**Application form for Evidence-Based Repository in Osteoporosis Adoption**

**Instructions to applicants: please answer the following questions and complete the column ‘applicant response’ overleaf and return to** [*ero.health@keele.ac.uk*](mailto:ero.health@keele.ac.uk)*.*

\*indicates mandatory questions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ERO eligibility** | | |
| I confirm this resource(s) is evidence-based (i.e developed through research).\* | | Yes/No |
| Intended audience:\* | Patients  Healthcare professionals  Researchers  Others, please state | ………………………….. |
| **Applicant details** | | |
| Name\* |  | |
| Email address\* |  | |
| Host organisation(s): what was the lead organisation involved in the development of the resource\* |  | |
| **Resource details** | | |
| Name of resource \* |  | |
| Brief description to be included on ERO website on heath professional page (max 150 words):\*  Please write this in lay language and include a description of the resource and intended audience. this will affect word and pdf versions of form |  | |
| Do you wish your resource(s) to be accessible on patient page? \* | Yes/ No | |
| **If yes please provide b**rief lay description to be included on ERO website on patient page (max 150 words): | |
| Current URL if available: |  | |
| OR Upload here (option to upload document/resource) |
| If adopted to ERO would you want to keep your existing URL?\* | Yes/ No/ Not Applicable | |
| **Request from ERO\*** | **Adoption onto ERO website embedded within ROS Quality Hub\*** | **Yes/No** |
| **Impact metrics** | **Yes/No**  **If Yes please give details**  **……………………………………………..** |
| **Advice on impact metrics** | **Yes/No**  **If yes, please add details of your intended impact measures** |
| **Advice on dissemination and implementation** | **Yes/No** **If yes, please add details of your current dissemination plan** |
| **Are you willing/able to amend resource wording or layout with ERO committee advice, following quality assessment?\*** | | **Yes/No**  **Please give details** |
| **Do you have any case studies of use of this resource you would like included on the website** | | **Yes/No**  **If yes, please give details** |
| **Please add a few sentences/paragraph of wording that could be used to advertise your resource being available on social media.\*** | |  |
| **Relevant keywords to tag on website eg:** Bone density scans  Bisphosphonates, Calcium, communication,  Decision making, Denosumab  Diagnosis, Drug treatments, DXA, Exercise, Falls, Fracture Liaison Service, Hip fractures, Risk, Spinal fractures, Vitamin D | |  |
| **Please provide any linked publications or outputs:** | |  |

**Criteria to assess the quality of Evidence-Based Resources in Osteoporosis[[1]](#footnote-2)**

Please complete as many boxes as possible. Enter N/A if not applicable. Adoption may be considered without a favourable assessment in each box.

**Note this completed quality assessment form will be uploaded alongside the resource on the website.**

\*Questions are mandatory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality assessment** | **Applicant response** | **ERO panel assessment –**  any points of concern or importance to bring to panel discussion |
| **General** |  |  |
| * Briefly describe how the resource was developed and by whom\* (max 300 words) |  |  |
| * Was the work that underpinned the resource peer reviewed?\* by competitive fundings or otherwise | Yes/No  **If yes describe** |  |
| * Who funded the development/testing of the resource\* |  |  |
| * Were patients and public were involved.\* If yes give details\* (max 300 words) | Yes/No  **If yes describe \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| * Describe any regulatory approvals for development and/or testing of the resource\* |  |  |
| **Royal Osteoporosis Society involvement** |  |  |
| Were the Royal Osteoporosis Society involved in the development of the resources?\* (max 300 words) | Yes/No  **If yes describe** |  |
| **Inclusivity and Diversity** |  |  |
| How have the needs of underserved communities been considered when developing the resource?\* (max 300 words) |  |  |
| How has accessibility been considered?\* (e.g. provision of Alt Text for images, tables and hyperlinks, provision of alternative versions) (See ERO accessibility guidelines {link} for details) | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Is the resource written at a level that can be understood by the intended audience?\* (max 300 words) | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| **Resource content** |  |  |
| Does the resource content align with current clinical guidelines? (National Osteoporosis Guideline Group, Scottish Intercollegiate Guideline Network)\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Does the resource explicitly state the target audience?\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Does the resource cite sources of evidence?\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Does the resource cite sources of funding?\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Does the resource include any necessary disclosure statements?\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Does the resource include a date of completion?\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| Are there plans for the resource to be updated?\* | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |
| **Testing of the resource** | | |
| Has the resource been explored for acceptability amongst the target audience?\* If yes, please provide detail\* (max 300 words) | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_\*** |  |
| Has the resource been tested for effectiveness?\* If yes, please provide detail\* (max 300 words) | Yes/No  **Details \_\_\_\_\_\*** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***TO COMPLETE FOR PATIENT INFORMATION RESOURCES ONLY*** | | |
| ***If describing osteoporosis, does the resource…*** | | |
| use recommended terms, e.g. ‘weak bone’ and avoid unrecommended terms such as ‘spongy’ and ‘honeycomb’[[2]](#footnote-3) | Yes/No/NA |  |
| explain anyone can be affected by osteoporosis (i.e. is inclusive of men, younger people and people of colour) | Yes/No/NA |  |
| avoid contradictory statements about absence or presence of symptoms | Yes/No/NA |  |
| include discussion of the physical, social and psychological impact of osteoporotic fractures | Yes/No/NA |  |
| use labelled images or animations where possible | Yes/No/NA |  |
| ***If describing osteoporosis drug treatment, does the resource…*** | | |
| Balance the amount of information about benefits and risks of drugs | Yes/No/NA |  |
| Use probabilities or simple event rates rather than percentages | Yes/No/NA |  |
| Avoid misleading terms such as ‘prevent’, ‘renew’ and ‘restore’[[3]](#footnote-4) | Yes/No/NA |  |
| Provide accurate information about the practical aspects of treatment and why these procedures are important | Yes/No/NA |  |

**Summary of Panel Discussion**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. These standards were obtained from a synthesis of quality assessment tools (patient information quality standards (m-IPDAS) and IPDAS), and recommendations in Crawford-Manning F, et al. Evaluation of quality and readability of online patient information on osteoporosis and osteoporosis drug treatment and recommendations for improvement. Osteoporos Int. 2021 Aug;32(8):1567-1584. doi: 10.1007/s00198-020-05800-7. Epub 2021 Jan 27. PMID: 33501570; PMCID: PMC8376728. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Recommended terms – less strong or weaker bone

   Unrecommended terms – spongy, fragile, honeycomb, weaker than average, established, idiopathic. Osteopenia should not be described as a diagnosis or condition [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Recommended terms – lower fracture risk, strengthen bone

   Unrecommended terms – prevent fracture. Renew, restore [↑](#footnote-ref-4)