

EVOLVING PUBLICATION PRACTICES FOR NURSES SPECIALIZED IN WOUND, OSTOMY AND CONTINENCE CANADA (NSWOCC)

John Gregory, IIWCC

Over the last three years, NSWOCC has published two documents to support best practice in wound, ostomy, or continence each year. These have included Canadian Standards of Practice for nurses specialized in wound, ostomy, and continence (NSWOC), two best practice recommendations and two position statements. This poster explores how the process methodology for standards of practice, best practice recommendations and position statements have been refined, harmonized, and contrast. Collectively, these projects aim to inform nurses and other professionals to raise the quality of care by supporting excellence in evidence-based practice.

The NSWOCC publications examined are:

- *Canadian Standards of Practice for Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence*¹
- *Clean Intermittent Urethral Catheterization in Adults Canadian Best Practice Recommendations for Nurses*²
- *Debridement Canadian Best Practice Recommendations for Nurses*³
- *Preoperative Stoma Site Marking for Fecal Diversions – Ileostomy & Colostomy Position Statement*⁴
- *Canadian Urinary Diversions Position Statement*⁵

In evaluating the process used by the task forces across each of the projects, we seek to delineate how the methodology should differ between standards of practice, best practice recommendations, or position statements. This starts by defining what each should be and how the components of their development should be different.

standard of practice—an authoritative statement that sets out the legal and professional basis of nursing practice. The primary purpose of standards is to identify for nurses, the public, government, and other stakeholders, the desired and achievable level of performance expected of nurses in their practice, against which actual performance can be measured.⁶

best practice recommendations—statements of best practice directed at the health care providers that are ideally evidence-based. Recommendations represent systematically developed statements to assist practitioner and patient decisions about appropriate health care for specific clinical circumstances. In the absence of data, best practice may simply be a matter of authority or expert opinion.

position statement—an official point of view or belief of an organization. Position statements in health are issued on scientific or medical issues. They are reviewed and published by an association through scientific/medical publications as appropriate.

This poster examines the insight from these projects regarding group dynamics, style of literature reviews, use of Delphi method, the peer review process, document production, and the use of technology. By evaluating the process methodology contributing to the development of the recent NSWOCC publications we can streamline the process, increase standardization, and project efficiency.

Task force organization—the NSWOCC-led projects since 2019 have composed the work of more than 130 health care practitioners. Each province in Canada has been represented and professionals have included NSWOCs, surgeons, dietitians, physical therapists, urology nurses, and infection prevention practitioners. Each project provides professional development to the task force members in the development of these publications. Members are organized into smaller groups to work on content. This also provides opportunity to groups to later critique the work of other groups and refine before external review.

Style of literature reviews—the review was conducted by the task force following the methodological framework of a scoping review proposed by Arksey and O'Malley (2005).⁷ Scoping reviews allow for synthesis of a wider spectrum of sources, including grey literature, non-indexed resources, provincial/territorial standards, or policies. Literature searches have been completed primarily through students at Queen's University or via librarians at Institut du Savoir Montfort and McMaster University. An adapted data capture matrix was created based on the Joanna Briggs Framework to guide mapping, review, and synthesis of the wide range of existing evidence. The task forces use two independent reviewers for data extraction from each of the relevant papers.⁷

Delphi methodology—to ensure consensus among the task force with drafted recommendations a Delphi process has been employed based on the work of Meyer et al. (2019).⁸ Multiple rounds of voting and discussion have been employed until greater than 70% consensus is achieved. All statements in the debridement best practice recommendations exceeded 80% consensus.

Peer review process—a consistent approach has evolved for the recruitment of reviewers. We have a reproducible mechanism to instruct peer reviewers, capture their feedback and allow the task force to resolve the comments. A line numbered pdf file with placeholders covers has been prepared for the peer review process.

