

## **Evidence-Based Practice Competencies among Nutrition Professionals and Students: A Systematic Review**

Nirjhar R. Ghosh, MSc, doctoral student; Zahra Esmaeilinezhad, MSc, doctoral student; Joanna Zając, PhD, Assistant Professor; Rebecca A. Creasy, PhD, NSCA-CPT, Instructional Assistant Professor; Saundra G. Lorenz, MS, RD, LD, Senior Lecturer; Molly Crews, MLS, Systematic Review Librarian; Karen M. Beathard, PhD, RD, LD, FAND, Instructional Associate Professor; Malgorzata M. Bala, MD, PhD, Profesor; Kevin C. Klatt, PhD, RD, Assistant Research Scientist; Bradley C. Johnston, PhD, Associate Professor

**Nirjhar R. Ghosh**, MSc, Doctoral student; Department of Nutrition, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [nirjharruth@tamu.edu](mailto:nirjharruth@tamu.edu)

**Zahra Esmaeilinezhad**, MSc, Doctoral student; Department of Nutrition, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [sahar.esnj8@tamu.edu](mailto:sahar.esnj8@tamu.edu)

**Joanna Zając**, PhD, Assistant Professor; Department of Hygiene and Dietetics, Chair of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland; email: [joanna.faustyna.zajac@gmail.com](mailto:joanna.faustyna.zajac@gmail.com)

**Rebecca A. Creasy**, PhD, NSCA-CPT, Instructional Assistant Professor; Department of Food Science and Technology, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [Rebecca.Creasy@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:Rebecca.Creasy@ag.tamu.edu)

**Saundra G. Lorenz**, MS, RD, LD, Senior Lecturer; Department of Nutrition, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [Saundra.Lorenz@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:Saundra.Lorenz@ag.tamu.edu)

**Molly Crews**, MLS, Systematic Review Librarian; School of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [crewsm@exchange.tamu.edu](mailto:crewsm@exchange.tamu.edu)

**Karen M. Beathard**, PhD, RD, LD, FAND, Instructional Associate Professor; Department of Nutrition, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [kbeathard@tamu.edu](mailto:kbeathard@tamu.edu)

**Malgorzata M. Bala**, MD, PhD, Profesor; Department of Hygiene and Dietetics, Chair of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland; email: [malgorzata.1.bala@uj.edu.pl](mailto:malgorzata.1.bala@uj.edu.pl)

**Kevin C. Klatt**, PhD, RD, Assistant Research Scientist; Department of Nutrition Sciences and Toxicology, University of California, Berkeley; email: [klatt@berkeley.edu](mailto:klatt@berkeley.edu)

**Bradley C. Johnston**, PhD; Department of Nutrition, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: [bradley.johnston@tamu.edu](mailto:bradley.johnston@tamu.edu)

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Evidence-based practice (EBP) promotes shared decision-making between clinicians and patients and has been widely adopted by various health professions including nutrition & dietetics, medicine and nursing.

**Objective:** To determine evidence-based practice (EBP) competencies among nutrition professionals and students reported in the literature.

**Design:** Systematic review.

**Data sources:** Medline, Embase, CINAHL, ERIC, CENTRAL, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global, BIOSIS Citation Index, and ClinicalTrials.gov up to March 2023.

**Eligibility criteria for study selection:** Eligible primary studies had to objectively or subjectively document the assessment of at least one of six predefined core EBP competencies, including formulating structured clinical questions, searching the literature for best evidence, and assessing studies for methodological quality, magnitude (size) of effects, certainty of evidence for effects, and determining the clinical applicability of study results based on patient values and preferences.

**Data extraction and synthesis:** Two reviewers independently screened articles and extracted data, including the reporting quality for eligible studies. Results were not amenable to meta-analysis and were thus summarized for each EBP competency.

**Results:** We identified 12 eligible cross-sectional survey studies, comprised of 1065 participants, primarily registered dietitians, across six countries, with the majority assessed in the United States (n=470). The reporting quality of the survey studies was poor overall, with 43% of items not reported and 22% of items partially reported. Only one study (8%) explicitly used an objective

questionnaire to assess EBP competencies. The proportion of studies reporting on each competency were: 17% on the formulation of clinical questions, 83% on searching the literature, 75% on methodological quality or critical appraisal, 58% on interpreting statistical results, and 75% on applying study results. In general, the six competencies were incompletely defined or reported (e.g., it was unclear what ‘applicability’ and ‘critical appraisal’ referred to, and what study designs were appraised by the participants). Two core competencies, the magnitude (size) of effects and the certainty of evidence for effects, were not assessed.

**Conclusions:** Among 12 included articles the overall quality of study reports was poor, and when EBP competencies were reported they were predominantly self-perceived assessments as opposed to objective assessments. No studies reported on competencies in assessing magnitude of effect or certainty of evidence, skills that are essential for optimizing clinical nutrition decision-making.

**Systematic review registration:** PROSPERO [CRD42022311916](#).

## INTRODUCTION

Evidence-based practice (EBP) promotes shared decision-making between clinicians and patients based on three foundational principles: (i) the use of best available evidence, (ii) clinical or real-world experience, and (iii) the consideration of patients' values and preferences based on their unique circumstances[1,2]. Having originated from the concept of evidence-based medicine (EBM) first described by Guyatt in 1991[3,4], EBP has been widely adopted by various health professions[5–9]. Based on the Users' Guides to the Medical Literature[10], EBP core competencies can be described as (i) formulating a structured clinical question, (ii) finding the best available research evidence, (iii) assessing the methodological quality or risk of bias (RoB) of available evidence, iv) assessing the study results (i.e., magnitude (size) and precision of effects) for all desirable (benefits) and undesirable (harms) outcomes, and (v) applying results to clinical care based on the generalizability of the evidence to one's patients, including the patients' values and preferences based on the evidence for potential benefits, harms and the burdens of an intervention. Here, values refer to the relative worth, merit or importance of health outcomes to the patients (e.g., mortality vs non-fatal stroke vs blood pressure), and based on the outcomes patients most value, preferences refer to patients' preferred treatment choices after the best available evidence for alternative management strategies is shared with them[11].

According to the International Confederation of Dietetic Association's definition, "*Evidence-based dietetics practice involves the process of asking questions, systematically finding research evidence, and assessing its validity, applicability, and importance to nutrition and dietetics practice decisions; and applying relevant evidence in the context of the practice situation, including professional expertise and the values and circumstances of patients/clients, customers, individuals, groups, or populations to achieve positive outcomes.*"[12] Similarly, the U.S. Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics states in their 2022 Accreditation Standards that the curricula of Didactic Programs in Dietetics and Dietetic Internship should prepare dietetic students and interns to locate, interpret, evaluate, and use peer-reviewed nutrition literature to make evidence-based practice decisions[13]. Comparably, the 'Partnership for Dietetic Education and Practice' in Canada, the 'National Competency Standards for Dietitians' in Australia and the British Dietetic Association state in their accreditation standards or curriculum framework that the dietetic programs should equip dietitians with the ability to employ or demonstrate evidence-based approaches to dietetic practices[14–16]. Given the global EBP

mandate set forth by leading dietetic associations[13–16] and the precedent of assessing EBP competencies in other health professionals[17], it is timely to evaluate the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors of nutrition professionals and students regarding EBP competencies that are believed to facilitate informed decision-making between patients and clinicians. Therefore, we systematically reviewed and documented the totality of published evidence assessing different EBP competencies among nutrition professionals and students.

## **METHODS**

### **Search methods for identification of primary studies**

We searched five electronic databases: Medline, Embase, CINAHL, ERIC and CENTRAL, from inception to March 2023. In addition, we searched the gray literature using ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global, BIOSIS Citation Index, and ClinicalTrials.gov up to March 2023. Reference lists of included studies were searched to help ensure all eligible studies were identified. We did not restrict our search based on language of publication or publication status. See **Appendix A** for detailed Medline search strategies. Full search strategies are available on request. We followed Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 statement[18] and Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM)[19] to report our review and the protocol was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42022311916)[20].

### **Definition of variables**

Regarding analyzing our data, we used the term ‘outcomes’ to refer to the broader knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors relevant to EBP competencies. We defined *knowledge* as the depth of learner’s awareness and understanding of EBP concepts; *skills* as the ability to apply knowledge and perform EBP steps in a practical setting; *attitudes* (also *perceptions*, *confidence* and *willingness*) indicated how individuals perceived the importance of EBP, including their willingness to apply EBP principles; and *behaviors* referred to one’s real-life execution of EBP steps[21,22]. We used the term ‘competency’ to indicate the specific domains of EBP. That is, one needs to have knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors in specific domains (e.g., formulating answerable clinical questions, assessing various study designs for methodological quality) to apply EBP effectively.

