

Regular Feature

SHOUT

Sharing Hints, Outcomes and Useful Techniques

In this feature we draw together some of the excellent knowledge and information that our international colleagues have recently produced.

If you have seen or published an open access study that should be highlighted in our regular SHOUT feature, please submit the reference, link and short summary (max 150 words) to hslj.hslj@gmail.com

USEFUL OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

- Journal of EAHIL (European Association for Health Information and Libraries) <https://ojs.eahil.eu/JEAHIL/index>
- Journal of Health Information and Libraries Australasia (JOHILA) <https://www.johila.org/index.php/Johila>
- Journal of the Medical Library Association (JMLA) <https://jmla.mlanet.org/ojs/jmla>
- Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP) <https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/eblip/index.php/EBLIP>

SELECTIONS FROM [EAHIL 2025, VOL. 21 NO. 3](#)

Harriss E, Bridge S & Henry M (2025) Shaking it up: a research project to determine why our information skills training sessions are so popular. Journal of EAHIL, 21(3), 2-6.

<https://ojs.eahil.eu/JEAHIL/article/view/684>

The Bodleian Health Care Libraries (BHCL) deliver ten different workshops as part of the wider University of Oxford (UK) Bodleian Libraries information skills training programme. The authors set out to discover why their training sessions are popular with postgraduate students, through interviews and focus groups. The data indicated a strong need for training in literature searching, evidence synthesis, critical appraisal, science communication (translating research for a non-specialist audience) and writing skills. Their training sessions fill some of those needs, and while the sessions are popular for that reason, the authors set out actions for the team to build on the results from this qualitative research.

Papachristoforou E, Lewney J, et al (2025) Library usage by DDUH students and staff. Journal of EAHIL, 21(3), 7-15. <https://doi.org/10.32384/jeahil21686>

The aim of this study was to explore the accessibility, functionality and effectiveness of Dublin Dental University Hospital (DDUH) library services for students and staff. The authors used a survey to assess satisfaction with library hours, study spaces, resources, online databases and preferred study environments among students (dental nursing, technology, hygiene, science) and staff [see article appendix for the questionnaire]. They found that, of 217 respondents (86.2% students, mostly dental science), 68.7% were satisfied with library hours, though undergraduates favoured extended and weekend access ($p=0.015$). Online database difficulties affected 32.3%, highest among dental technology students (57.9%, $p=0.025$). Study spaces were most valued; librarian services least. Most requested additional quiet, group, and lounge areas. Despite alternatives, 68.7% considered DDUH Library optimal. The authors conclude that extended

hours, improved study spaces, digital training, and promoting librarian services are essential to enhance accessibility and meet evolving needs.

Förstner KU & Albers M (2025) Creating an open, community-driven and resilient data base of life science literature metadata. Journal of EAHIL, 21(3), 16-18. <https://doi.org/10.32384/jeahil21688>

This brief article presents a brief overview of the proposed OLSPub (Open Life Science Publication database) project, which seeks to develop a continuously expanding database of life-science metadata. Designed as a resource built by the community and for the community, OLSPub aims to provide an open, interoperable, and sustainable infrastructure that enhances access, supports discovery, and ensures long-term resilience in the management of biomedical literature.

SELECTIONS FROM [EAHIL 2025, VOL. 21 NO. 4](#)

D'Hont A, Cortebeeck K, et al (2025) Navigating the publishing trap: safeguarding researchers from predatory practices. Journal of EAHIL, 21(4), 9-13. <https://doi.org/10.32384/jeahil21699>

This article describes the motivation, development and results of the workshop 'Spotting sharks in the ocean of academic publishing: how to steer clear of predatory behaviour'. The goal of the workshop was to teach researchers how to make the distinction between reliable and untrustworthy journals and reduce distrust of new or smaller publishers. The session was developed at KU Leuven and then adapted for presentation at the EAHIL conference. It provided valuable insights into raising awareness, fostering collaboration among research support staff, and strengthening trust in the publishing landscape.

Wa Baile M (2025) Making the Medical Library of the University of Bern a caring and safe space. Journal of EAHIL, 21(4), 14-17. <https://doi.org/10.32384/jeahil21694>

The Medical Library (BibMED) at the University of Bern has launched the Caring Library initiative. This initiative promotes a safe, welcoming space through twenty guiding principles displayed prominently behind the information desk. These principles, such as respect, inclusion, and solidarity, serve as a daily reminder of the values that keep our community caring and discrimination-free. This article describes the motivations behind the Caring Library initiative. The BibMED is committed to fostering an environment where all backgrounds and identities are valued and respected.

Walz J (2025) Human vs. machine in medical search strategy development: a comparative evaluation of ChatGPT-4.1. Journal of EAHIL, 21(4), 18-21. <https://doi.org/10.32384/jeahil21697>

This study examined the potential of generative artificial intelligence, specifically ChatGPT-4.1, to support development of search strategies. Using two Cochrane Review topics as benchmarks, AI-generated MEDLINE strategies were compared to the expert strategies using PRESS (Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies) criteria. Results show that ChatGPT-4.1 can accurately translate research questions and apply Ovid syntax and Boolean operators but shows considerable weaknesses in subject heading and text word selection.