Document production—the application of the American Psychological Association 7th edition 2020 *Publication Manual* with Vancouver style referencing has additionally raised the standard of writing and consistency.⁹ Each document is recreated by a graphic designer to set a standard for the production quality. Several of the projects could not have been completed without the generous financial support of industry members.

Use of technology—unrelated to the pandemic the respective task forces have relied upon primarily Zoom and Google Drive. These are not without their challenges. Task force members are not expected to be digital natives. Clear file structures, naming conventions, and video tutorials are used to help orientation.

I would like to thank the project leads for their strong leadership ensuring that projects have been completed within twelve months through the pandemic. I have been privileged to work with such a committed group of professionals.

Table 1 Comparison of the process methodologies for standards of practice, best practice recommendations, and position statements

	Position statement	Best practice recommendations	Standards of practice
Literature review	Scoping review style	Scoping review style	Scoping review style
Delphi	No	Yes	No
Grading of evidence	Not applicable	Yes, of the recommendations	No
Peer review	Yes	Yes	Yes
Revision	No	No	5 years

We have a reproducible toolkit to aid in the publication of future documents to deliver better informed health care practice.

Essential project components

The success of any project has been consistently shown to be dependent upon critical factors:

- a strong task force project lead;
- a clear project mandate with a defined scope;
- collaboration among task force members;
- a regular cadence of facilitated meetings;
- a designated medical writer; and
- support with the literature search.

Conclusion

This poster set out to examine the way in which the NSWOCC best practice publications have evolved. Over three years we have improved the quality rigour, consistency, and quality of the Standards of Practice of NSWOC, best practice recommendations and position statements. This represents a continual development process where each new publication is a refinement based on the learnings of each successive project. This will be explored in more depth in a subsequent paper.

There remains work to do to meet the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario guidance steps on publication practices. Work has begun to formulate a consistent mechanism to evaluate the implementation of NSWOCC publications.

There are two additional best practice recommendations in advanced stages of development on paediatric incontinence-associated dermatitis and parastomal hernia. They will be published in English late 2022 following peer review.



References

1. Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence Canada. Canadian Standards of Practice for Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence (3rd ed.). 2021. <https://nswoc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/canadian-urinary-diversions-position-statement-january2022.pdf>
2. Clean Intermittent Urethral Catheterization in Adults – Canadian Best Practice Recommendations for Nurses. Developed by Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence Canada, Canadian Nurse Continence Advisors, Urology Nurses of Canada, and Infection Prevention and Control (1st ed.). 2020 <https://nswoc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Clean-Intermittent-Urethral-Catheterization-Adults-for-Nurses-BPR-May2020-lr.pdf>.
3. Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence Canada. Debridement: Canadian Best Practice Recommendations for Nurses (1st ed.). 2021. <https://nswoc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/NSWOCC-Debridement-Best-Practice-Recommendations-April-2021.pdf>
4. Preoperative Stoma Site Marking for Fecal Diversions (Ileostomy & Colostomy): Position Statement of The Canadian Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons and Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence Canada (1st ed.). 2020. <https://cscrs.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Preoperative-stoma-site-marking-position-statement-2020-final-highres.pdf>
5. Canadian Urinary Diversions Position Statement: Collaboration of Canadian Urological Association, Nurses Specialized in Wound, Ostomy and Continence Canada & Urology Nurses of Canada (1st ed.). 2022. <https://nswoc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/canadian-urinary-diversions-position-statement-january2022.pdf>
6. College of Registered Nurses of Prince Edward Island. Nurse Practitioner standards for practice. Charlottetown (PEI): College of Registered Nurses of Prince Edward Island; 2019. <https://crnpei.ca/professional-practice/standards/>
7. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol.* 2005;8(1):19-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
8. De Meyer D, Kottner J, Beele H, Schmitt J, Lange T, Van Hecke A, Verhaeghe S, Beeckman D. Delphi procedure in core outcome set development: rating scale and consensus criteria determined outcome selection. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2019 Jul 1;111:23-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.03.011>
9. American Psychological Association. Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>