We elected to use the five EBP competencies based on the Users' Guides to the Medical Literature[10], while adding one additional competency based on a recent consensus statement on core EBP competencies for health professionals[23]. This sixth competency addresses interpreting the certainty of evidence for outcomes of benefit and harm based on study results, ideally based on up-to-date high-quality systematic reviews with meta-analysis and/or guidelines based on such reviews[22]. See summary of six competencies in **Table 1**.

### **Criteria for study inclusion**

We included primary studies that assessed knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors related to six EBP competencies among participants (**Table 1**). Eligible participants included clinicians (i.e., registered dietitians (RDs), nutritionists) and nutrition students (i.e., undergraduates, graduates, postgraduates, dietetic interns). Included studies could utilize subjective and/or objective approaches, and report on quantitative or qualitative outcomes. Our target EBP competencies could be measured using questionnaires that were developed by the investigators, adapted from existing instruments, or adopted from already developed instruments such as Fresno test[35] or Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire[36]).

### **Study selection**

Our search results were uploaded into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (2007) and any study duplicates were removed. Following the guidance from the Cochrane Handbook, two authors, independently and in pairs, screened the titles and abstracts and the full text articles.

### **Data extraction**

#### *Study and participant characteristics*

We extracted data, independently and in pairs, from all eligible articles including authors' last name, publication year, country or region of publication, study design, population characteristics (e.g., profession, education level), EBP outcomes (i.e., knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors), EBP competencies, and the detailed characteristics of EBP competency questions from available survey questionnaires (e.g., formulating answerable questions, assessing RoB) including their response options (e.g., Likert scale, multiple choice, dichotomous questions, qualitative data input).

### *Risk of bias assessment*

Two reviewers independently assessed the RoB of each cross-sectional observational study (i.e., quantitative survey studies, both web-based and non-web-based, and qualitative study (i.e., focus group)). Risk of bias factors assessed were but not limited to response rate, missing data, clinical sensibility of survey, data collection, data analysis, and clarity of findings. For survey studies, we used a modified version of the CLARITY instrument that included an additional question on the use of sensitivity or subgroup analysis for potential confounding factors[37]. For each question, the instrument uses four response options: ‘definitely low RoB’, ‘probably low RoB’, ‘probably high RoB’ and ‘definitely high RoB’[38]. For focus group studies, we used the Critical Appraisals Skills Programme (CASP) instrument to assess the RoB[39] with three response options: ‘low RoB’, ‘intermediate RoB’ and ‘high RoB’.

### *Quality of reporting assessment*

With respect to the quality of study methods reporting, we utilized the CROSS[40] (Consensus-based Checklist for Reporting of Survey Studies) instrument for quantitative studies, and the COREQ[41] (Consolidated criteria for Reporting Qualitative studies) instrument for qualitative focus group studies to assess how comprehensively authors reported population characteristics, study design, data analysis methods and study findings. Two reviewers independently categorized the reporting for each item as: a) clearly reported, b) partially reported, c) unclearly reported, and d) not reported.

### *Questionnaire characteristics and type of competency outcome measured*

We extracted the characteristics of questionnaires that were used to assess EBP competencies. We categorized the questionnaires as: a) self-developed (if investigators developed survey questionnaires de novo), b) adapted (if investigators altered existing questionnaires before using them to suit their own study objectives), and c) adopted (if investigators used existing questionnaires verbatim). We also looked at how each study presented the questions from the instruments and categorized them as: a) clearly reported questions, b) partially reported questions, and c) unclearly reported questions. Further, we categorized the competencies assessed by the questionnaires as: a) self-perceived (when participants reported their self-assessment of EBP



competencies)[42], and b) objectively assessed (when instruments objectively measured participants' EBP competencies)[43]. If it was not clear from the study reports, we contacted the authors and asked them to provide their full questionnaire.

## Data analysis

We report our findings descriptively under study and population characteristics, RoB of studies, quality of reporting, and characteristics of the EBP competency questionnaires, while documenting if competencies were self-perceived or objectively (e.g., written or multiple-choice answers) assessed. We could not conduct meta-analysis due to heterogeneous participant groups and methods used to assess the EBP competencies. There was considerable heterogeneity in the questions asked by each study to measure the competencies (e.g., dichotomous, multiple-choice, open-ended questions), as well as variability in reporting central tendency and variance (e.g., some studies used dichotomous response options to calculate proportions, some used means with standard deviations or interquartile ranges).

## RESULTS

### Study and participant characteristics

Our search yielded 2265 initial references. After deduplication, 2002 titles and abstracts were available for screening and 1959 were excluded, leaving 43 full text articles for full text screening. We ultimately included 12 studies that were published between 2001 and 2020[21,24–34], with studies having enrolled between 14 to 258 participants. Details are shown in **Table 1**. All studies reported quantitative survey data (i.e., 7 web-based surveys; 5 non-web-based surveys) with one of the studies[31] also reporting qualitative data (i.e., focus group). Our screening results are outlined in **Figure 1**.

**Table 1. Characteristics of studies documenting EBP competencies.**

<b>Reference (country) Study design</b>	<b>Respondent type (Number analyzed; response rate*)</b>	<b>Outcomes and EBP competencies measured in the included studies</b>
---	--	---



<p>Metcalfe 2001 (UK)[24]</p> <p>Non-web-based survey (postal)</p>	<p>Registered dietitians (n=45, 73%)</p>	<p><i>Attitudes in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> 24% of RDs did not find searching and reading research a high priority, and 2% found it of no interest. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of databases and hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p> <p><i>Skills in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> 60% of RDs were not capable of evaluating the quality of research<sup>‡</sup>.</p> <p><i>Knowledge in interpreting study results:</i> 78% of RDs reported that the statistical analyses in papers were not understandable for them. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, magnitude of effect for absolute effects, or 95% confidence intervals.</p>
<p>Thomas 2003 (Australia)[25]</p> <p>Non-web-based survey (postal)</p>	<p>Pediatric dietitians (n=59, 86%)</p>	<p><i>Skills &amp; behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> 81% of dietitians reported lacking the required skills to searching the literature (skills). 81% of dietitians searched electronic databases &lt;5 times per month, though all dietitians had access to at least one electronic database. 39% of RDs searched Medline to answer clinical questions arising in their practice and one RD used the Cochrane Library as their main source of information. 95% of dietitians performed literature searches themselves (behaviors). There was no specific mention of the hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p> <p><i>Knowledge and skills in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> When participants evaluated articles, 93% of RDs considered study designs as an important criterion for study quality, 51% considered critical appraisal criteria published in JAMA Users' Guides to the Medical Literature or EBM textbooks as guides. 19% of dietitians considered systematic reviews as the best source for information, 12% considered randomized controlled trials as best, and 52% ranked clinical practice guidelines as the best source (knowledge). 86% of dietitians reported lacking the required skills to critically appraise the quality of research articles (skills).</p>
<p>Byham-Gray 2005 (USA)[26]</p>	<p>Registered dietitians (n=258, 52%)</p>	<p><i>Behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> 17% of RDs searched the literature few days per week to help solve clinical questions among which 3% of RDs used Cochrane Library to find the answers. 33% of RDs searched &lt;1 per month, and 17% never conducted a search. There was</p>

<p>Non-web-based survey (postal)</p>		<p>no specific mention of the hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p> <p><i>Knowledge in interpreting study results:</i> RDs understood or had knowledge of the terms: relative risk (31%), absolute risk (30%), confidence interval (32%), systematic review (29%) and meta-analysis (37%). There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, or magnitude of effect for absolute effects.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in applying study results to practice:</i> RDs' mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 4.00 (<math>\pm</math>1.1) on a scale from 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) for the perception question, "I can use results from the published research in my job". Authors did not mention the proportion of RD responded to each option or how frequently they applied study results in their clinical practice.</p>
<p>Upton 2006 (UK)[27]</p> <p>Non-web-based survey (postal)</p>	<p>Dietitians (n=20, 85%)</p>	<p><i>Skills in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> Dietitians' mean score was 4.18 on a scale of 1 to 7 (the lower the 'poorest', the higher the 'best') on skills for critically appraising the literature<sup>‡</sup>. There was no information on how frequently they appraised the literature in their clinical practice.</p> <p><i>Skills and attitudes in applying study results to practice:</i> Dietitians' mean score was 4.71 on a scale of 1 to 7 (the lower the 'poorest', the higher the 'best') in their skills to apply the evidence to their own clinical cases, but authors did not mention how frequently they applied the evidence in their clinical practice (skills). Dietitians' mean score was 3.88 on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=least likely to act, 5=most likely to act) in both willingness to act on evidence received from colleagues from the same profession and evidence from journal articles, indicating they valued both sources in a similar manner (attitudes).</p>
<p>Heiwe 2011 (Sweden)[28]</p> <p>Non-web-based</p>	<p>Dietitians (n=41, 78%)</p> <p>Occupational therapists (n=57, 84%)</p>	<p><i>Behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> Dietitians (n=40) searched for 2-5 practice-relevant articles per month using Medline or other "non specified" databases. There was no specific mention of the hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p>

