

Clinical Reasoning and Evidence-Based Practice

Deliberate Decision-Making by Nurses

Author(s)

Dobber, Jos; Harmsen, José; van Iersel, Margriet

DOI

[10.1007/978-3-031-27069-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27069-7)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dobber, J., Harmsen, J., & van Iersel, M. (2023). *Clinical Reasoning and Evidence-Based Practice: Deliberate Decision-Making by Nurses*. (1 ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27069-7>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please contact the library: <https://www.amsterdamuas.com/library/contact>, or send a letter to: University Library (Library of the University of Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences), Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Clinical Reasoning and Evidence-Based Practice

Jos Dobber • José Harmsen
Margriet van Iersel

Clinical Reasoning and Evidence-Based Practice

Deliberate Decision-Making by Nurses

Jos Dobber
Faculty of Health
Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

José Harmsen
Faculty of Health
Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Margriet van Iersel
Faculty of Health
Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ISBN 978-3-031-27068-0 ISBN 978-3-031-27069-7 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27069-7>

The translation was done with the help of artificial intelligence (machine translation by the service DeepL.com). A subsequent human revision was done primarily in terms of content.

0th edition: © Bohn Stafleu van Loghum 2021

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Foreword 1

The professional profile and the training profile of the bachelor nurse emphasise the professional role of the nurse in increasingly complex care situations. This complexity requires thinking and collaborative skills in which clinical reasoning plays a key role. By asking the right questions, the nurse is able to make optimal decisions about diagnosis, aetiology, prognosis and therapy. The complexity of modern healthcare demands from nurses to be able to carry out this reasoning both within the realm of their professional autonomy and within interprofessional problem areas. After all, the nurse is in a position to make frequent and purposeful observations, communicate with the patient and their significant others, monitor their health status, and thereby identify potential health problems at an early stage. In addition, through interventions, the nurse can support the patient's functioning and contribute to the treatment of other disciplines.

This book helps students to develop in clinical reasoning. Because the book teaches students to systematically ask themselves questions when engaging in clinical reasoning, it stimulates the exploratory and investigative aspects of clinical reasoning. After all, in complex situations there are no ready-made answers, and in reasoning a great deal of appeal is made to the student's investigative ability. In addition, the first chapter of the book exposes the anatomy of clinical reasoning itself. Knowledge of reasoning in general improves the quality of reasoning, among other things because notorious errors in reasoning can be recognised and avoided. In the training profile of the Bachelor of Nursing, the importance of clinical reasoning is reflected in the CanMEDS role of Healthcare Professional. This book teaches the student to apply this competency in an investigative way. Assisted by student Isabella, the student not only learns clinical reasoning, but also to use the method of *evidence-based practice* (EBP) to involve scientific knowledge in decisions about patient care. The student learns how EBP serves clinical reasoning. The book also demonstrates the breadth of the nursing profession through examples and also through challenging films that illustrate clinical reasoning from different healthcare areas.

The decision to develop the book as much as possible in accordance with the modern educational concept 4C/ID, and to develop the ‘book’ as an interactive medium, means that it fits in with ‘today’s student’. The combination of professional nursing content and education is a success factor in learning clinical reasoning.

Wilma Scholte op Reimer is a nurse, epidemiologist, member of the board of governors of Hogeschool Utrecht and professor of Complex Care (Amsterdam UMC-UvA).

Foreword 2

The present book on clinical reasoning links a complex professional task at the heart of the nursing profession to good educational design. The fact that these two components have been brought together in one book is quite unique. The 4C/ID model is attracting a great deal of interest, and there are reasons for this. The evidence-based design model fits in well with the need in education to design and develop education that is based on scientific evidence about how people learn. Attention to the development of (professional) competences, knowledge about the integration of knowledge, skills and attitudes, and attention to transfer—i.e. applying what has been learnt in new situations—are telling examples of this.

In this book, the complex professional task of clinical reasoning, a thought process of the nurse that proceeds differently with each patient and in each situation, is analysed into sub-factors. These are then worked out into four levels of complexity which serve as a framework for the design of subtask exercises and learning tasks which then guide the approach of teachers. The subtask exercises and learning tasks are presented here at levels 1 and 2, whereby the subtask exercises, entirely in accordance with the principles of the 4C/ID model, serve to support the performance of the entire reasoning task. The teacher's environment is thus entirely based on insights from the model, and the design of the tasks for students is also consistent with the model. Teachers are also supported by practical aids, such as good examples of case studies and tests. Whether it concerns learning tasks or tests: all teaching materials can be applied flexibly, which means that they can be fitted into any curriculum. Another unique feature is the multimedia offering of patient cases: these real-life and authentic professional problems make reasoning extra interesting and challenging for the student. In short: a range of teaching aids for state-of-the-art education.

