PEN® Guidelines for Third Party Tool/Resource (TR) Approval

Purpose: To ensure that third party TRs are valuable additions to PEN®, by considering the following criteria for new and current TRs.

Guidelines

PEN® client handouts are the preferred resources, but when these are not available PEN® administrators need to use clinical judgment when reviewing external resources.

Generally, the more global or widely applicable a resource is, the better, however country or even region specific resources can be added to PEN®.

Critical criteria are the key points that need to be met and that make or break including a resource on PEN®. Critical criteria are noted in the table below and include:

- consistency with PEN® evidence (see PEN® Supporting evidence below)
- does not contain sponsorship or links to sponsored information (see Sponsorship below).

The usability (and readability) of a TR is additional (but not critical) criteria that can be used in deciding upon a TR. Note that items, such as a high literacy, may prevent a TR from being added to PEN, however the TR description can be used to inform users of these types of issues Exceptions are sometimes made, particularly if no other TR exists on the topic. If in doubt, check with the PEN® Resource Managers.

| Topic Area | Criteria |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Existing TRs (critical) | Does the TR currently exist in PEN®? Search on the administrative side so that each portal's TRs can be viewed. Ensure that the TR is not part of an existing collection. If the TR is in PEN®, is the new TR an updated version? (If it is, then the existing TR would be updated.) If it does not exist in PEN®, is the new information better than what already exists? Should it replace a resource in PEN® or be added as an additional Related Tool and Resource? An example would be a resource with similar content, but from another country of origin. |
| PEN® supporting evidence (critical) | Is the information in the TR current (last 5 years) and congruent with the evidence in PEN®? To assess this, review any content statements made in the TR against related Practice Questions (PQs) and Backgrounds in PEN®. For example, if within the TR it says that 'eating too much rice can increase arsenic levels', this needs to be searched and verified with evidence in PEN®. A search on PEN® would bring up the PQ: Is the consumption of rice (white and brown) associated with increased arsenic-related health risks? Reviewing the PQ, it would be noted that a direct correlation to eating rice and high arsenic levels can't be made: "any studies conducted that investigate a relationship between rice consumption and the increased risk of any disease". Therefore the TR would need to be edited to have the content statement removed. If the TR can't be edited, then it cannot be added to PEN®. If there isn't evidence on PEN® that covers the complete content of the TR, the reviewer must ensure that the content is evidence-based and/or best practice If the TR topic isn't in PEN® then the TR cannot be added, and the topic should be submitted to the PEN® Content Manager for future consideration and addition to PEN®. The TR can be put aside until there is evidence in PEN® to support the information and/or the TR can be modified. |
| Sponsorship (critical) | Does the TR meet the PEN® Sponsorship Policy Guidelines? |

| Topic Area | Criteria |
|------------------|--|
| | In accordance with the guidelines: "Resources and or tools that have been developed by the corporate sector may be eligible for inclusion in PEN® if they are |
| | reviewed through an independent peer review process and deemed congruent with |
| | the evidence in PEN®. However, preference will always be given to tools that have |
| | not been developed by corporate interests, should similar tools exist". |
| Access | If the TR is housed on a website: |
| Considerations | Is the website appropriate (information is unbiased); credible (author's qualifications are sound and professibly poor reviewed); and directly related to |
| | qualifications are sound and preferably peer reviewed); and directly related to KP content and is current (last 3-5 years)? |
| | The website does not contain sponsorship; or advertizing and other |
| | links are appropriate (as defined above) |
| | If the TR is a PDF, is there a URL to use instead? (URLs are easier for updating and identifying broken links.) |
| | and identifying broken links.) Is there information specific to PEN[®] that needs to be added? |
| Design | Does the TR have a date, organization logo identifying where it is from? |
| Considerations | Is the TR national/global in scope? Or is the TR specific to one geographic area |
| | within a country? Is it appropriate just for Canada? for Global PEN®? |
| | Is it clear who the intended audience is for the TR? |
| | Does it provide useful/relevant information for the intended audience? Is the layout clear, good flow of information, grammatically correct, no typos? |
| | Can the TR be easily loaded and printed? |
| | Does the user have to be registered to the site to access the tool? Is there a user |
| | fee or a subscription required? Note: it is OK to use tools that require any of these |
| | but it should be noted in the description of the tool. Is the TR available in other languages and/or culturally adapted? |
| | Does the TR have an option for the visually impaired? |
| | Are all the links in the TR active? |
| Resources for | For TRs for professionals: |
| Professionals | Is the information source referenced? |
| | • Is the TR better added under Key Resources for Professionals in the related KP Background rather than as a Related TR (e.g. a separately loaded TR)? |
| Resources for | For TRs for clients: |
| Clients | Does the language/reading level match the audience? (Client TRs requiring a |
| | high level of literacy may be fine, but the literacy level needs to be noted in the description. (Aim for reading levels of about grade 5 to 9) |
| | Is there an advisory to the effect that health information should not be taken |
| | as health advice and does not substitute consultation with a health professional? |
| Corporate | TRs that have been developed by the corporate sector or other |
| Sector | organizations/agencies external to PEN® may be eligible for inclusion in PEN® if |
| Developed TRs | they are reviewed through an independent peer review process and deemed congruent with the evidence in PEN® when assessed by the PEN®/CC-PEN |
| 1103 | Resource Managers and/or Knowledge Pathway author. Preference will always be |
| | given to TRs that have not been developed by corporate interests, should similar |
| | tools exist. If these TR contain names/logos of products or services the following |
| | considerations should be used for their assessment in PEN[®]. if the TR is a database listing of products or services, its goal should be to |
| | assist the consumer and/or health provider in making healthy food choices; |
| | should be inclusive and as national in scope as possible, or at least be broader |
| | than one region; product or company; and if there is no other resource that is available and there is a high user need for |
| | the information. |
| | An example currently in PEN®. <u>Diabetes Products and Medications</u> |