<p>survey (postal)</p>	<p>Physical therapists (n=129, 70%)</p>	<p><i>Behaviors in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> Dietitians (n=40) appraised 2-5 research articles related to their clinical practice each month<sup>‡</sup>.</p> <p><i>Knowledge in interpreting study results:</i> When asked about understanding of research terms (two options were given: ‘understand somewhat’ or ‘understand completely’), among 226 professionals (profession specific data was not available) 78% understood reliability, 80% understood validity, 58% understood systematic reviews, and 40% understood odds ratio. Publication bias and heterogeneity were somewhat understood by 30% of participants, and 38% somewhat understood confidence intervals and meta-analysis. Among all respondents, 33% perceived that they lacked enough statistical knowledge to apply EBP. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, or magnitude of effect for absolute effects.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in applying study results to practice:</i> Dietitians (n=40) scored a median of 5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) regarding their willingness to learn or improve EBP skills to implement in their practice, but authors did not mention how frequently they implemented this competency in their clinical practice.</p>
<p>Chiu 2012 (Taiwan)[29] Non-web-based survey (postal)</p>	<p>Registered dietitians (n=67, 79%)</p>	<p><i>Skills in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> 23% of dietitians reported having skills and 43% of dietitians reported being deficient in the skills to search relevant literature for best evidence. Authors did not give the proportion of RDs that utilized these databases weekly or monthly. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p> <p><i>Skills in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> Among 62 dietitians, 13% reported having skills and 55% reported deficiency in skills to appraise the literature critically<sup>‡</sup>.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in applying study results to practice:</i> 82% of dietitians believed in applying EBN for the improvement of patient care quality, but authors did not mention how frequently they applied EBN in their clinical practice.</p>

<p>Vogt 2013 (USA)[21]</p> <p>Web-based survey</p>	<p>Registered dietitians (n=198, 9%)</p>	<p><i>Knowledge and behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> RDs' (n=190) mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 1.58 (<math>\pm</math>0.87) on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=unaware, 5=aware and used weekly) on their awareness of Cochrane Library as an evidence-based database (knowledge). Among 190 RDs, 6% accessed databases a few days a week and 20% accessed databases twice a month (behaviors). There was no specific mention of the hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> RDs' (n=193) mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 3.84 (<math>\pm</math>0.94) on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) for the perception question, "I am able to evaluate the quality of research"*.</p> <p><i>Knowledge in interpreting study results:</i> For understanding statistical analysis, RDs' mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 3.85 (<math>\pm</math>0.99) on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree &amp; 5=strongly agree). On a scale of 1 to 4 (1=no understanding, 4=understand and can explain), 188 RDs scored a mean of 2.64 (<math>\pm</math>0.93) when asked about understanding meta-analysis, 2.52 (<math>\pm</math>0.89) for understanding systematic reviews and 2.25 (<math>\pm</math>1.00) for understanding confidence intervals. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, or magnitude of effect for absolute effects.</p> <p><i>Skills and attitudes in applying study results to practice:</i> RDs' (n=195) mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 4.14 (<math>\pm</math>0.91) on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) on their skills to apply research into practice, but authors did not mention how frequently they applied research in their clinical practice (skills). RDs' mean score (n=194) was 4.59 (<math>\pm</math>0.52) on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) about their willingness to use EBP skills for patient care (attitudes).</p>
<p>Saeed 2017 (Pakistan)[30]</p> <p>Web-based survey</p>	<p>Registered dietitians and Nutritionists (n=23, 45%)</p>	<p><i>Behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> 48% of RDs had access to different databases and 52% of RDs utilized them (e.g., Medline, Cochrane Library, Evidence Analysis Library), but the author did not mention the frequency. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p>

		<p><i>Skills in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> 39% of RDs reported that they lacked the skills to critically appraise and apply nutrition literature in their practice<sup>‡</sup>.</p> <p><i>Attitudes and behaviors in applying study results to practice:</i> All participants had a positive attitude on applying EBN in clinical practice to increase the quality of patient care (attitudes), and 61% of responders used EBN skills in their clinical practice (behaviors).</p>
<p>Hinrichs 2018 (USA)[31]</p> <p>Web-based survey; focus group</p>	<p>Dietetic interns (n=14 for survey, 88%; n=7 for focus group, 44%)</p>	<p><i>Knowledge and behaviors in formulating structured clinical questions:</i> Dietetic interns' mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) on knowledge of the definition and structure of PICO<sup>§</sup> was 0.17 (<math>\pm</math>0.25) on a scale of 0=false to 0.5=true (knowledge). On average, participants formulated PICO questions less than once per month (behaviors).</p> <p><i>Behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> A scale of 1 to 5 (1=never, 5=2 or more times per week) was used to measure the frequency of dietetic interns' access of databases. Their mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 3.6 (<math>\pm</math>1.0) on accessing original research articles, 3.0 (<math>\pm</math>1.2) on accessing pre-appraised evidence (e.g., Evidence Analysis Library) and 2.1 (<math>\pm</math>1.0) on accessing Cochrane Library.</p> <p><i>Knowledge and behaviors in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> Dietetic interns' mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 0.79 (<math>\pm</math>0.43) out of the maximum score of 1 on their knowledge on the 'best quality' study design to address questions on therapy or prevention, as well as about hierarchy of evidence (knowledge). Dietetic interns' mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 2.6 (<math>\pm</math>1.0) on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=never, 5=2 or more times per week) on critically appraising articles (behaviors)<sup>‡</sup>.</p> <p><i>Knowledge in interpreting study results:</i> Dietetic interns' mean score (<math>\pm</math>SD) was 0.04 (<math>\pm</math>0.13) on a scale of 0 to 0.5 on knowledge of interpreting study results. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, magnitude of effect for absolute effects, or 95% confidence intervals.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in applying study results to practice (focus group data):</i> Dietetic interns were interested in basing their future</p>

		clinical practice on research evidence to inform clinical decisions.
Gooding 2019 (Australia)[32]  Web-based survey	Undergraduate nutrition students (n=30, 32%)  Postgraduate nutrition students (e.g., Masters) (n=50, 53%)  Professionals (e.g., accredited practicing dietitians, associate nutritionists, public health nutritionists, registered nutritionists) (n=87, 93%)	<i>Attitudes in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> 93% of participants (group specific data was not available) considered systematic reviews to be an extremely or very valuable source of evidence when they were asked, “How valuable or not valuable do you believe systematic reviews are as a source of evidence?”  <i>Attitudes in interpreting study results:</i> 38% of participants felt very confident at interpreting the results of systematic reviews when asked, “How confident or not confident are you at interpreting the results of systematic reviews?” and given the options “extremely confident, very confident, quite confident, confident, not confident”. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, magnitude of effect for absolute effects, or 95% confidence intervals.  <i>Behaviors in applying study results to practice:</i> 50% of respondents used systematic reviews regularly to guide practice.
Amjad 2020 (Pakistan)[33]  Web-based survey	Dietitians (n=81, no data provided)	<i>Behaviors in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> 14% of dietitians used online databases to find practice related literature once a month and 12% searched the databases 2-5 times per month. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.
Young 2020 (Australia)[34]  Web-based survey	Dietitians (n=124, 27%)	<i>Attitudes in formulating structured clinical questions:</i> Approximately 13% of dietitians strongly agreed and 5% of dietitians strongly disagreed that they were confident in formulating a clinical question to guide their literature review when asked about their confidence in the competency and given options of strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of the definition of PICO.  <i>Attitudes in searching literature for best available evidence:</i> Approximately 61% of respondents were confident in searching for the best evidence to answer a clinical question on



		<p>a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of databases and hierarchy of evidence when searching literature.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in assessing quality and/or RoB of studies:</i> Approximately 60% of participants agreed that they were confident in critically appraising the evidence on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree<sup>‡</sup>.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in interpreting study results:</i> Approximately 63% of participants were confident in determining the clinical significance of study results on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. There was no specific mention of the knowledge of dichotomous and continuous outcomes, the various data presentation methods, or measures of association for each type of outcomes, relative vs absolute effects for dichotomous outcomes, magnitude of effect for absolute effects, or 95% confidence intervals.</p> <p><i>Attitudes in applying study results to practice:</i> Approximately 89% of participants were confident in determining if evidence applies to their patients/context in a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree, but authors did not mention how frequently they applied evidence in their clinical practice.</p>
--	--	--

Six competencies: i) formulating structured and answerable clinical questions, ii) searching the literature for the best evidence to answer specific clinical questions (e.g., high quality systematic reviews), iii) assessing the quality and/or the RoB of various study designs, iv) interpreting the magnitude (size) of effect based on study results for outcomes of benefit and harm and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (including relative versus absolute estimates of effect), v) interpreting the certainty of evidence for each health outcome of interest (particularly when systematic reviews exist), and vi) applying the study results in clinical practice based on the patients' values and preferences.