Paul Kirschner is a university professor and professor of Educational Psychology at the Open University. Together with Jeroen van Merriënboer, Paul Kirschner wrote the book *Ten steps to complex learning* (2013) about the 4C/ID model.

Preface

Clinical reasoning is a skill that is close to our hearts. The decisions that result from clinical reasoning largely determine whether the patient receives optimal nursing care. However, clinical reasoning is a complex cognitive core skill of the nursing profession that is not easy for beginning students to learn. Because reasoning happens ‘in your head’, it is difficult to get a grip on the learning process. It is not visible and not graspable. We can think so much that we can’t express it all. Reproducing reasoning and explaining how a reasoning came about is virtually impossible. With this book, we think we have made a good step towards getting a grip on learning clinical reasoning. We have tried to make thinking processes conscious and somewhat visible. The point of clinical reasoning is that through good reasoning the nurse, in good cooperation with the patient, can make the optimal decision for the patient. In this book, decisions are classified into four types, each of which requires its own reasoning process. For each of these decisions, standard questions have been formulated that allow the student to arrive at a responsible clinical decision. By practicing a lot with these standard questions, the student can develop four cognitive schemes with which each clinical decision with accompanying clinical reasoning can be approached in professional practice.

The book consists of three parts. The first part, on clinical reasoning, has been written for first and second year bachelor nursing students. The second part, on EBP, is also suitable for later years. The book offers students a basis in reasoning that they can build on in later years. The third part of the book contains various extras.

The text of the book consists of several layers. The first layer is the main text; it contains what the student (in the opinion of the authors) should at least know. The second layer is the extras (see videos that are linked to various chapters). The third layer is the educational layer. Based on the 4C/ID model, complexity levels have been established, learning tasks formulated, and subtask exercises made available. The instructor environment can be found in Chap. 12.

For the sake of readability, we have chosen to refer to nurses in this book as ‘she’. Of course, in these places ‘he’ can also be used. There are many terms in use to refer to the person receiving care, such as patient and client. In this book, we follow the choice of the International Council of Nurses (ICN). That is why we have chosen the word ‘patient’.

Finally, we would like to thank everyone who contributed to this book by thinking, reading, acting in one of the films, or in any other way: Arie Berg, Dorothee Blaisse, Ype van der Brug, Margriet Dijkmans van Gunst, Sophie Dobber, Tom Dobber, Paul Doedens, Anne Eskes, Astrid Jansen, Martijn Klok, Marieke Kroon, Aster de Lange, Corine Latour, Martin Leeda, Bas van Oort, Hajar Rifi, Özlem Solmaz, Richard Steenborg, Nicky van Oostrum, Michelle Wagemaker, Elsbeth Wielinga, Christine Zwart.

Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Jos Dobber
José Harmsen
Margriet van Iersel

Introduction

Is it safe to let someone with paraplegia sit alone on a chair? How can I best manage someone with depression? How often should I check this patient and why? Why does one patient stop smoking immediately after a heart attack, while another is having difficulty? Nurses encounter a wide range of questions in their work. They answer these questions with knowledge, which they use to make decisions. Clinical reasoning is a continuous process of critical thinking. It is at the heart of the nursing profession because it is essential for patients that nurses make the right decisions. The importance of clinical reasoning is also reflected in the training profile for all bachelor nursing courses, in which clinical reasoning has been formulated as a central core concept for the CanMEDS role of healthcare provider.

This book unravels the thought process that the bachelor nurse performs, and presents this process in four clear-cut decisions that nurses must constantly make during their work: What is going on? How did it come about? What outcome can we expect? What can we do about it? Behind these four main questions are a few sub-questions which, when systematically worked through, address all aspects of what is relevant to informed decision-making.

Part I Clinical reasoning is about contemplating, considering and designing care delivery. This is important because it leads to deliberate and better nursing care. Clinical reasoning is best learned through practice. It is not a simple skill. The book takes the reader through the experiences of Isabella, a bachelor nursing student. By following her doubts and ideas, the issues involved in learning clinical reasoning become even more apparent.

Part II Evidence-based practice (EBP) is a way of making better clinical decisions because it involves current scientific knowledge in reasoning. EBP is at the service of clinical reasoning. Proper use of scientific information requires knowledge of how to find that information efficiently, how to weigh up the quality of the information found, and how to assess what the information means for the care of the patient. Here too, student Isabella helps the reader gain insight: for example, into whether you can assess whether the results of a study can be used in your own practice. Choices about how to provide care are ultimately made in consultation with the patient.