Scotti V, De Silvestri A, et al (2025) Exploring the impact of scientific research through citation analysis tools in policies and guidelines. Journal of EAHIL, 21(4), 22-24. <https://doi.org/10.32384/jeahil21695>

Research impact has traditionally been measured through academic citations. In recent years, however, the focus has shifted towards assessing the broader effects of research on society, including its influence on policy-making and clinical guidelines. This brief article explores the role of citation analysis, extending impact measurement beyond academia. Using data from Scival Impact Module, the authors demonstrate how scientific publications from their institution have influenced policy documents and guidelines. They argue that these tools are essential in recognising the real-world value of research, providing meaningful indicators for evaluation and accountability.

SELECTIONS FROM [JMLA 2025, VOL. 113 NO. 4](#)

Wang J & Moody H (2025) Language inclusion intentions in scoping reviews. *JMLA*, 113(4), 290-297. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2025.2170>

Scoping reviews, in comparison to systematic reviews, examine a broader range of sources to build a conceptual summary of a field of inquiry, making languages other than English (LOTE) literature an important source of information for authors. This study therefore aimed to characterise the current state of LOTE inclusion intentions in scoping reviews. Peer-reviewed, PubMed indexed scoping review protocols published from 01-Jan-2024 to 11-Aug-2024 were analysed for LOTE inclusion. Author affiliation, which LOTEs (if any) were included, and what methods authors planned to use to read LOTE literature were recorded. Their analysis demonstrates the need for increased LOTE inclusion and reporting guidelines for scoping reviews, as well as the importance of analysing LOTE inclusion for other forms of evidence synthesis.

Patterson B, Diekema AR, et al (2025) "Is this professionally correct?": understanding the criteria nurses use to evaluate information. *JMLA*, 113(4), 298-309. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2025.2163>

This study sought to determine nurses' evaluation criteria when encountering health information using a mixed-methods approach with a survey and follow-up individual interviews. The authors conclude that nurses value accurate, relevant information; however, their evaluation criteria are often superficial. Educators should encourage nursing students to engage more deeply with the nuances of evaluation. While many nurses pointed to research and peer review as evidence of accuracy, fewer demonstrated a deeper understanding of how to evaluate particular research methodologies, such as systematic reviews. [See appendices A–G for survey and other instruments.]

Wilson P (2025) Sometimes the apple does fall far from the tree: a case study on automatic indexing precision errors in PubMed. *JMLA*, 113(4), 318-326. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2025.2110>

This case study identifies the presence and prevalence of precision indexing errors in a subset of automatically indexed MEDLINE records in PubMed (specifically, all MEDLINE records automatically indexed with the MeSH term Malus, the genus name for apple trees). In short, how well does automatic indexing compare [figurative] apples to [literal] apples? The author found that automatic indexing can commit errors when indexing records that have words with non-literal or alternative meanings in their titles or abstracts. Librarians should be mindful of the existence of automatic indexing errors and instruct authors on how best to ameliorate the effects of them within their own manuscripts.

Watson E & Zhang L (2025) Analyzing the citation impact of predatory journals in the health sciences. *JMLA*, 113(4), 327-335. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2025.2024>

Using citation analysis techniques, this study investigates the influence of predatory journals in the health sciences. The study found that the content from articles published in predatory journals has infiltrated reputable health sciences journals to a substantial extent. They conclude that it is crucial to develop strategies to prevent citing such articles.

SELECTIONS FROM [JMLA 2026, VOL. 114 NO. 1](#)

Shipman JP (2026) The I's have it: everything needed to practice medical librarianship starts with an I. *JMLA*, 114(1), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2026.2431>

The medical or health sciences library professional vocabulary uses many words that start with an I. On the eve of the 60th anniversary of the Janet Doe Lectureship, this lecture article highlights and summarizes the 15 lectures (27%) that have included an I in their titles. The most frequent I word was information; this word appeared in four lectures. Only one lecture used more than one I word in the title. A new I word incorporated in this lecture, but not in its title, is Intelligence, Artificial.

[Note: +Italics were used to emphasize I words within the lecture or titles of published works.]

Roga E (2026) Using andragogy and instructional design to teach workshops on systematic searching in an academic library: case report. JMLA, 114(1), 46-52. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2026.2185>

At Federation University Australia Library, in response to increasing requests for support from researchers conducting knowledge syntheses, a series of workshops on systematic searching was developed using adult learning methods. The authors aimed to deliver quality, engaging learning experiences to researchers, and using instructional design was likely to help meet this goal. Learning outcomes were identified, followed by developing active, collaborative learning strategies and activities. After implementation, the workshops were evaluated informally, resulting in planned changes and improvements to future offerings. The authors found that using andragogy and instructional design provided a structure to follow, and centred researcher needs. While positive feedback was received from workshop participants, there is a need to formally evaluate the learning outcomes to determine if the workshops resulted in improvements in systematic searching practices. The approach to developing the workshops can be adapted by other libraries delivering similar training on systematic searching.