\*Response rate is based on how many participants were approached and how many responded.


<sup>‡</sup>Authors did not specifically report the types of study designs appraisal criteria was applied to, or the specific appraisal criteria used.

<sup>§</sup>PICO: patient or problem, intervention, comparison, outcomes.

Eligible studies were comprised of 1065 participants across six countries (USA, UK, Sweden, Pakistan, Taiwan, Australia). Eleven studies[21,24–30,32–34] included nutrition professionals and one study included dietetic interns[31]. Two studies[30,32] reported enrolling ‘nutritionists’; however, authors did not clarify if nutritionists differed in terms of registration or comprehensive training as compared to RDs. One study[32] reported including undergraduate nutrition students and postgraduate nutrition Masters’ students. Seven studies reported on participants’ age (ranging between 20 years to  $\geq 66$  years)[21,25,26,28–30,33], seven studies reported on participants’ education level (i.e., 37% had undergraduate degree and 46% had



postgraduate degree)[21,24,26,28–30,32], and 11 studies reported on participants’ employment settings (i.e., 95% were involved in clinical practice and 5% were involved in research)[21,24–30,32–34].



*Figure 1 Outline of search strategy depicted by PRISMA Flow Diagram*


## Questionnaire characteristics

Among 12 cross-sectional survey studies, only three studies (25%) clearly reported the questions they used to measure EBP competencies[28,29,32]. After contacting the authors of nine studies for their full questionnaires, only Hinrichs (2018)[31] was determined to use a questionnaire that, in part, had objective questions on four competencies: formulating structured clinical questions, searching the literature, assessing the quality of studies, and, albeit vaguely, interpreting study results. For information regarding the measurement of EBP competencies on the questionnaires, see **Table 1**.

In terms of the evidence of psychometric properties, five questionnaires had evidence of both reliability and validity, of which two had psychometric testing in RDs[21,26], one had testing in physical therapists[33], and two had testing in an unspecified population[29,31]. Four questionnaires had evidence of validity only, with two reporting validity in an unspecified nutrition population[28,32], and two in an unspecified population[30,34]. One questionnaire had evidence of reliability only, tested in an unspecified nutrition population[24]. Despite some evidence of reliability and validity for our first three competencies, no instruments had explicit questions on determining the magnitude (size) of effect, and none asked about the certainty of evidence for estimates. Further, with respect to applicability, none explicitly asked about the application of patient health-related values and preferences relative to the size and certainty of effect estimates. **Appendix table 1** summarizes the characteristics of the questionnaires.

### **Risk of bias and quality of reporting assessment**

The overall RoB of included studies varied substantially. Among 12 cross-sectional survey studies, one study was judged as having overall low RoB[26], eight studies had moderate RoB[21,24,25,27–29,31,32], and three studies had high RoB[30,33,34] (**Appendix table 2**). The most common RoB issues included no reporting of sensitivity, subgroup, or adjustment analysis for potential confounding factors in eight (67%) studies. The focus group component of Hinrichs (2018)<sup>39</sup> study was rated as having moderate RoB[31] (**Appendix table 3**). Reporting quality from the 40-item CROSS[40] and 32-item COREQ[41] instruments are shown, respectively, in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3**. For details on all items, see **Appendix table 4** (CROSS) and **Appendix table 5** (COREQ).



**Figure 2 Reporting quality for cross-sectional survey studies**

**Figure 3 Reporting quality for focus group study**

## Evidence-based practice competencies

### *Formulating structured and answerable clinical questions*

Knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors specific to formulating questions was examined by two (17%) studies[31,34]. Hinrichs (2018)[31] asked if dietetic interns (n=14) knew what PICO (patient, population or problem, intervention, comparison, outcomes) referred to, and reported that participants lacked knowledge about the definition and structure of PICO when formulating a clinical question. Young et al (2020)[34] asked dietitians (n=124) to rate their confidence in formulating a clinical question, reporting that only 13% of the participants perceived themselves as confident. Authors did not report how often they performed this competency, or the average number of patients they typically attended to. Regarding behavior, dietetic interns reported formulating PICO questions, on average, less than once per month[31]. Data on the average number of patients over a particular time frame (e.g., per month) was not reported. See **Table 1**.

### *Searching literature for best evidence to answer clinical questions*

Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors specific to searching literature was reported in 10 (83%) studies[21,24–26,28–30,32–34]. Vogt et al (2013)[21] looked at RDs' (n=190) awareness (knowledge) of different databases containing evidence (e.g., Cochrane Library, Evidence Analysis Library, Medline) and reported that RDs' awareness was low for the best source of summary data (i.e., Cochrane Library). Thomas et al (2003)[25] and Chiu et al (2012)[29] assessed participants' skills in searching the literature[25,29] and reported that 81% of dietitians (n=59) and 43% of dietitians (n=67), respectively, lacked skills in searching databases (e.g., Medline) to

inform clinical practice. Two studies reported on participants' attitudes with respect to searching the literature[24,34]. Metcalfe et al (2001)[24] reported that 24% of RDs (n=45) did not feel that searching the literature was a high priority activity, while Young et al (2020)[34] reported that 61% of RDs (n=124) were confident in searching the literature to answer a clinical question. In both study reports there was no specific evaluation of RDs' knowledge of databases or the hierarchy of evidence when searching the literature. Seven studies reported on the typical behaviors of participants when searching the literature (e.g., percentage and frequency of respondents who searched the literature, which databases were searched)[21,25,26,28,30,31,33]. In six studies (n=629)[21,25,26,28,31,33], 26% of respondents searched the literature at least twice per month (data on average number of patients per month was not reported). The remaining study by Saeed 2017[30] reported that 52% of RDs searched different databases but did not report on the frequency of searching. See **Table 1**.

#### *Assessing quality and/or the RoB of evidence based on different study designs*

Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors specific to assessing the methodological quality of the studies was reported in nine (75%) articles[21,24,25,27–31,34], with most reports using the term 'critical appraisal' instead of more specific terms such as methodological quality or RoB. For this competency, almost all studies did not report the specific questions (e.g., on selection bias, attrition bias) used to appraise selective study designs. Further, it was often unclear from the study reports if investigators measured participants' competency in assessing RoB for specific study designs (e.g., systematic review with meta-analysis, randomized controlled trials, cohort), or something else.

Two studies assessed participants' knowledge on the 'best quality' study design[25,31]. Thomas et al (2003)[25] reported that 52% of RDs (n=59) considered clinical practice guidelines, 19% considered systematic reviews, 17% considered local experts, textbooks or case reports, and 12% of RDs considered randomized trials to be the best source of information to address questions on therapy or prevention. Hinrichs (2018)[31] reported that dietetic interns (n=14) had moderate knowledge of the study designs and the hierarchy of evidence. Studies by Metcalfe et al (2001)[24], Thomas et al (2003)[25] and Chiu et al (2012)[29] assessed RDs skills in critical appraisal of scientific literature and reported that, respectively, 60% of RDs (n=27), 86% of RDs (n=51) and 55% of RDs (n=62) lacked the skills. Study by Upton and Upton (2006)[27] reported

that RDs' (n=20) had moderate skills in critical appraisal skills; however, authors and available questionnaires used in the study did not define what was meant by critical appraisal.