Structure and Use of the Book

The book offers the theory of clinical reasoning in two ‘layers’. In the first layer, the four key questions are explained in more detail and illustrated with examples, so that it becomes clear how these questions are given content in reasoning. The second layer contains more in-depth knowledge, for example, about thought processes and decision-making, but also about more nursing aspects of reasoning, such as when the nurse can rely on their intuition when making decisions or when more analysis is required. The first layer provides a general overview of the reasoning process. From this first layer the student can click on (digitally) for more content about underlying concepts or browse through the book to the second layer, where clinical reasoning is approached more theoretically. The reader can thus choose and, if desired, switch levels at any time. It is advisable to start with the general line in the first layer and from there to go deeper. The multimedia nature of the book makes this even easier for the reader, as the in-depth content is just a mouse click away from the first layer, and vice versa. The book also contains this second layer. This layer can be found in the book in Part III in depth. The checklists that are part of the in-depth content are also included separately in the Chap. 12 Checklists for quick reference.

Terms preceded by an ► in the text: this term is in the glossary: click on it and you get the description.

The in-depth texts can be recognised by their layout (Sect. 12.1).

Texts in this layout are in the second layer and in Chap. 12.

The book includes several resources as part of the chapters in Part I. In process worksheets, all questions of the reasoning process are clearly listed. During the reasoning process these can serve as a checklist. The cases provided in the form of short films ensure that the reality of healthcare provision is presented in a realistic manner. You can see how patients present their complaints and problems, how a meeting is conducted and how nurses think aloud about ‘their’ patient. The professional practice is thus realistically portrayed. In addition, there are assignments related to the dilemmas of professional practice.

In addition to the main text (first layer) and the digital environment (second layer) for students, the book also contains material for teachers. This material has been developed from the 4C/ID design model. The 4C/ID model is based on recent cognitive-psychological knowledge about learning. The model offers tools for systematically designing education for a complex professional task such as clinical reasoning. An important starting point is the provision of whole tasks that are optimally aligned with the requirements of professional practice.

The teacher’s environment of the book includes a brief introduction to the 4C/ID model and an explanation of how the model is used in the book. Teaching materials in the form of learning tasks and subtask exercises can be inserted into curricula as desired. There are also good examples of detailed case studies and test criteria at two levels of complexity. The material is flexible in its application, based on the fact that the structure of the study programmes differs as much as the wishes of the instructors.

The teacher’s environment can be found in Chap. 13.

Contents

Part I Clinical Reasoning

1	Background Knowledge in Clinical Reasoning	3
1.1	What Is Clinical Reasoning?	3
1.2	How to Use Clinical Reasoning?	4
1.3	Trusting Relationship	5
1.4	The ICF as a Thought Model in Clinical Reasoning	6
1.4.1	What Is the ICF Diagram? What Do the ICF Terms Mean?	6
1.4.2	How Does the ICF Support Structuring and Reasoning?	10
1.5	Analysing and Answering the Four Basic Questions of Clinical Reasoning	12
1.5.1	What Are the Standard Questions in Diagnostic Reasoning?	12
1.5.2	What Are the Standard Questions in Etiological Reasoning?	13
1.5.3	What Are the Standard Questions in Prognostic Reasoning?	13
1.5.4	What Are the Standard Questions in Therapeutic Reasoning?	14
1.5.5	What Is the Course of the Clinical Reasoning Process?	15
1.6	The ICN Definition of Nursing as a Framework for Nursing Decisions	16
1.6.1	What Is Meant by Autonomous Action and What by Collaborative (or Participatory) Action?	17
1.6.2	How Does This Division of the Nursing Professional Domain into Autonomous and Collaborative Action Affect Clinical Reasoning?	18
1.7	Diversity-Sensitive Reasoning	19
1.7.1	What Areas of Diversity Support Diversity-Sensitive Reasoning?	19
1.7.2	Why Is Diversity-Sensitive Reasoning Important?	20
1.7.3	How Does Diversity-Sensitive Reasoning Fit with the ICF?	21

