

Critique of Research Studies

Name

Institution of affiliation

Date

## Critique of Research Studies

**Quantitative****The role of nurses in the recognition and treatment of patients with sepsis in the emergency department: A prospective before-and-after intervention study**

The title is good noting that it recognizes the key phenomenon under study as the role of nurses in the specified medical condition. It also specified that the study looks at the situation before and after the study.

**Abstract**

The abstract clearly and concisely summarizes the key components of the study. It correctly provides the background context leading to the study. Noting that there has been a global initiative to decrease mortality owing from Sepsis. This initiative, however, does not include the role of the nurse. The abstract also provides objectives for the study. It also notes that participants are patients (adults above 16 years) coming to 825 patients. It notes that the study methods includes measuring compliance with Surviving Sepsis Campaign (SSC) recommendations. It notes that the intervention mechanisms led to an improvement from 3.5% to 12.4%.

**Introduction**

The introduction correctly and unambiguously identifies the problem. The introduction notes that 2% of all patients who are hospitalized are septic patients. The paper correctly identifies the medical intervention mechanism for treating Sepsis. The introduction also provides the background for the Surviving Sepsis Campaign (SSC) which was to reduce the mortality rate for Sepsis.

**Statement of the problem**

The problem statement notes the limitation of the current Sepsis management protocol through the 6h and 24h bundles. The statement recognizes that nurses are not involved in this protocol. Thus, the statement advocates for a program that includes nurses in implementing SSC recommendations.

The problem is significant for nursing noting that with a 40-50% fatality rate for severe sepsis cases. Yet, sepsis makes up 2% of all hospitalized patients, the number of at-risk patients is significant.

The match between the research problem and the method was good. Utilizing a quantitative method paradigm was sound noting that the study is interested in reducing the fatality rate of Sepsis. This method is the only paradigm capable of determining that protocols are working.

**Hypotheses or research questions / Literature review**

Research questions are not explicitly stated in the study. The hypothesis is alluded to where the role of nurses in the management of Sepsis will result in an increase in the quality of care for Sepsis patients.

The literature review study is severely lacking in content. There is minimal reference to previous studies. Where previous studies are quoted, this is merely done in passing. E.g. the paper notes that past studies describe how implementation activities of the SSC recommendations can affect diagnosis. It does not, therefore, provide the theoretical foundations for the study.

**Conceptual/theoretical framework**

The conceptual framework for the study is not clearly stated. It can only be inferred from reading the study.

### **Method**

The study was humane, with the procedures of the study designed to protect the innate rights of the patients and their identity within the study. The study was also designed to maximize benefits for the patient. The study was approved by the local medical ethics committee; it waives the need for informed consent. The research design, sample choice and setting, data collection and analysis procedures were beyond reproach (Tromp, 2010).

### **Qualitative**

#### **A Qualitative Investigation of Patients' and Caregivers' Experiences of Severe Sepsis**

The title is appropriate noting that the study features a qualitative paradigm to investigate the quality of experiences for patients and caregivers with regard to Severe Sepsis. It correctly identifies the phenomenon and groups under study.

### **Abstract**

The abstract concisely and clearly demonstrates the general gist of the study. It identifies the objective of the study as to determining the subjective experiences of caregivers. This is done through a qualitative paradigm noting that the phenomenon under study cannot be empirically examined. The study adopts a thematic analysis approach to analyze experiences as provided by respondents. The study further identifies the means through which patients are brought into the study. The abstract section also provides the location of the study. It identifies the interview as the

data collection method and notes there are no intervention mechanisms. The paper also provides the conclusion of the study.

### **Introduction**

The problem is stated clearly and unambiguously. This is the onset of Sepsis resulting in infection and potentially acute organ dysfunction. The introduction notes that caring for Sepsis patients after discharge can demand an investment of up to hours a week on informal caregivers. The study takes note of this burden and thus attempts to place it under study.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The problem statement adequately builds an argument for the study noting that there is a lack of understanding with regard to the impact of Sepsis to patients and caregivers after discharge. The problem is significant for nursing, noting that the period after discharge determines whether the patient makes a full recovery. There is a good match between the research problem and the chosen paradigm. The problem under investigation is pseudo psycho-sensory in nature. Thus, only a qualitative approach would allow it to be investigated.

### **Research Questions**

The research questions are not explicitly stated in the study; there is no justification provided or discernible for this.

### **Literature review**

The paper does not provide any literature review. There are limited connections between the study and previous scholarly work done in the subject. The paper does not in any way indicate

that there was any attempt to look into any previous work done on the subject. This severely disadvantages the study; it lacks any theoretical foundations upon which to build on.

### **Conceptual underpinnings**

The key concepts of the study are not adequately defined. The reader must derive meaning from context. The paper does not also specify the conceptual framework for the study. The philosophical basis for the paper can be inferred from a cursory examination of the text. This is, however, insufficient.

### **Methods**

There are appropriate safeguards in place to protect the patient. The patient is informed prior to inclusion in the study. Caregivers are also informed and are allowed to decline from participation. The study does not indicate if the subject was reviewed by an ethics board. The study is designed to minimize risks for the respondents. The respondents provide their responses through transcripts which are then analyzed. This analysis removes any personal identifying information. This protects respondent's key information as well as well as the credibility of the study. The study uses interviews to collect data from respondents. The sampling techniques, data collection, and analysis procedures are designed to ensure the data received is of high quality (Gallop, Kerr, Nixon, & Lara Verdian, 2015).

References

- Gallop, K. H., Kerr, C. E., Nixon, A., & Lara Verdian. (2015). A Qualitative Investigation of Patients' and Caregivers' Experiences of Severe Sepsis. *Critical Care Medicine*, 296-607.
- Tromp, M. (2010). The role of nurses in the recognition and treatment of patients with sepsis in the emergency department: A prospective before-and-after intervention study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 1464–1473.