Four studies reported on participants' attitudes regarding, again, undefined critical appraisal of the literature[21,25,32,34]. Among these studies, Thomas et al (2003)[25] found that when participants (n=59) evaluated articles, 93% of them considered study designs as an important criterion for study quality, and 51% of them considered critical appraisal criteria published in the Users' Guides to the Medical Literature[10] or EBM textbooks. Gooding et al (2020)[32] found that 93% of participants (n=167) perceived systematic reviews to be an extremely or very valuable source of evidence, and Young et al (2020)[34] reported that 60% of RDs (n=124) perceived themselves as confident in critically appraising the evidence.

Two studies reported on participants' behaviors related to undefined critical appraisal of the literature (e.g., percentage and frequency of participants who appraised the literature to inform clinical practice). Heiwe et al (2011)[28] reported that RDs (n=40) appraised 2 to 5 research articles per month, while Hinrichs (2018)[31] reported that dietetic interns (n=14) performed a moderate amount of appraisal activities to help inform practice. See **Table 1**.

#### *Interpreting magnitude (size) of effect and corresponding precision of 95% confidence intervals*

Knowledge and attitudes specific to interpreting the study results was discussed in seven (58%) studies[21,24,26,28,31,32,34]. Five studies reported on participants' overall knowledge in this competency[21,24,26,28,31]. For instance, Metcalfe et al (2001)[24] assessed RDs' (n=45) and Hinrichs (2018)[31] assessed dietetic interns' (n=14) understanding or knowledge in interpreting study results. Metcalfe (2001) reported that among 78% of RDs, the statistical analyses in research papers were not understandable, while Hinrichs (2018) reported that all dietetic interns had inadequate knowledge in this competency. Three studies[21,26,28] evaluated participants self-perceived knowledge of statistical terms rather than their actual knowledge of common relative (e.g., risk, odds or hazard ratios) and absolute (e.g., risk difference, number needed to treat) estimates of effect and corresponding estimates of precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). For instance, Byham-Gray et al (2005)[26] asked about participants' (n=258) knowledge of the terms 'relative risk' and 'absolute risk difference' and found that, respectively, 31% and 30% of RDs perceived that they understood or had knowledge of the terms.

Young et al (2020)[34] and Gooding et al (2020)[32] reported on participants' attitudes towards this competency. Young (2020) examined participants' (n=124) confidence in determining the clinical significance of study results and 63% of participants reported confidence in their skills. Gooding (2020) asked participants (n=167) "How confident or not confident are you at interpreting the results of systematic reviews?" and reported that 38% felt confident to very confident. No study explicitly reported on participants' skills to interpret the magnitude (size) of the estimate of effect (e.g., from a trivial to a small, moderate, and large effect) and the corresponding precision of the 95% confidence intervals, nor did they report assessing participants skills in interpreting relative and absolute estimates of effect. See **Table 1**.

#### *Interpreting certainty of evidence for each health outcome of interest*

While Gooding et al (2020)[32] queried participants about interpreting the results from systematic reviews, no study examined competencies in interpreting the certainty of evidence (e.g., evaluation of consistency of evidence, assessment of publication bias) to support estimates of effect for outcomes of benefit or harm (particularly in the context of systematic reviews with meta-analysis).

#### *Applying study results in clinical practice based on patients' values and preferences*

Skills, attitudes, and behaviors in applying study results in clinical practice were heterogeneously assessed in nine (75%) studies[26–32,34,44]. Vogt et al (2013)[21] and Upton and Upton (2006)[27] examined participants' skills in applying study results to their practice and reported that participants perceived themselves as skilled in this competency. Eight studies reported on participants' attitudes or willingness in applying study results in practice, of which studies by Vogt et al (2013)[21], Heiwe et al (2011)[28] and Upton and Upton (2006)[27] reported that participants' (n=254) had a moderate to high degree of willingness towards this competency. Studies by Chiu et al (2012)[29], Hinrichs (2018)[31] and Saeed (2017)[30] reported that participants either believed in (82% among 67 participants), were interested in (100% of 7 participants), or had a positive attitude toward (100% of 23 participants) applying study results. The remaining two studies by Young et al (2020)[34] and Byham-Gray et al (2005)[26] reported that participants perceived themselves, respectively, as confident (89% among 124 participants) and capable of (most or all of 258 participants, no proportion was given) applying evidence in their practice. Two studies[30,32] reported on participants' behaviors in applying study results among

which Gooding (2020)[32] reported that 50% of the respondents (n=167) used systematic reviews regularly to guide their practice.

Applicability was vague across all studies. For instance, it was unclear if investigators looked at participants' competency in applying the best available evidence (e.g., high quality systematic reviews with meta-analysis) based on estimates of benefits and harms of an intervention with patients, or something else. Moreover, no studies explicitly reported on applying patients' values and preferences based on the best available evidence. See **Table 1**.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Summary of findings**

Our systematic review of EBP competencies included 12 cross-sectional surveys comprised of 1065 participants (i.e., RDs, nutritionists, dietetic interns, and nutrition students) across six countries. The overall reporting quality among the surveys was poor, with only 33% of items clearly reported and the survey questions were predominantly self-perceived assessments. There were also considerable deficiencies across studies regarding the measurement of EBP competencies. For instance, the six competencies were often incompletely defined or reported (e.g., it was unclear what 'applicability' and 'critical appraisal' referred to, and what study designs were appraised by the participants), which made it difficult to compare studies and to reach an overall conclusion. Further, no studies had explicit questions on two (33%) of the six core EBP competencies (i.e., determining the magnitude (size) of effect, determining the certainty of evidence for estimates), and study reports were unclear with respect to competencies in applying patient values and preferences relative to the size and certainty of effect estimates, skills that are essential for optimizing clinical and public health nutrition decision-making.

### **Strengths of this study**

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review that has evaluated EBP competencies in the field of nutrition. The competencies assessed are based on the Users' Guides to the Medical Literature[10] and a consensus statement on EBP competencies for health professionals[23]. In addition to medicine[3], these competencies have generally been embraced in many contemporary evidence-based programs including nursing[5], pharmacy[8], physiotherapy[6], occupational therapy[9], and psychology[7]. We worked with an experienced librarian to conduct a



comprehensive search across five databases and four grey literature sources with no language restrictions, and we registered our study protocol on an open-access, publicly accessible website[20]. We performed screening, data extraction, and quality assessment independently and in pairs, including the assessment of our 12 studies using CROSS[40] and COREQ[41] reporting instruments. Finally, we used the PRISMA[18] and SWiM[19] reporting standards to provide a transparent and clear presentation of our findings.

### **Limitations of this study**

Our study protocol, published *a priori*[20], underwent several revisions that were necessary once we better understood the available data. The first revision was the exclusion of the seventh competency, which involved self-evaluation of EBP competencies. This decision was made because it seemed impractical to expect participants to perform self-evaluation when there appeared to be a limited understanding of the first six competencies. This aspect of limited understanding may have resulted from poor reporting in 12 eligible studies, as determined by CROSS[40] and COREQ[41] assessments, and no reporting on competencies five and six (i.e., effect size, and certainty of evidence). Although there has been a longer list of EBP competencies proposed for medical and allied health practitioners[23], we emphasized six core EBP competencies that are directly related to treatment and prevention[10,23], competencies that are long standing and directly relevant to nutrition and the broader health professions practice. With respect to the assessment instruments, the second departure from our protocol was the inclusion of an analysis of the reporting quality of surveys and focus groups. Post-hoc, we decided to add these assessments given that we were surprised by how poorly the studies documented key items that were used to assess competencies (e.g., clear reporting of the questions regarding assessing the methodological quality or RoB). Finally, we used the CLARITY[45] instrument to assess the RoB across survey studies, an instrument that does not have a peer-reviewed publication, or established evidence of validity and reliability. In keeping with rationale for the development of the CLARITY cross-sectional RoB instrument, we used the tool due to our inability to find a comprehensive instrument that addresses RoB in surveys of attitudes and practices[46]. It should be noted that the response options on the CLARITY instrument[46] are based on the Cochrane RoB instrument which has established evidence of validity and reliability[47].

## **Implications for clinical practice**

The accreditation standards for dietetic programs give flexibility[13–16] for diverse programs to define where and how to incorporate training in EBP competencies into their curricula which leaves the possibility for heterogeneity in the training, understanding and application of EBP competencies among dietetics practitioners[48]. Since EBP questions are included in the registration examination for dietitians[49–51], our review shows the urgency to offer specific information on EBP competencies through dietetic curricula that nutrition trainees should learn and use in practice (such as locating literature through formulating clinical questions using the PI(E)CO (population/problem, intervention/exposure, comparison, outcome) format; evaluating the available literature for methodological quality or RoB using specific tools for different study designs; interpreting the effect size and precision of effects from the literature). That, in turn, will contribute to the increased utilization of EBP competencies in clinical and public health nutrition settings and serve to benefit patients and dietitians by promoting more fully informed decisions[52].