1.8	Evidence-Based Practice (EBP).	21
1.8.1	How Can Evidence-Based Practice Improve Clinical Reasoning and Skill Implementation?	21
1.8.2	What Is Evidence-Based Practice and What Components Does It Consist Of?	22
1.8.3	What Is the Methods of Evidence-Based Practice? What Kind of Knowledge Does EBP Lead to?	23
1.9	The Use of Hypotheses in Clinical Reasoning	24
1.9.1	What Is Meant by ‘Hypothesis Formulation’ and by ‘Hypothesis Testing’?	24
1.9.2	How Can I Formulate Hypotheses and Test Criteria About Health Problems?	25
1.9.3	How Can Hypotheses About Etiology Be Tested?	26
1.9.4	How Can Goals of Nursing Care Be Assessed?	26
1.9.5	What Should the Hypotheses Be About When Reasoning About Interventions?	27
1.10	The Thought Structure of Clinical Reasoning	27
1.10.1	How Do We Think? The Dual Processing Model and Pitfalls in Decision-Making	27
1.10.2	How Do We Think? Biases as Threats to Reasoning.	29
1.10.3	Intuition and Analysis	30
1.10.4	Background Knowledge and Foreground Knowledge.	32
	Glossary	33
	References.	39
2	Diagnostic Decision: What Is the Matter with the Patient?	41
2.1	What Is a Diagnosis?	41
2.2	What Is Diagnostic Reasoning?	42
2.3	How Are the Health Problem, Clues and Symptoms Incorporated into the Diagnosis?	43
2.4	When Should I Use Diagnostic Reasoning?	43
2.5	How Do I Get a Diagnosis?	44
2.6	How Do I Find Out a Patient’s Symptoms?	45
2.7	How Can I Assess the Severity and Importance of the Symptoms?	46
2.8	How Do I Get from Symptoms to an Overview of Possible Health Problems?	46
2.9	How Do I Get Information About the Characteristic Symptoms of the Diagnosis?	50
2.10	How Can I Test the Defining Characteristics?	50
2.11	How Do I Process All This Information into a Diagnosis?	50
2.12	What About Diagnoses in the Area of Prevention?	51
	Glossary	52
	Cases and Learning Tasks.	55
	Learning Task 1: Sanne.	55
	Process Worksheet for the Sanne Case	56

Process Worksheet Diagnostic Reasoning	56
Conclusion	58
Learning Task 2: Mr Bakker	59
References	61
3 Etiological Decision: What May Have Caused the Problem?	63
3.1 What Is Etiology? What Are Etiological and Related Factors?	63
3.2 What Is Etiological Reasoning?	64
3.3 How Are Etiological Factors Incorporated into the Diagnosis?	65
3.4 How Should I Reason Etiologically in a High-Risk Diagnosis?	66
3.5 How Do I Find the Etiological Factors?	66
3.6 How Can I Estimate the Importance of the Etiological Factors?	67
3.7 How Can I Test Whether the Factors Found Do Indeed Cause or Perpetuate the Problem?	67
Glossary	68
Cases and Learning Tasks	69
Learning Task 3: Simone Case	70
Process Worksheet for the Simone case	70
Process Worksheet Diagnostic Reasoning	70
Conclusion	72
Process Worksheet Etiological Reasoning	72
Conclusion	73
Learning Task 4: Laila Case	74
References	74
4 Prognostic Decision: What Can We Achieve?	77
4.1 What Is a Prognosis? What Is Prognostic Reasoning?	77
4.2 Why Is a Prognosis Important?	78
4.3 Should Prognosis Be Reasoned About First and Then Therapy, or Vice Versa?	79
4.4 What Is the Difference Between Risk Factors, Etiological Factors and Prognostic Factors?	79
4.5 How Do I Know What Factors Influence the Prognosis?	79
4.6 What Should I Do Once I Have Identified the Prognostic Factors?	81
4.7 Which Types of Prognosis Are Possible?	81
4.8 How Can I Formulate Patient Goals from a Prognosis?	81
4.9 How Do I Formulate a Patient Goal?	82
4.10 How Can I Use the Goals in Evaluation?	83
Glossary	84
Cases and Learning Tasks	85
Learning Task 5: Mrs Kimanski Case	86
Process Worksheet for the Mrs Kimanski Case	87
Process Worksheet Diagnostic Reasoning	87
Conclusion	89
Process Worksheet Etiological Reasoning	89

Conclusion	90
Process Worksheet Prognostic Reasoning	91
Conclusion	92
Learning Task 6: Mr Ewijk Case	93
References.....	94
5 Therapeutic Decision: What Can We Do About the Problem?.....	95
5.1 What Is the Difference Between a Therapy and an Intervention?...	95
5.2 Is Therapy Also Performed by Nurses?.....	96
5.3 What Is Therapeutic Reasoning?.....	96
5.4 How Do I Know What Interventions There Are?.....	97
5.5 How Do I Know What Effects I Can Expect from an Intervention? And How Do I know If There Is Strong Evidence for These Effects?.....	98
5.6 How Do I Know If the Evidence Applies to My Patient?	98
5.7 What Is Meant by the Point of Intervention?.....	99
5.8 How Do I Find Out the Mechanism of Change of the Intervention?	99
5.9 How Can I Assess the Feasibility of the Intervention?	100
5.10 How Do I Choose from Several Alternative Interventions?.....	100
5.11 How Do I Get from Choosing the Intervention to Implementing It?	101
Glossary	101
Cases and Learning Tasks.....	103
Learning Task 7: Sven Case	103
Process Worksheet for the Sven Case.....	104
Process Worksheet Diagnostic Reasoning	104
Conclusion	106
Process Worksheet Etiological Reasoning	106
Conclusion	107
Process Worksheet Prognostic Reasoning	107
Conclusion	109
Process Worksheet Therapeutic Reasoning.....	109
Learning Task 8: Mr Bachoni Case.....	112
References.....	112

