.
- Pearson A, Wiechula R, Court A, Lockwood C. The JBI model of evidence-based healthcare. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2005;3(8):207-15. doi: 10.1111/j.1479-6988.2005.00026.x.

Aromataris E, Pearson A. The systematic review: an overview. *Am J Nurs*. 2014;114(3):53-8. doi: 10.1097/01.NAJ.0000444496.24228.2c.

Munn Z, Stern C, Aromataris E, Lockwood, Jordan Z. What kind of systematic review should conduct? A proposed typology and guidance for systematic reviewers in the medical and health sciences. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018;18(1):5. doi 10.1186/s12874-017-0468-4.

Author notes

Corresponding author:

Wendel Mombaque dos Santos E-mail:
wendelmombaque@hotmail.com