Although our primary objective was not to systematically collect data on training, we documented it whenever available. Only seven (58%) studies from our review reported on participants' training in EBP[21,25,26,28,29,32,34]. For instance, Byham-Gray et al (2005)[26] reported that 55% of RDs (n=258) received “critical appraisal training”, and Chiu et al (2012)[29] reported that 27% of RDs (n=67) took an educational course in “evidence-based nutrition”[53]. Considering that EBP is an important skill endorsed by dietetic associations worldwide, it would be beneficial to increase the standardization of EBP training to better support dietitians and to further promote interdisciplinary care. Various pedagogical approaches are available to teach foundational EBP competencies at different levels of education including journal clubs and critical appraisal courses, and educators may select those with proven effectiveness[54]. To build on foundational EBP competencies, integrating case-based learning, which showcases the real-life application of EBP competencies into the current framework of the Nutrition Care Process (i.e., at the time of developing Problem, Etiology and Signs/Symptoms (PES) statements and identifying an appropriate nutrition intervention) would enable dietetic learners to better recognize and appreciate the impact of EBP competencies in clinical decision-making across different domains of dietetics practice[55]. This integration would ultimately assist dietitians in their interactions with patients. Additionally, standardized RD board exam questions that address each of our EBP

competencies would promote improved training in various nutrition programs. While it is expected that some patients will be uncomfortable with a detailed, fully enumerated discussion of the absolute estimates and certainty of estimates for the benefits and potential harms for a given nutritional intervention[56], and prefer to leave the decision to the clinician, based on published evidence it is anticipated that many patients will be very comfortable, and relieved to learn of such details, allowing for fully informed decision-making[2,57].

Several studies have shown that there is a growing recognition and reliance on evidence-based clinical practice guidelines in the field of dietetics[21,25,26,28,33]. These guidelines are consistently emphasized in educational curricula and professional standards documents. This highlights the need for awareness and increasing access to practice guidelines that are relevant to different areas of clinical dietetic practice. Nonetheless, we need to keep in mind that not all guidelines are created equal (e.g., many lack adherence to Institute of Medicine 2011 and National Guideline Clearinghouse Extent of Adherence to Trustworthy Standards (NEATS) 2019 criteria). Further, while resources like the Evidence Analysis Library from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics provide some evidence-based guidelines, they are not regularly updated, and many of the existing reviews are outdated by more than five years[58]. Therefore, it is essential to develop evidence-based guidelines in accordance with established standards, consistently update them, and offer systematic training to dietitians that would enable them to locate, evaluate, and apply these guidelines. Currently, many guidelines are developed by professional societies outside of dietetics, focusing on specific areas (e.g., cardiometabolic disease risk[59], pediatric nutrition[60]). This requires dietitians to be familiar with these societies, often requiring membership and additional fees to access guidelines. These barriers should be addressed to ensure dietitians' familiarity with and adherence to the evidence-based guidelines. This will enable clinical practitioners to effectively engage with the literature and apply it to their practice.

### **Implications for research**

Future cross-sectional surveys should comprehensively assess knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors for core EBP competencies using valid and reliable instruments to more objectively measure each of the competencies[61], in addition to following CROSS[40] reporting instrument. For instance, a well-rounded set of EBP skills should encompass instruction and evaluation in the following areas: 1) understanding research study findings, which involves assessing the magnitude

(size) of effects (absolute estimates such as mean difference, risk difference and numbers needed to treat for benefit/harm, and relative estimates such as relative risk, odds ratios, and hazard ratios, along with measures of precision e.g., 95% confidence interval)[62], 2) understanding the certainty of evidence for estimates, particularly for systematic reviews with meta-analysis, and 3) demonstrating proficiency in applying results based on patient values and preferences relative to the size and certainty of effect estimates. These competencies, considered essential to decision-making[63], have not been evaluated in studies to date. Research should be conducted to help elucidate how these competencies may impact satisfaction with the dietitian-patient encounter[57]. Furthermore, it is important to distribute surveys to targeted professional groups that are focused on specific areas of practice (e.g., dietetic practice groups within the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics[64], or international dietetic societies like Genetic Metabolic Dietitians International[65]). This ensures that accurate data is gathered to gain insights into the implementation of EBP in specific clinical settings. Finally, to improve EBP competencies, research on various teaching strategies (e.g., seminars, workshops, courses, journal clubs) is also required[66,67].

## **CONCLUSION**

Among 12 included articles, there were considerable deficiencies across studies regarding the measurement of EBP competencies. In addition to the questions being predominantly self-perceived, as opposed to objective assessments, the six competencies were often incompletely defined or reported, which made it difficult to compare studies. No studies reported explicit questions on two (33%) of the six core EBP competencies (i.e., determining the magnitude (size) of effect, determining the certainty of evidence for estimates), skills that are essential for optimizing clinical and public health nutrition decision-making.

## **Acknowledgement**

We thank Delaney Sauers (undergraduate nutrition student) for helping with our preliminary literature search and article screening, Joshua Goldenberg for assistance with piloting our data extraction forms, and Erin Boyce (Librarian) for her assistance with our initial search for articles addressing EBP competencies.

## REFERENCES

1. Sackett DL, Straus SE, Richardson WS, Rosenberg W, Haynes RB, Livingstone C. Evidence-Based Medicine: How to Practice and Teach EBM, 2nd Edition: By David L. Sackett, Sharon E. Straus, W. Scott Richardson, William Rosenberg, and R. Brian Haynes, Churchill Livingstone, 2000: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088506660101600307> [Internet]. 2016 Dec 7 [cited 2022 Jan 4];16(3):155–6. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/088506660101600307>
2. Johnston BC, Seivenpiper JL, Vernooij RWM, Souza RJ de, Jenkins DJA, Zeraatkar D, et al. The Philosophy of Evidence-Based Principles and Practice in Nutrition. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes* [Internet]. 2019 Jun 1 [cited 2022 Apr 2];3(2):189–99. Available from: <http://www.mcpiqjournal.org/article/S2542454819300311/fulltext>
3. Evidence-based medicine | ACP Journal Club [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 21]. Available from: <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/ACPJC-1991-114-2-A16>
4. Guyatt G, Rennie D, Meade MO, Cook DJ. Preface. In: *Users' Guides to the Medical Literature: A Manual for Evidence-Based Clinical Practice*, 3rd ed [Internet]. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education; 2015. Available from: <http://jamaevidence.mhmedical.com/content.aspx?aid=1147670269>
5. Stevens KR. The impact of evidence-based practice in nursing and the next big ideas. *Online J Issues Nurs*. 2013;18(2):4.
6. Veras M, Kairy D, Paquet N. What Is Evidence-Based Physiotherapy? *Physiother Canada* [Internet]. 2016 Mar 1 [cited 2022 Apr 1];68(2):95. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC5125490/](https://pmc/articles/PMC5125490/)
7. Goodheart CD, Levant RF, Barlow DH, Carter J, Davidson KW, Hagglund KJ, et al. Evidence-based practice in psychology. *Am Psychol*. 2006;61(4):271–85.
8. Wiffen P, Eriksson T, Lu H. CHAPTER 2 introduction to evidence-based practice in evidence-based pharmacy 2nd edition. *Eur J Hosp Pharm Sci Pract* [Internet]. 2013 Dec 1 [cited 2023 May 23];20(6):324–7. Available from: <https://ejhp.bmj.com/content/20/6/324>
9. Myers CT, Lotz J. Practitioner Training for Use of Evidence-Based Practice in Occupational Therapy. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0738057720171333183> [Internet]. 2017 Jul 3 [cited 2023 May 23];31(3):214–37. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07380577.2017.1333183>
10. Guyatt G, Meade MO. How to Use the Medical Literature—and This Book—to Improve Your

