

Evidence-based cancer nursing: Cancer nursing and the cochrane collaboration

Author

Chan, Raymond Javan

Published

2013

Journal Title

Cancer Nursing

DOI

[10.1097/NCC.0b013e3182578a14](https://doi.org/10.1097/NCC.0b013e3182578a14)

Rights statement

© 2013 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins. This is a non-final version of an article published in final form in Cancer Nursing, Vol.36 (1), pp.1–2. Reproduced in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the journal link for access to the definitive, published version.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/59637>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

Title

Evidence-based cancer nursing: Cancer Nursing and the Cochrane Collaboration

Authors

Raymond Javan Chan, RN, BN, MAppSc (Research), PhD Candidate, FRCNA

Author Affiliations: Cancer Care Services, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Queensland, Australia; School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Queensland; and Research Centre for Clinical Practice Innovation, Griffith University.

Corresponding Author: Raymond Javan Chan, Nurse Researcher, Cancer Care Services, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Herston, Q4029, Australia (r.chan2@uq.edu.au).

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

A number of Cochrane systematic review summaries have been published in *Cancer Nursing* since 2010¹⁻⁴. These summaries are the outcomes of the Evidence Transfer

Program (Review Summaries), which is an initiative between the Cochrane Nursing Care Field (CNCF) and *Cancer Nursing*. The participation of *Cancer Nursing* in this program has demonstrated its commitment to promote evidence based practice among cancer nurses internationally.

But why the Cochrane Collaboration? The Cochrane Collaboration is a not-for profit organization established in 1993, following a British medical researcher's call for systematic, up to date reviews of all relevant randomized controlled trials^{5, 6}. To date, over 4,600 systematic reviews have been published online in *The Cochrane Library*⁶. Systematic reviews are the highest level of evidence and have been increasingly used as the standard approach in summarizing health research and influencing health care decisions⁷. There is a set of standards expected of systematic reviews, including having a clearly stated set of objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies; an explicit reproducible methodology; a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies that would meet the eligibility criteria; an assessment of the validity of the findings of the included studies, for example, through the assessment of risk of bias; and a systematic presentation and synthesis of the characteristics of findings of the included study⁵. Unfortunately, the quality of non-Cochrane systematic reviews varies^{8, 9}. The Cochrane Collaboration certainly has the credibility that its reviews adhere to the standards listed above very consistently⁵.

The Cochrane Collaboration comprises 52 review groups. Review groups are composed of individuals around the world who share an interest in developing and maintaining systematic reviews relevant to a particular health area¹⁰. These reviews group are disease-specific (e.g. Gynecological Cancer Group, Childhood Cancer Group, Breast Cancer Group), rather than discipline-specific. In other words, none of the review groups are nursing-specific. However, there is a strong nursing involvement in contributing to this repository of up-to-date high quality systematic reviews¹¹.

The published summaries in *Cancer Nursing* thus far have confirmed the relevancy of Cochrane reviews for informing cancer nursing practice. As cancer nurses, we need to further examine our practice and ensure that it is evidence-based. Numerous clinical issues require further attention and good evidence from cancer nurses. For example, as cancer nurses, we are challenged to provide the right amount of right information at the right time to cancer patients. In examining the evidence in this area, a Cochrane review was conducted to aid decision making of information giving at the beginning of a patient's journey¹². For another example, the end-of-life care pathways were developed to improve the outcomes of dying cancer patients and have become the standard of practice over recent years. However, a recent Cochrane review¹³ reported that this practice is not supported by any evidence. Until further research is conducted, these pathways should not be widely rolled out¹⁴. Cochrane reviews have direct implications for decision making among cancer nurses and policy makers.

I used to think that I could only make a difference in the individuals that I cared for (patients or caregivers/families), and that I would not be able to contribute to cancer care at a higher level. However, conducting and disseminating Cochrane reviews has been extremely fulfilling for me as a cancer/palliative care nurse, because I know that my work can truly impact the quality of cancer care at an international level. I am encouraged to see that *Cancer Nursing* is facilitating research utilization among cancer nurses by providing highly accessible and relevant summaries of Cochrane reviews. I hope that an increasing number of cancer nurses will contribute to evidence-based cancer nursing practice by conducting Cochrane reviews. We will together continue to support, and advance the conduct, dissemination, and utilization of high quality systematic reviews in the future.

Reference:

1. Chan R. Cochrane Review Summary for Cancer Nursing: influenza vaccination in children having chemotherapy for cancer. *Cancer Nurs* 2010;33(4):327-328.
2. Chan R. Cochrane Review Summary for Cancer Nursing: drug therapy for the management of cancer-related fatigue. *Cancer Nurs* 2011;34(3):250-251.
3. Konno R. Cochrane Review Summary for Cancer Nursing: acupuncture-point stimulation for chemotherapy-induced nausea or vomiting. *Cancer Nurs* 2010;33(6):479-480.
4. Ye X, Chu J. Cochrane Review Summary for Cancer Nursing: Nonhormonal Interventions for Hot Flushes in Women With a History of Breast Cancer. *Cancer Nurs* 2011;34(5):423-424.
5. Higgins J, Green S, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.; 2008.
6. Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Collaboration Home Page- About Us. Available at: <http://www.cochrane.org/about-us>. Accessed 14-3-2012, 2012.
7. Grimshaw JM, Russell IT. Effect of clinical guidelines on medical practice: a systematic review of rigorous evaluations. *Lancet*. Nov 27 1993;342(8883):1317-1322.
8. Choi PT, Halpern SH, Malik N, Jadad AR, Tramer MR, Walder B. Examining the evidence in anesthesia literature: a critical appraisal of systematic reviews. *Anesth Analg*. Mar 2001;92(3):700-709.
9. Hoving JL, Gross AR, Gasner D, et al. A critical appraisal of review articles on the effectiveness of conservative treatment for neck pain. *Spine*. 2001;26(2):196-205.
10. Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Collaboration- Glossary. Available at: <http://www.cochrane.org/glossary/5#term167>. Accessed 14-03-2012, 2012.
11. Davison CM, Sochan A, Pretorius R. Are Cochrane Collaboration systematic reviews relevant resources for evidence-based nursing internationally? *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2010;47(7):795-797.
12. Chan RJ, Webster J, Marquart L. Information interventions for orienting patients and their carers to cancer care facilities. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011;12:CD008273.
13. Chan R, Webster J. End-of-life care pathways for improving outcomes in caring for the dying. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2010(1):CD008006.
14. Chan R, Webster J. A national rollout of an insufficiently evaluated practice: how evidence based are our end-of-life care policies? *J Pall Med*. 2011;14(7):802; author reply 803.