

The Informing Practice Award

The Informing Practice Award was created to recognize a publication that substantiates a new and novel idea or approach contributing to the cumulative knowledge base of the field and is likely to inspire fellow RTs in their research.

2025 Winner

[Roles of anesthesia assistants within the code blue team at in-hospital cardiopulmonary arrests: A retrospective analysis](#)

Claire A Ward, Melissa Berry, Maria Bou-Habib, Julia Law, Andrew D Milne

Past Winners

2024

[Exploring knowledge gaps and research needs in respiratory therapy: A qualitative description study](#)

Marco Zaccagnini, Andrew West, Esther Khor, Shirley Quach, and Mika L. Nonoyama

2023

[Use of video laryngoscopy versus direct laryngoscopy as a teaching tool for neonatal intubation: A systematic review](#)

Jenna MacKinnon and Carolyn McCoy

2022

[A survey of Canadian respiratory therapists working in the COVID-19 pandemic: The RRT perspective](#)

Claire Ward, Jillian C. Banfield, Paul Brousseau

2021

[The Respiratory Therapy Practice-Based Outcomes Initiative \(RT-PBOI\): Developing a framework to explore the value added by respiratory therapists to health care in Alberta](#)

Roberta Dubois, Rena Sorensen, Bryan Buell, Tracey Telenko, Andrew West

2020

[Design and performance testing of a novel emergency ventilator for in-hospital use](#)

Jacob M. Knorr, Megan M. Sheehan, Daniel C. Santana, Sergey Samorezov, Ibrahim Sammour, Michael Deblock, Barry Kuban, Neal Chaisson, and Robert L. Chatburn

2019

[Ventilatory equivalent for oxygen as an extubation outcome predictor: A pilot study](#)

Troy Ellens, Ramandeep Kaur, Kelly Roehl, Meagan Dubosky, David L. Vines

Selection Process

The Editor-in-Chief selects a top 5 from all published papers within the year. The executive board (Deputy Editor, Associate Editors) will score the papers according to the rubric below. Should any board member also be an author of a top paper selection, they will recuse themselves, and scoring will be weighted accordingly.

	3 Outstanding	2 Good	1 Average
Contribution to the Field	Original and novel research in terms of theory, practice, or both.	A significant contribution but not exceptional.	A nice but incremental extension of previous work
Writing Quality	Clear and concise. Terms defined, avoids unnecessary jargon. Well organized, with good use of figures and tables where appropriate.	Minor flaws in 1 to 2 areas of writing quality.	Flaws that hinder understanding.
Conceptual Framework	Reviews relevant research. The research question, purpose, and rationale are clear and follow from the reviewed works. Aligns well with methods and results. The research question is significant.	Minor flaws in 1 to 2 areas of the conceptual framework.	Flaws in conceptual framework.
Methods & Results	The methods and research design are appropriate to the research question. The sources of data are sufficient (e.g., reliable, valid, shows triangulation of data sources). The analyses are appropriate given data sources (e.g., correct statistical procedures). Results are clear and convincing.	Minor flaws in the methods or results.	Flaws in methods or results.
Interpretation of Findings	The results make an important contribution to the field. The interpretations provide insights into the pattern of the data, notes contribution(s) to the field, and don't overstate the findings. Limitations are noted or addressed with suggested future studies.	Minor flaws (e.g., slight overinterpretation of data, contribution to the field is not well explained).	Flaws in interpretation.