- Patient Care. In: Guyatt G, Rennie D, Meade MO, Cook DJ, editors. Users' Guides to the Medical Literature: A Manual for Evidence-Based Clinical Practice, 3rd ed [Internet]. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education; 2015. Available from: <http://jamaevidence.mhmedical.com/content.aspx?aid=1183875424>
11. Llewellyn-Thomas HA, Crump RT. Decision support for patients: values clarification and preference elicitation. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2013 Feb;70(1 Suppl):50S-79S.
  12. Hand RK, Davis AM, Thompson KL, Knol LL, Thomas A, Proaño G V. Updates to the Definition of Evidence-Based (Dietetics) Practice: Providing Clarity for Practice. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2021 Aug 1;121(8):1565-1573.e4.
  13. 2022 Standards and Templates [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 21]. Available from: <https://www.eatrightpro.org/acend/accreditation-standards-fees-and-policies/2022-standards-and-templates>
  14. National competency standards for dietitians | Dietitians Australia [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 21]. Available from: <https://dietitiansaustralia.org.au/working-dietetics/standards-and-scope/national-competency-standards-dietitians>
  15. INTEGRATED COMPETENCIES FOR DIETETIC EDUCATION AND PRACTICE (ICDEP). 2020 [cited 2023 Jun 18]; Available from: [www.pdep.ca](http://www.pdep.ca).
  16. A Curriculum Framework for the pre-registration education and training of dietitians.
  17. Saunders H, Gallagher-Ford L, Kvist T, Vehviläinen-Julkunen K. Practicing Healthcare Professionals' Evidence-Based Practice Competencies: An Overview of Systematic Reviews. *Worldviews Evidence-Based Nurs* [Internet]. 2019 Jun 1 [cited 2023 Jun 10];16(3):176–85. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/wvn.12363>
  18. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2021 Mar 29 [cited 2022 Oct 2];372. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC8005924/](https://pmc/articles/PMC8005924/)
  19. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, Katikireddi SV, Brennan SE, Ellis S, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 16 [cited 2023 Jun 6];368. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.l6890>
  20. Ghosh N, Lorenz S, Creasy R, Crews M, Zajac J, Bala M, et al. International prospective register of systematic reviews Knowledge , skills , attitudes and behaviors related evidence-based practice in the field of nutrition : A systematic review Citation Review question Participants / population



Intervention ( s ), ex. 2022;1–5.

21. Vogt EAM, Byham-Gray LD, Touger-Decker R. Perceptions, attitudes, knowledge, and clinical use of evidence-based practice among us registered dietitians: A prospective descriptive pilot study. *Top Clin Nutr* [Internet]. 2013 Jul [cited 2021 Dec 20];28(3):283–94. Available from: [https://journals.lww.com/topicsinclinicalnutrition/Fulltext/2013/07000/Perceptions,\\_Attitudes,\\_Knowledge,\\_and\\_Clinical.9.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/topicsinclinicalnutrition/Fulltext/2013/07000/Perceptions,_Attitudes,_Knowledge,_and_Clinical.9.aspx)
22. Koota E, Kääriäinen M, Kyngäs H, Lääperi M, Melender HL. Effectiveness of Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) Education on Emergency Nurses' EBP Attitudes, Knowledge, Self-Efficacy, Skills, and Behavior: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Worldviews Evidence-Based Nurs* [Internet]. 2021 Feb 1 [cited 2022 Apr 2];18(1):23–32. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/wvn.12485>
23. Albarqouni L, Hoffmann T, Straus S, Olsen NR, Young T, Ilic D, et al. Core Competencies in Evidence-Based Practice for Health Professionals: Consensus Statement Based on a Systematic Review and Delphi Survey. *JAMA Netw open*. 2018;1(2):e180281.
24. Metcalfe C, Lewin R, Wisher S, Perry S, Bannigan K, Moffett JK. Barriers to implementing the evidence base in four NHS therapies. *Physiotherapy*. 2001;87(8):433–41.
25. Thomas DE, Kukuruzovic R, Martino B, Chauhan SS, Elliott EJ. Knowledge and use of evidence-based nutrition: A survey of paediatric dietitians. *J Hum Nutr Diet*. 2003;16(5):315–22.
26. Byham-Gray LD, Gilbride JA, Dixon LB, Stage FK. Evidence-based practice: What are dietitians' perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge? *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2005;105(10):1574–81.
27. Upton D, Upton P. Knowledge and use of evidence-based practice by allied health and health science professionals in the United Kingdom. *J Allied Health*. 2006;35(3):127–33.
28. Heiwe S, Kajermo KN, Raija Tyni-Lenné, Guidetti S, Samuelsson M, Andersson IL, et al. Evidence-based practice: Attitudes, knowledge and behaviour among allied health care professionals. *Int J Qual Heal Care*. 2011;23(2):198–209.
29. Chiu YW, Weng YH, Wahlqvist ML, Yang CY, Kuo KN. Do registered dietitians search for evidence-based information? A nationwide survey of regional hospitals in Taiwan. *Asia Pac J Clin Nutr*. 2012;21(4):630–7.
30. Saeed A. Evidence based nutrition: knowledge and use among dietitians of Pakistan. *Prog Nutr*. 2017;19(3):291–4.
31. Hinrichs RJ. Dietetic interns' perceptions and use of evidence-based practice: An exploratory study.



- J Med Libr Assoc. 2018;106(1):65–73.
32. Gooding B, Probst Y, Houston L, Neale E. Exploring perceptions, barriers and use of systematic reviews amongst nutrition professionals and nutrition students. *Nutr Diet*. 2020;77(1):151–9.
  33. Amjad A, Fatima A, Bashir A. Knowledge and use of evidence-based practice among physical therapists, dietitians and nurses. *Rawal Med J*. 2020;45(2):493–6.
  34. YOUNG AM, Olenski S, WILKINSON SA, Campbell K, Barnes R, Cameron A, et al. Knowledge Translation in Dietetics: A Survey of Dietitians’ Awareness and Confidence. *Can J Diet Pract Res*. 2020;81(1):49–53.
  35. Ramos KD, Schafer S, Tracz SM. Validation of the Fresno test of competence in evidence based medicine. *BMJ Br Med J [Internet]*. 2003 Feb 2 [cited 2022 Aug 23];326(7384):319. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC143529/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/143529/)
  36. Upton D, Upton P. Methodological issues in nursing research: Development of an evidence-based practice questionnaire for nurses. *J Adv Nurs*. 2006;54(4):454–8.
  37. Risk of Bias Instrument for Cross Sectional Surveys of Attitudes and Practices DistillerSR - DistillerSR [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jan 10]. Available from: <https://www.evidencepartners.com/resources/methodological-resources/risk-of-bias-instrument-for-cross-sectional-surveys-of-attitudes-and-practices-distillersr>
  38. Akl EA, Sun X, Busse JW, Johnston BC, Briel M, Mulla S, et al. Specific instructions for estimating unclearly reported blinding status in randomized trials were reliable and valid. *J Clin Epidemiol [Internet]*. 2012;65(3):262–7. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.04.015>
  39. CASP CHECKLISTS - CASP - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jul 4]. Available from: <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>
  40. Sharma A, Minh Duc NT, Luu Lam Thang T, Nam NH, Ng SJ, Abbas KS, et al. A Consensus-Based Checklist for Reporting of Survey Studies (CROSS). *J Gen Intern Med*. 2021 Oct;36(10):3179–87.
  41. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Heal care J Int Soc Qual Heal Care*. 2007 Dec;19(6):349–57.
  42. Bandura A. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York, NY, US: W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co; 1997. ix, 604–ix, 604.
  43. Wimmers PF. *Developing Clinical Competence*. In 2006.

44. Metcalfe CJ, Hughes C, Perry S, Wright J, Lewin RJP, Closs J. Research in the NHS: a survey of four therapies. *Br J Ther Rehabil*. 2000 Apr 1;7(4):168–75. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjtr.2000.7.4.13886>
45. José Closs S, Lewin BJP. Perceived barriers to research utilization: a survey of four therapies. *Br J Ther Rehabil*. 1998 Mar 1;5(3):151–5. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjtr.1998.5.3.14095>
46. Scott I, Heyworth R, Fairweather P. The use of evidence-based medicine in the practice of consultant physicians. Results of a questionnaire survey. *Aust N Z J Med*. 2000 [cited 2022 Sep 19];30(3):319–26. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10914748/>
47. Funk SG, Champagne MT, Wiese RA, Tornquist EM. Barriers: The barriers to research utilization scale. *Appl Nurs Res*. 1991 Feb 1;4(1):39–45.
48. McColl A, Smith H, White P, Field J. General practitioner’s perceptions of the route to evidence based medicine: a questionnaire survey. *BMJ Br Med J*. 1998 Jan 1 [cited 2022 Sep 20];316(7128):361. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC2665572/?report=abstract](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10914748/)
49. Upton D, Lewis B. Clinical effectiveness and EBP: design of a questionnaire. <http://dx.doi.org/1012968/bjtr199851214028>. 2013 Sep 27 [cited 2022 Sep 20];5(12):647–50. Available from: <https://www.magonlinelibrary.com/doi/10.12968/bjtr.1998.5.12.14028>
50. Jette DU, Bacon K, Batty C, Carlson M, Ferland A, Hemingway RD, et al. Evidence-based practice: Beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors of physical therapists. *Phys Ther*. 2003;83(9):786–805.
51. Chiu YW, Weng YH, Lo HL, Ting HW, Hsu CC, Shih YH, et al. Physicians’ characteristics in the usage of online database: a representative nationwide survey of regional hospitals in Taiwan. *Inform Health Soc Care*. 2009 [cited 2022 Sep 21];34(3):127–35. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19670003/>
52. Chiu YW, Weng YH, Lo HL, Shih YH, Hsu CC, Kuo KN. Impact of a nationwide outreach program on the diffusion of evidence-based practice in Taiwan. *Int J Qual Heal care J Int Soc Qual Heal Care*. 2010 Aug 17 [cited 2022 Sep 21];22(5):430–6. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20716552/>
53. Vogt EAM, Byham-Gray LD, Denmark R, Touger-Decker R. Impact of an evidence-based practice intervention on knowledge and clinical practice behaviors among registered dietitians. *Top Clin Nutr*. 2016;31(2):111–24.