Part II Evidence-Based Practice (EBP)

6 Clinical Reasoning and Evidence-Based Practice (EBP)	115
6.1 What Is Evidence-Based Practice? How Does Evidence-Based Practice Help Improve My Clinical Reasoning?.....	115
6.2 What Is the Method of Evidence-Based Practice?.....	116
6.3 How Can I Translate a Clinical Problem into an Answerable Question?.....	117
6.4 How Do I Know What the Best Evidence Is?	117

6.5	Where Do I Find the Evidence?	119
6.6	How Can I Weigh the Found Evidence on Methodological Quality and Applicability in My Own Practice?	119
	Glossary	119
	References.	120
7	What May Be the Matter with the Patient: How to Critically Appraise Articles on Diagnostic Tests?	123
7.1	What Is a Diagnostic Test?	123
7.2	How Can I Assess the Validity of a Diagnostic Measuring Instrument?	124
7.3	What Is Meant by ‘Sequential’ or ‘Random Sample’? Why Is It So Important?	125
7.4	What Is a Valid Reference Test?	125
7.5	Why Do the Evaluators of the Test Have to Be Blinded?	125
7.6	In What Situation Is the Requirement Dropped That Both Tests Be Performed? In That Case, How Can the Comparison Be Done Properly?	126
7.7	What Is ‘Selective Dropout’? What Should I Look for in Assessing Dropout?	126
7.8	How Can I Assess the Value of the Measuring Instrument Under Study?	126
7.9	How Can I Assess Whether I Can Apply the Researched Diagnostic Instrument to My Patients?	127
	Glossary	128
	References.	130
8	What May Be the Cause: How to Critically Evaluate Articles on Etiological Factors?	131
8.1	In What Kind of Sources Can I Find the Best Evidence About Etiological Factors?	131
8.2	What Does a Cohort Study of Etiological Factors Involve?	132
8.3	What Does a Case-Control Study of Etiologic Factors Involve?	133
8.4	How Can I Determine the Quality of the Cohort Study?	134
8.5	How Do I Know If the Two Groups Are Comparable?	134
8.6	What Is Selection Bias? How Can I Estimate the Risk of Bias in Research Results?	135
8.7	What Is Information Bias? How Can I Estimate the Risk of Research Results Being Biased by Information Bias?	135
8.8	How Do I Know If the Period of Time Until Follow-Up Is Long Enough?	136
8.9	Why Does the Intermediate Dropout of Participants Threaten the Validity of the Study? How Can I Determine Whether Too Many Participants Have Dropped Out?	136
8.10	What Is ‘Adjustment for Significant Risk Factors’? How Can I Check Whether These Factors Have Been Controlled for?	136

8.11	Do the Same Requirements Apply to Determining the Validity of a Case-Control Study?	137
8.12	What Is Meant by New Cases? Why Is It Important That the Cases Are New?	137
8.13	What Is Meant by Misclassification? How Can I Find Out If There Is a High Risk of Misclassification?	138
8.14	How Can I Assess the Magnitude of the Effect of the Etiological Factor?	138
8.15	How Can I Determine If the Point Estimate Is Really the Actual Effect?	139
8.16	What Does the Confidence Interval Say About Statistical Significance?	139
8.17	How Do I Know If I Can Use the Results for My Patients?	141
8.18	What Is the Difference Between Association and Causation?	141
	Glossary	142
	References	145
9	What Can We Achieve: How to Critically Review Articles on Prognostic Research?	147
9.1	What Are Prognostic Factors? Why Are They Important?	147
9.2	In What Sources Can I Find the Best Evidence for Prognostic Factors?	148
9.3	How Can I Determine the Quality of a Cohort Study of Prognostic Factors?	148
9.4	What Is Important in the Description of the Patient Group?	149
9.5	How Can I Verify That the Follow-Up Measurement Was Conducted with a Sufficient Number of Study Participants?	150
9.6	How Do I Know If the Period to Follow-Up Is Long Enough to Measure the Effect of the Studied Factor on the Course and Outcome of the Studied Health Condition?	151
9.7	How Can I Assess the Quality of the Measurements of the Outcomes?	151
9.8	How Can I Assess the Quality of the Measurements of the Potential Prognostic Factor?	151
9.9	What Is the Value of Initial Research on a Prognostic Factor? How Does It Differ from Later Research?	152
9.10	How Can I Determine the Importance of the Study Results in Relation to the Prognostic Factor for the Patients?	152
9.11	How Can I Find Out If the Study Results Can be Used for My Own Patients?	153
	Glossary	154
	References	155

