

Urologic Nursing[®]

Research Article Template

1. Introduction
2. Significance of Research (Why this study is important)
3. Purpose or Research Questions/Problems/Hypotheses
4. Literature Review (Supports study methodology)
5. Methodology
 - a. Sample (Size, convenience or not)
 - b. Instruments (Should we include reliability and validity of these)
 - c. Procedure (For distributing and collecting data)
 - d. Design (Exploratory, descriptive, experimental)
 - e. IRB approval was obtained
 - f. Data analysis procedures
6. Findings/results
7. Discussion (of findings) (How findings support or contradict earlier research results)
8. Limitations (Instrument, sample size, etc.)
9. Conclusions (What is the main point)
10. Nursing Implications (How to apply this information to urology practice)
11. Research Box (Introduction, Purpose, Methods, Results, Conclusions)
12. Key words to be included with abstract (approximately 40 words or less)
13. Level of Evidence to be included in research box (from Johns Hopkins, 2016)

Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Appendix C: Evidence Level and Quality Guide

Evidence Levels	Quality Guides
<p>Level I Experimental study, randomized controlled trial (RCT) Systematic review of RCTs, with or without meta-analysis</p>	<p>A <u>High quality</u>: Consistent, generalizable results; sufficient sample size for the study design; adequate control; definitive conclusions; consistent recommendations based on comprehensive literature review that includes thorough reference to scientific evidence</p>
<p>Level II Quasi-experimental study Systematic review of a combination of RCTs and quasi-experimental, or quasi-experimental studies only, with or without meta-analysis</p>	<p>B <u>Good quality</u>: Reasonably consistent results; sufficient sample size for the study design; some control, fairly definitive conclusions; reasonably consistent recommendations based on fairly comprehensive literature review that includes some reference to scientific evidence</p>
<p>Level III Non-experimental study Systematic review of a combination of RCTs, quasi-experimental and non-experimental studies, or non-experimental studies only, with or without meta-analysis Qualitative study or systematic review with or without a meta-synthesis</p>	<p>C <u>Low quality or major flaws</u>: Little evidence with inconsistent results; insufficient sample size for the study design; conclusions cannot be drawn</p>

Evidence Levels	Quality Guides
<p>Level IV Opinion of respected authorities and/or nationally recognized expert committees/consensus panels based on scientific evidence</p> <p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical practice guidelines • Consensus panels 	<p>A <u>High quality</u>: Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, private organization, or government agency; documentation of a systematic literature search strategy; consistent results with sufficient numbers of well-designed studies; criteria-based evaluation of overall scientific strength and quality of included studies and definitive conclusions; national expertise is clearly evident; developed or revised within the last 5 years</p> <p>B <u>Good quality</u>: Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, private organization, or government agency; reasonably thorough and appropriate systematic literature search strategy; reasonably consistent results, sufficient numbers of well-designed studies; evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies with fairly definitive conclusions; national expertise is clearly evident; developed or revised within the last 5 years</p> <p>C <u>Low quality or major flaws</u>: Material not sponsored by an official organization or agency; undefined, poorly defined, or limited literature search strategy; no evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies, insufficient evidence with inconsistent results, conclusions cannot be drawn; not revised within the last 5 years</p>

Evidence Levels	Quality Guides
<p>Level V Based on experiential and non-research evidence</p> <p>Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature reviews • Quality improvement, program or financial evaluation • Case reports • Opinion of nationally recognized experts(s) based on experiential evidence 	<p>Organizational Experience:</p> <p>A <u>High quality</u>: Clear aims and objectives; consistent results across multiple settings; formal quality improvement, financial or program evaluation methods used; definitive conclusions; consistent recommendations with thorough reference to scientific evidence</p> <p>B <u>Good quality</u>: Clear aims and objectives; consistent results in a single setting; formal quality improvement or financial or program evaluation methods used; reasonably consistent recommendations with some reference to scientific evidence</p> <p>C <u>Low quality or major flaws</u>: Unclear or missing aims and objectives; inconsistent results; poorly defined quality improvement, financial or program evaluation methods; recommendations cannot be made</p> <p>Literature Review, Expert Opinion, Case Report, Community Standard, Clinician Experience, Consumer Preference:</p> <p>A <u>High quality</u>: Expertise is clearly evident; draws definitive conclusions; provides scientific rationale; thought leader(s) in the field</p> <p>B <u>Good quality</u>: Expertise appears to be credible; draws fairly definitive conclusions; provides logical argument for opinions</p> <p>C <u>Low quality or major flaws</u>: Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn</p>