54. Dougherty CM, Burrowes JD, Hand RK. Why Registered Dietitian Nutritionists Are Not Doing Research-Perceptions, Barriers, and Participation in Research from the Academy's Dietetics Practice-Based Research Network Needs Assessment Survey. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2015 Jun 1 [cited 2022 Sep 20];115(6):1001–7. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25801190/>
55. Schaafsma T, Wakefield J, Hanisch R, Bray F, Schüz J, Joy EJMM, et al. Africa's oesophageal cancer corridor: Geographic variations in incidence correlate with certain micronutrient deficiencies. *PLoS One*. 2015 Oct 8 [cited 2019 Aug 21];10(10). Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84948700563&doi=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0140107&partnerID=40&md5=4cce0549c7ca9eb961b8b07ac64db4c3>
56. Risk of Bias Instrument for Cross Sectional Surveys of Attitudes and Practices DistillerSR - DistillerSR. [cited 2022 Apr 2]. Available from: <https://www.evidencepartners.com/resources/methodological-resources/risk-of-bias-instrument-for-cross-sectional-surveys-of-attitudes-and-practices-distillersr>
57. Methods Commentary: Risk of Bias in Cross-Sectional Surveys of Attitudes and Practices - DistillerSR. [cited 2023 May 23]. Available from: <https://www.distillersr.com/resources/methodological-resources/risk-of-bias-cross-sectional-surveys-of-attitudes-and-practices>
58. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2011 Oct 18 [cited 2023 May 23];343(7829). Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/343/bmj.d5928>
59. Dawes M, Summerskill W, Glasziou P, Cartabellotta A, Martin J, Hopayian K, et al. Sicily statement on evidence-based practice. *BMC Med Educ*. 2005 Jan 5 [cited 2023 Jun 10];5(1):1–7. Available from: <https://bmcmmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6920-5-1>
60. Test Specifications and Study Guides - Commission on Dietetic Registration. [cited 2023 Mar 6]. Available from: [https://www.cdrnet.org/study?set\\_ga\\_opt\\_in\\_cookie=0&set\\_ga\\_opt\\_in=Save+Settings](https://www.cdrnet.org/study?set_ga_opt_in_cookie=0&set_ga_opt_in=Save+Settings)
61. Exam preparation | Dietitians Australia. [cited 2023 Jun 18]. Available from: <https://dietitiansaustralia.org.au/working-dietetics/skills-recognition-australia/process-overseas-educated-dietitians/exam-preparation>
62. College of Dietitians - Canadian Dietetic Registration Examination. [cited 2023 Jun 18]. Available

from: <https://www.collegeofdietitians.org/applicants/cdre.aspx>

63. Lehane E, Leahy-Warren P, O’Riordan C, Savage E, Drennan J, O’Tuathaigh C, et al. Evidence-based practice education for healthcare professions: An expert view. *BMJ Evidence-Based Med.* 2019;24(3):103–8.
64. Research Priorities 2020-2025. [cited 2023 May 21]. Available from: <https://www.eatrightpro.org/practice/research/about-dietetics-research/academy-research-priorities-2020-2025>
65. Bala MM, Peričić TP, Zajac J, Rohwer A, Klugarova J, Välimäki M, et al. What are the effects of teaching Evidence-Based Health Care (EBHC) at different levels of health professions education? An updated overview of systematic reviews. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(7 July):1–28.
66. Thompson KL, Davidson P, Swan WI, Hand RK, Rising C, Dunn A V., et al. Nutrition Care Process Chains: The “Missing Link” between Research and Evidence-Based Practice. *J Acad Nutr Diet.* 2015 Sep 1 [cited 2023 Jun 12];115(9):1491–8. Available from: <http://www.jandonline.org/article/S221226721500502X/fulltext>
67. Price D. Sharing Clinical Decisions by Discussing Evidence with Patients. *Perm J.* 2005 Apr 1 [cited 2023 May 23];9(2):70. Available from: </pmc/articles/PMC3104837/>
68. Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, Barry MJ, Bennett CL, Eden KB, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2017 Apr 12 [cited 2023 May 23];2017(4). Available from: <https://www-cochranelibrary-com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub5/full>
69. EAL. [cited 2023 May 21]. Available from: <https://www.andeal.org/topic-list>
70. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, Buroker AB, Goldberger ZD, Hahn EJ, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation.* 2019 Sep 10 [cited 2023 Jun 11];140(11):e596–646. Available from: <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000678>
71. Schwarzenberg SJ, Georgieff MK. Advocacy for improving nutrition in the first 1000 days to support childhood development and adult health. *Pediatrics.* 2018 Feb 1 [cited 2023 Jun 11];141(2). Available from: </pediatrics/article/141/2/e20173716/38085/Advocacy-for-Improving-Nutrition-in-the-First-1000>
72. Kumaravel B, Hearn JH, Jahangiri L, Pollard R, Stocker CJ, Nunan D. A systematic review and

- taxonomy of tools for evaluating evidence-based medicine teaching in medical education. *Syst Rev.* 2020;9(1):1–12.
73. Johnston BC, Alonso-Coello P, Friedrich JO, Mustafa RA, Tikkinen KAO, Neumann I, et al. Do clinicians understand the size of treatment effects? A randomized survey across 8 countries. *CMAJ.* 2016 Jan 5;188(1):25–32.
74. Tikkinen KAO, Guyatt GH. Understanding of research results, evidence summaries and their applicability-not critical appraisal-are core skills of medical curriculum. Vol. 26, *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine.* BMJ Publishing Group; 2021. p. 231–3.
75. Dietetic Practice Groups. [cited 2023 Jun 12]. Available from: <https://www.eatrightpro.org/career/academy-groups/dietetic-practice-groups>
76. Home. [cited 2023 Jun 12]. Available from: <https://www.gmdi.org/>
77. Lizarondo LM, Grimmer-Somers K, Kumar S, Crockett A. Does journal club membership improve research evidence uptake in different allied health disciplines: A pre-post study. *BMC Res Notes.* 2012;5.

## Footnotes

*Contributors:* BCJ conceived the study. NRG and BCJ designed the study. NRG and BCJ developed a *priori* list of core evidence-based competencies for nutrition professionals and students. NRG, BCJ and MC designed and performed the search strategy. NRG and RAC selected the articles. NRG, ZE, JZ, and SGL extracted the data. NRG analyzed the data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. BCJ reviewed the data of the draft manuscript. All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and contributed to the writing of the final version of the manuscript. All authors agreed with the results and conclusions of this article. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. NRG and BCJ are the guarantors.

*Funding:* This research was not funded by a specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. It was funded, in small part, by the Presidential Transformational Teaching Grant from Texas A&M University (awarded to BCJ). The university had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

*Conflict of interest:* All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/](http://www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/) and declare: support from Texas A&M University for the submitted work; BCJ received a grant from Texas A&M AgriLife Research to fund investigator initiated research related to saturated and polyunsaturated fats. The grant was from Texas A&M AgriLife institutional funds from interest and investment earnings, not a sponsoring organization, industry, or company.

*Ethical approval:* Not required. All the work was developed using aggregate level data.

*Data sharing:* Further data is available on request through the corresponding author at [bradley.johnston@tamu.edu](mailto:bradley.johnston@tamu.edu).