10 What Can We Do About the Problem: How to Critically Appraise

Articles on Interventions?	157
10.1 Randomised Controlled Trial and Controlled Clinical Trial	157
10.1.1 What Is a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT)?	158
10.1.2 How Can I Critically Evaluate the Quality of a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT)? How Can I Determine the Applicability of the Intervention to Patients in My Practice?	160
10.1.3 What Is Meant by Randomisation?	160
10.1.4 Why Is Randomisation Important?	161
10.1.5 What About a Controlled Clinical Trial?	161
10.1.6 Why Is the Comparability of the Participant Groups Important?	162
10.1.7 What Is Meant By Blinding?	162
10.1.8 Why Is Treatment Comparability Important?	163
10.1.9 How Is the Quality of the RCT Affected by Sample Size and Completeness of Follow-Up?	163
10.1.10 What Is Meant By Validity? How Can the Validity of an RCT Be Assessed?	165
10.1.11 How Can the Results of an RCT Be Interpreted?	166
10.1.12 What Is Meant by Significance?	168
10.1.13 What Does the <i>p</i> -Value Say About Statistical Significance?	168
10.1.14 What Does the Confidence Interval Say About Statistical Significance?	169
10.1.15 What Role Do Adverse Effects Play in Assessing an Intervention?	171
10.1.16 How Can It Be Assessed Whether the Experimental Intervention Can Be Generalised To, and Applied In, My Patient Care?	171
10.2 Synthesis: What Is the Value of Systematic Reviews?	173
10.2.1 What Is a Systematic Review?	173
10.2.2 How Can the Value of a Systematic Review Be Determined?	174
10.2.3 How Can the Research Question of the SR Be Appraised?	175
10.2.4 What Requirements Must the Systematic Search for Relevant Studies Meet in a Systematic Review?	175
10.2.5 What Are the Requirements for the Selection Procedure of the Articles for the SR?	177
10.2.6 How to Assess Whether a Systematic Review Is Based on Good or Weak RCTs?	177
10.2.7 What Is Data Extraction? What Are the Requirements for Reporting on the Data Extraction Process in a Systematic Review?	179

10.2.8	In What Way Should the Original Studies Be Described in the SR?	179
10.2.9	What Is Heterogeneity? How Can It Be Verified That Heterogeneity Has Been Correctly Estimated and Correctly Incorporated into an SR?	179
10.2.10	How Should the Results of an SR Be Reported?	182
10.2.11	How to Assess the Validity of an SR?	183
10.2.12	How Can the Results of an SR Be Interpreted? How to Assess the Applicability of the Intervention in Patient Care?	183
10.3	Evidence-Based Guidelines	183
10.3.1	What Is a Guideline?	183
10.3.2	What Value Do Guidelines Have for Clinical Reasoning?	184
10.3.3	How Can the Quality of a Guideline Be Critically Assessed?	184
	Glossary	185
	References	191
11	How to Better Understand Patients' Experience: Understanding Psychosocial Processes in Healthcare Through Qualitative Research.	193
11.1	What Is Qualitative Research? What Is the Difference Between Quantitative and Qualitative Research?	193
11.2	What Is the Most Important Method in Qualitative Research?	194
11.3	What Are the Ways of Collecting Data in Qualitative Research?	194
11.4	How Are Data Analysed in Qualitative Research?	195
11.5	What Are the Pitfalls of Conducting Qualitative Research?	196
11.6	What Are Quality Criteria for Qualitative Research?	197
11.6.1	Truth Value or Credibility	197
11.6.2	Applicability or Transferability	198
11.6.3	Repeatability	199
11.6.4	Neutrality or Confirmability	199
11.7	How Does Qualitative Research Contribute to Clinical Reasoning?	200
	Glossary	200
	References	202
 Part III Second Layer with Extras		
12	In-Depth Texts	205
12.1	Examples of the Four Types of Questions	205
12.2	Making a Deliberate Decision	205

