

EDITORIAL

Keywords: KNOWLEDGE SUMMARIES; REVIEW ARTICLES; STATISTICS

Veterinary Evidence: moving forward

Peter Cockcroft, MA, MSc, MBA, Vet MB, DVM&S, DCHP, Dip ECBHM^{1*}
Editor-in-Chief¹School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Surrey, Guildford, GU2 7AL* Corresponding author email: eic@veterinaryevidence.org

Published 18 September 2024

Unrecognised and unknown information needs can significantly impact on the quality of decision making, advice, and patient care. In the practice of veterinary medicine, additional information may be required in one or more of epidemiology, diagnosis, treatment, prognosis, control (risk reduction), and prevention (risk avoidance), in order to optimise patient care.

Veterinary Evidence publishes Knowledge Summaries, which aim to answer a specific and focused clinical query by appraising the best available evidence published in peer-reviewed scientific journals. By presenting the evidence in a structured and easily digestible format, Knowledge Summaries enable veterinary professionals to stay informed and apply the best available evidence to their decision-making.

To assist in the identification of unrecognised deficits and the generation of clinical queries *Veterinary Evidence* has developed a list of common conditions for each species, alongside the different categories of information. The aim is to prompt and support the generation of new clinical queries in a more systematic format. This resource sits alongside our species-based lists of clinical queries that have already been suggested by practicing veterinarians, veterinary nurses, and other paraprofessionals (see veterinaryevidence.org/index.php/ve/clinical-queries). We hope readers and prospective authors will use these resources to generate new clinical queries or as a starting point for writing their own Knowledge Summaries.

Most of the papers published in *Veterinary Evidence* are Knowledge Summaries, but the journal has always accepted and will continue to accept and encourage other types of reviews and original research that provide evidence to inform clinical practice. For example, in this issue we have published a commentary paper by Professor Jonathan Elliott regarding the processes and evidence required for the registration of veterinary medicinal products which provides some important insights and debate into the publication of evidential information (Elliott, 2024).

A Knowledge Summary may not always be the best format to synthesise and summarise evidence on a multifaceted topic; scoping reviews, systematic reviews, or narrative reviews maybe more appropriate. Munn et al. (2018) provide a useful account of scoping reviews and how they differ from traditional literature and systematic reviews. In particular, we are keen to receive articles on artificial intelligence applications, sustainability, and quality improvement in clinical practice, as the impact and importance of these topics grows.

We are also making some changes to the presentation of Knowledge Summaries in *Veterinary Evidence*, to help readers more easily understand the details and context of the summarised evidence. In order to support everyone in appraising and understanding quantitative clinical studies, we will be publishing a glossary and guidance on basic statistical terms and tests on the journal website.

—
This Open Access work is distributed under a Creative Commons Attributions 4.0 International License. You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) or adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially), provided you fully cite this original work.

—
Veterinary Evidence is an online, open access, peer-reviewed journal owned and published by RCVS Knowledge.

ORCID

Peter Cockcroft: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0090-07060>

References

1. Elliott, J. (2024). Publication of registration studies in peer-reviewed academic journals. *Veterinary Evidence*. 9(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18849/ve.v9i3.682>
2. Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A. & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 18(143). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>

Licence

Copyright (c) 2024 Peter Cockcroft

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Veterinary Evidence uses the Creative Commons copyright [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). That means users are free to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. Remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially – with the appropriate citation.

Intellectual property rights

Authors of articles submitted to RCVS Knowledge for publication will retain copyright in their work, and will be required to grant to RCVS Knowledge a non-exclusive licence to publish including but not limited to the right to publish, re-publish, transmit, sell, distribute and otherwise use the materials in all languages and all media throughout the world, and to licence or permit others to do so.

Disclaimer

Any opinions expressed in articles and other publication types published in *Veterinary Evidence* are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect the view of the RCVS Knowledge. *Veterinary Evidence* is a resource to help inform, and the content herein should not override the responsibility of the practitioner. Practitioners should also consider factors such as individual clinical expertise and judgement along with patient's circumstances and owners' values. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of the content. While the Editor and Publisher believe that all content herein are in accord with current recommendations and practice at the time of publication, they accept no legal responsibility for any errors or omissions, and make no warranty, express or implied, with respect to material contained within. For further information please refer to our [Terms of Use](#).