Lipke L & Gilman N (2026) Changing minds and methods: providing health sciences faculty with alternatives to systematic reviews assignments. JMLA, 114(1), 60-66.

<https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2026.2056>

Health sciences librarians frequently engage in discussions about the appropriate assignment of evidence synthesis reviews (ES) for graduate students. Health sciences faculty are often not familiar with required standardized methodologies. Health sciences librarians at an R1 (doctoral) institution ventured to address the ES review knowledge gap through a continuing education webinar for health sciences faculty and graduate students. The webinar provided guidance on systematic review (SR) methodology, optional alternative research assignments, and discussions encouraging the use of these assignments. Alternative assignments were developed based on those by Lipke & Price (2025), each with specific learning objectives and grading rubrics. Pre- and post-webinar surveys were conducted to gauge any changes in participants' knowledge, skills, or abilities. Study participants included six faculty and a graduate student. Survey results showed that participants had an improved understanding of, and placed increased importance on, ES method guidelines, with an equal understanding of the need for alternative assignments.

A recording of the webinar can be found in the Binghamton University institutional repository https://orb.binghamton.edu/library_resources/31/ (under additional files).

Duffy C, Tripp T, et al (2026) Information mastery skills among pre-clerkship students in a problem-based learning curriculum: a case report. JMLA, 114(1), 68-74. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2026.2203>

Training students to utilize and apply principles of evidence-based medicine (EBM) is critical but data and methods for evaluating students' EBM skills are lacking. The Hackensack Meridian School of Medicine has early curricular introduction of information mastery techniques to combat these challenges. Students create research presentations related to the weekly problem-based-learning (PBL) case to practice applying EBM skills. Medical librarians developed and utilized an assessment tool to evaluate students' weekly presentations. Librarian staff reviewed 595 presentations during the first year of the pre-clerkship curriculum using five criteria: (1) appropriate scope of presentation (2) correct categorization of the question based on the finding information framework (3) appropriate resource used (4) search strategy and (5) bibliographic citations according to American Medical Association (AMA) guidelines. They conclude that, of the evaluated presentations using these criteria, the majority of students routinely and reliably applied EBM skills in their case-based presentations. Further studies will need to look at continued development of these skills throughout other phases of training.

SELECTIONS FROM [EBLIP 2026, VOL. 21 NO. 1](#)**Medaille A (2026) Editorial: Publishing assessment projects as research. Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 21(1), 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip31053>**

Librarians and other information professionals commonly conduct assessments and evaluations of their own programs and services and report the results of these efforts in journal articles. However, consideration should be given to when it is appropriate to publish the results of an assessment project as research. This article will provide some guidance about this issue.

Bell EC & Stagg A (2026) Developing an OPEN Framework for asking EBLIP questions in open education. Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 21(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip30867>

This paper proposes a novel framework for asking questions in evidence based library and information practice (EBLIP) called OPEN (Objective, Purpose, Evidence, and Narrative). It responds to the question: How can a framework for asking EBLIP questions be developed and applied to open educational practices (OEP)? Arising concurrently from three-year collaborative project to create a data dashboard, the OPEN framework comprises four elements - Objective: What do we need to know?; Purpose: Why do we need to know this?; Evidence: What evidence do I have or need?; and Narrative: How will I communicate this evidence? These elements guide library and information professionals to define what they need to know, collect, and communicate to make evidence based decisions. and found that the collaborative and reflective nature of the project was instrumental in developing both a useful data dashboard to empower authors to tell their own data stories, and a new framework that contributes to the future of EBLIP and enhances the ability of OEP practitioners to meaningfully engage with EBP.

Cabugos L & Premji Z (2026) Examining the meaning and methodological characteristics of the systematized review label: a scoping review. Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 21(1), 167–193. <https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip30757>

In 2009, a typology by Grant and Booth introduced the concept of a systematized review in which authors (typically students) selectively employ various elements of the systematic review process. The objective of this scoping review is to identify and describe the extent of published systematized reviews, and to 1) identify and collate, where available, sources used for the conceptualization and conduct of the systematized reviews, 2) determine if explanations provided were based on constraints, and 3) describe common methodological characteristics. The authors found that the methodological attributes of published systematized reviews vary significantly. A small number (15) of reviews searched only one database or source, while the majority searched between 2 and 6 sources. The majority (134) provided no search details or a non-reproducible search strategy. Only 36 included reviews mentioned librarian involvement. They conclude that librarians, as methodological guides, participants, or evaluators can play a key role in reinforcing the expectations of this review type and the standards that should be met when publishing a systematized review.

SHOUT is a regular feature of the HSLJ and is compiled by Mary Dunne, of the editorial team.