12.3	Conditions for Critical Thinking by the Nurse	206
12.3.1	Use Good Information	206
12.3.2	Assess and Weigh Information Properly	207
12.3.3	Thorough Professional Knowledge	207
12.4	Examples of Standard Questions That Are Asked in Order to Eventually Answer the Basic Question	207
12.5	Example of Body Structures and Their Body Functions (ICF)	208
12.6	Deepening Knowledge of Environmental Factors	208
12.7	Explanation of the Standard Questions for a Diagnostic Decision	209
12.8	Explanation of the Standard Questions for an Etiological Decision	210
12.9	Explanation of the Standard Questions for a Prognostic Decision	211
12.10	Explanation of the Standard Questions for a Therapeutic Decision	212
12.11	Forms of Collaboration Between Professionals: Multiprofessional, Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary or Interprofessional	215
12.12	Further Elaboration of the Nursing Professional Domain	216
12.13	Short Case with Autonomous and Participative Action	217
12.13.1	Autonomous Reasoning and Acting	217
12.13.2	Participatory Reasoning and Action	217
12.14	Explanation of the Seven Diversity Aspects	218
12.15	Example of Blood Pressure Measurement by Isabella: First Part	219
12.16	Blood Pressure Measurement by Isabella: Second Part	223
12.16.1	Health Risk: The Whole Is More Than the Sum of the Parts	223
12.17	Considering Hypothetical Diagnoses	225
12.18	Example of Hypothesis Formation and Test Criteria of Etiology	226
12.19	Example of Hypothesis Formation and Test Criteria for Patient Goals	227
12.20	Example of Hypothesis Formation and Test Criteria for Interventions	228
12.21	Risk of Death for Smokers and Ex-Smokers Compared with People Who Never Smoked	229
12.22	Examples of the Use of Relevant and Irrelevant Information	230
12.22.1	Use of Irrelevant Information	230
12.22.2	Use of Relevant Information	231
12.22.3	Analysis	231

12.23	Test Your Use of the Thinking Systems Through the Cognitive Response Test.	231
12.23.1	Questions	231
12.24	Example of Mrs. Brown Elaborated in the Dual Processing Model.	232
12.24.1	Patient Situation	232
12.24.2	Question	232
12.25	More Examples of Biases	233
12.26	Brief Overview of the Differences Between Intuition and Analysis.	234
12.27	Examples of When a More Intuitive Approach Is Preferred	234
12.28	Standards for BMI and Abdominal Size	235
12.28.1	BMI.	235
12.28.2	Waist Circumference: High Risk of Obesity-Related Conditions.	235
12.29	In-Depth Text About Monitoring: Diagnosis - Monitoring - Ongoing Diagnostic Reasoning	235
12.30	Example of How Knowledge Leads to Further Questions.	236
12.31	Brief Description of the Area Within Which Nurses Make Autonomous Diagnosis and Practice Participatory Diagnostic Reasoning.	236
12.32	Deepening on Sufficient and Necessary Causes	237
12.33	Example of a Nutritional Instrument: The Short Nutritional Assessment Questionnaire (SNAQ).	238
12.34	Explanation of the Six Types of Results	238
12.35	Isabella's Elaboration on Smoking Cessation Prognosis and Goals by Mrs. Jacobi.	239
12.36	Autonomous and Participatory Interventions	240
12.36.1	Autonomous Nursing Interventions	240
12.36.2	Participatory Interventions, Carried Out By the Nurse	240
12.37	Elaboration of Isabella's Search for Exercise Interventions	241
12.37.1	Intervention.	242
12.37.2	Impact.	242
12.37.3	The Evidence Applied to Isabella's Patient	242
12.37.4	Focus.	242
12.37.5	Mechanism of Change	243
12.37.6	Feasibility of the Intervention.	243
12.37.7	Patient Acceptability.	243
12.38	Examples of Mechanisms of Change.	243
12.38.1	Aspirin as a Painkiller.	243
12.38.2	Motivational Interviewing	244

12.39	Explanation of Three Questions About the Applicability of Specific Scientific Knowledge	244
12.39.1	Is the New Information Emerging from These Scientific Articles Likely to be True?	244
12.39.2	What Does This Information Tell About Patient Care? . . .	244
12.39.3	Can This Information be Used for One's Patient?	245
12.40	More Examples of Determinants	246
12.41	More Examples of Questions Using the PICO System	246
12.42	The Use of PICO for Questions on Diagnosis, Etiology, or Prognosis	247
12.42.1	Diagnostic Question	247
12.42.2	Etiological Question	247
12.42.3	Prognostic Question	248
12.43	Alternatives for the Reference Test, If It Cannot Be Carried Out on All Patients	248
12.44	Sensitivity/Specificity Exercise	249
12.44.1	Test Questions Sensitivity/Specificity	249
12.44.2	What Do the Sensitivity and Specificity Mean in This Case? Choose an Answer from A, B, C, or D	249
12.45	Exercise with Positive and Negative Predictive Values	249
12.46	Schematic Overview of the Cohort Study of Li et al.	250
12.47	Schematic Overview Case-Control Study	251
12.48	All Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria from Minneboo et al	252
12.49	Explanation of the Concept 'Allocation Concealment'	252
12.50	Example of a Flow Diagram	253
12.51	Explanation of the Exact Meaning of $RR = 1.43$ (1.14–1.78) from Minneboo et al.	255
12.52	Elaboration of Found Relative Risk in Terms of Percentages	255
12.53	Explanation of Thresholds and Significance Level	256
12.53.1	Some Possible Situations	256
12.53.2	After Statistical Testing, The Following Situations Can Arise	257
12.54	Example of the Value of an SR Over Several RCTs	258
12.55	Example of Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria in an SR by Machado et al	259
12.56	Example of Response Bias.	260
12.57	Overview of Factors Weakening and Strengthening the Strength of Evidence of a Systematic Review	260
12.57.1	Factors Weakening the Strength of Evidence	260
12.57.2	Factors Strengthening the Strength of Evidence	261
12.58	More Examples of Qualitative Research Questions	261
12.59	Different Ways of Participating and Observing in Qualitative Research.	262

