

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Journal Club	Royal Hobart Hospital
JC Facilitator	Lisa Greskie
JC Discipline	Speech pathology

Clinical Scenario

Does cognitive-communication intervention improve outcomes for patients with Traumatic / Acquired Brain Injury?

Review Question/PICO/PECO

- P Patient Group – Traumatic Brain Injury /ABI
- I cognitive communication intervention
- C other intervention
- O function, quality of life

Article/Paper

Macdonald S & Wiseman-Hakes C (2010) "Knowledge translation in ABI rehabilitation: a model for consolidating and applying the evidence for cognitive-communication interventions" *Brain Injury*, 24(3):389-395.

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).

Article Methodology: Systematic Review

Journal Club Meeting on: 17 March 2011



University of
South Australia

iCAHE

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review ask a clearly-focused question?</p> <p>The objectives of the review were:</p> <p>(1) To propose a model for consolidating and disseminating existing evidence relevant to cognitive communication interventions after acquired brain injury (ABI).</p> <p>(2) To present the Cognitive-Communication Intervention Review Framework (CCIRF).</p> <p>(3) To outline future considerations for applying evidence to clinical practice.</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the review include the right type of study?</p> <p>The review identified 20 systematic reviews with an array of recommendations. Systematic reviews are considered to be the most robust form of evidence.</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES</p>
3	✓			<p>Did the reviewers try to identify all relevant studies?</p> <p>A search for all systematic reviews pertaining to communication and cognitive interventions in ABI published between 1997–2007 was then conducted using the following search engines: Medline, PubMed, Scholars Portal, Google Scholar. To avoid missing out on publications the authors also conducted manual, table-of-contents searches of specific speech language pathology journals.</p> <p>Five online resources PsycBITE, the website of the Academy of Neurological Communication Disorders (ANCDs), the American Speech and Hearing Association's, the Acquired Brain Injury Evidence Based Review and the Cochrane Collaboration</p>
4		✓		<p>Did the reviewers assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>The authors haven't mentioned what tools they used to determine the quality of the included systematic reviews. They mention that they only included systematic reviews that were peer reviewed and had defined search strategies.</p>
5		NA		<p>If the results of the studies have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>The findings of the 20 included SR's have been summarized in tabular form. No statistical analysis has been done.</p>

CONTACTS
www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



University of South Australia | **iCAHE**
 International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

6				<p>How are the results presented and what is the main result?</p> <p>The CCIRF was used to synthesize the evidence within 11 intervention categories. Reviews were analysed according to: organization, population, intervention, comparison and outcome, with a focus on communication outcomes.</p> <p>The main results revealed support for interventions relating to: social communication, behavioural regulation, verbal formulation, attention, external memory aids, executive functions and communication partner training. Research gaps were noted in the areas of comprehension (auditory/reading), written expression and vocational communication interventions.</p>
7				<p>How precise are these results?</p> <p>These results are fairly precise as the authors have assimilated findings from the included systematic reviews.</p>
8				<p>Can the results be applied to the local population?</p> <p>Were all important outcomes considered?</p> <p><i>The article provided a good general summary of cognitive communication impairments and characteristics to look for in this patient group. It would have been more beneficial for the study to comment on specific interventions and how effective they were rather than only listing treatment options. We found the treatment approaches related more to sub-acute care rather than acute care making it difficult to apply the interventions in our setting.</i></p>
9				<p>Should policy or practice change as a result of the evidence contained in this review?</p> <p>Implementation of the evidence for cognitive-communication interventions is challenged by variability in study populations, interventions, and research focus on communication.</p> <p>However the CCIRF provides a means of promoting consistency in knowledge translation and application.</p>
<p><u>Summary of search strategy</u></p> <p>Key words Concept 1: 'cognitive communication' Concept 2: 'brain injury'</p> <p>Databases Medline, EMBASE, CINAHL, Academic Search Premiere, PubMed, Ageline, Allied and Complementary medicine, BioMed Central Gateway, ProQuest family health, Health and Medical Complete and Google</p> <p>Limiters English articles only</p>				