

PEARLS 5 (R2)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of PEARLS 5 is to have a discussion about whether we as individual physicians, and we as a team, should or should not change our practice based on the findings of a systematic review and how this information can be used to guide quality improvement. PEARLS 5 occurs in your PGY-2 year.

***** Your article must be approved by your implementing evidence site lead at least 1 week prior to your presentation date *****

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW SELECTION

The systematic review you select:

- should address one of the 99 topics
- should conduct a systematic search of the literature and critically appraise the studies found

PRESENTATION

Your presentation should:

- be about 20 minutes long to allow time for questions and discussion
- discuss why you chose the topic
- present a brief summary of your article
- present your critical appraisal and conclusions (we want to hear **your opinion** on how the evidence should impact our practice)

***** see attached sample format and assessment guide that the preceptors will use to assess your presentation *****

PEARLS 5 Presentation Suggested Outline/Format

Title Slide:

Name of Resident

“Review of [title of article]”

Date and clinic

Slide: Why did you choose this topic?

Why is this topic important to family medicine?

Slide: Why did you choose this systematic review (SR)?

How did you find this SR? (from a guideline, personal recommendation, database, PubMed search, etc.)

Are there better SRs on this topic? How do you know? (describe the methods you used to search for alternative SRs.)

Slide: PICO question

What PICO question did the SR address? How does this question compare to the PICO question you would ideally like to answer? (Is your population similar? Is the SR intervention comparable to the intervention you would recommend? Is the control comparable to the alternatives you would otherwise consider? Is the outcome a patient oriented outcome – one that a patient would notice and value?)

Slide: Flow diagram of the search strategy

Was a reasonable search performed? (Describe the search and process of narrowing the results in a flow diagram)

Slide: Internal validity of included studies

For the studies incorporated into the SR conclusions, did the reviewers evaluate the internal validity of each? How many reviewers evaluated each study, and what criteria were used? (make sure you know what internal validity means, the factors that were evaluated for each study, and the factors that should have been evaluated for studies of that design)

Slide: How consistent were the results from different studies?

For the studies incorporated into the SR conclusions, was the magnitude of benefit similar from one study to the next? This may be found in a Forest plot or in the text.

Slide: What is the (quantitative) answer to the PICO question?

How much better did the intervention perform? What were the confidence intervals for that result?

Considering the characteristics of your population, and planned intervention, will your patients benefit more or less than those in the SR?

Slide: How much has this evidence impacted relevant guideline recommendations?

Summarize relevant guideline recommendations and offer an opinion on the reason for any discrepancies.

Slide: How does the SRs summary of the evidence compare to the quality, PICO relevance, and findings of its constituent primary studies?

Slide: What local factors might influence whether the intervention would be practical and/or beneficial for your patients?

Slide: Potential QI intervention

Open a discussion about whether the group agrees with implementing the intervention and measuring it with quality improvement approaches.