12.60	Different Forms of Triangulation	262
12.61	More Detailed Explanation of the Measures to Enhance Credibility	263
12.62	Checklists	264
12.62.1	Checklist 1 Checklist for Assessing Studies on Diagnostic Accuracy	264
12.63	Checklist 2	265
12.63.1	Checklist for Assessment of Cohort Studies into Etiological Factors	265
12.64	Checklist 3	266
12.64.1	Checklist for Assessment of Case-Control Studies	266
12.65	Checklist 4	267
12.65.1	Checklist for Assessment of Prognostic Research	267
12.66	Checklist 5	267
12.66.1	Checklist for Assessment of RCTs	267
12.67	Checklist 6	269
12.67.1	Checklist Generalisability, Usability and Appropriateness of the Experimental Intervention	269
12.68	Checklist 7	271
12.68.1	Checklist for Assessment of a Systematic Review of RCTs	271
12.69	Checklist 8	273
12.69.1	Checklist for Assessment of Qualitative Research	273
12.70	Checklist 9	274
12.70.1	Checklist of Frequently Used Measures of Effect	274
12.71	Process Worksheets	279
12.71.1	Process Worksheet Diagnostic Reasoning	279
12.71.2	Process Worksheet Etiological Reasoning	279
12.71.3	Process Worksheet Prognostic Reasoning	280
12.71.4	Process Worksheet Therapeutic Reasoning	281
12.72	Answers to Questions	281
12.72.1	Cognitive Response Test About the Use of Thinking Systems	281
12.72.2	Exercise Sensitivity/Specificity	282
12.72.3	Exercise with Positive and Negative Predictive Values	282
	Glossary	282
	References	283
13	Education About Clinical Reasoning and Evidence-Based Practice . .	287
13.1	Explanation of the 4C/ID Model	287
13.2	Practical Tools for the Organisation of Education	287
13.3	Process Worksheets	288
13.4	Test Material	288
13.4.1	Complexity Level 2	288
13.4.2	Complexity Level 4	288
	Index	289

Authors and Contributors

About the Authors

Jos Dobber, PhD is a mental health nurse, an educational scientist and health scientist. He is a senior lecturer in the bachelor's and the master's programme in Nursing at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands), with a special focus on the content and consistency of the curriculum. He is an expert on Motivational Interviewing, and on the learning and didactics of clinical reasoning and evidence-based practice.

José Harmsen, MSc is a general healthcare nurse and nursing scientist. She is lecturer at the Bachelor Education in Nursing (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences). Her core task as a teacher is clinical reasoning. In addition, she provides workshops in the country on clinical reasoning to graduate nurses.

Margriet van Iersel, PhD is a mental health nurse, educational scientist and programme leader of a Master in Mental Health Nursing. She is senior lecturer at the Bachelor and Master Education in Nursing (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences). She has a special interest for curriculum design, specifically the 4C/ID model, and she brings in her expertise into the Bachelor and Master nursing curriculum. The authors of this publication are lecturers from the bachelor's programme in Nursing of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. The contents of this publication reflect the knowledge that has been developed in this field within the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

Contributors ¹

W. J. Assendelft, MD, PhD Department of Primary Care Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

A. M. Eskes, PhD Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

¹The following authors contributed to Part II Evidence-based practice (EBP).

C. H. M. Latour, PhD School of Nursing, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Integration of Psychiatric and Somatic Care, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Faculty of Health, Centre of Expertise Urban Vitality, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

M. Offringa, MD, PhD Child Health Evaluative Sciences CHES, The Hospital for Sick Children Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

R. J. P. M. Scholten, MD, PhD Cochrane Netherlands and Julius Centre for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Centre Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands