

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

All Domains

Expert Opinion / General Review Article

Reviewer:

Today's Date:

Final Evidence Level:

Project/Topic of your Clinical Question:

Article Title:

Year:

First Author:

Journal:

Do the aim/purpose/objectives assist in answering your clinical question?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unknown

- Aim/Purpose/Objectives:

When reading the bolded questions, consider the bulleted questions to help answer the main question.

If you are uncertain of your skills in evidence evaluation, please consult a local evidence expert for assistance:

- [CCHMC Evidence Experts](#)

Unfamiliar terms can be found in the [LEGEND Glossary](#).

Basic Elements of an Expert Opinion / Review Article

1.	Is the author a known expert in the field being studied? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the author's credentials?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
2.	Does the author have a known bias?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
3.	Is the patient population, problem, or issue clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
4.	Is the literature search clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
5.	Is the date range of the cited literature appropriate and current?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
6.	What types of research are cited (e.g., animal model, basic science, clinical studies)?			
7.	Is there more than one point of view explained, reported, or referenced?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
8.	Were any conclusions clearly presented in the article? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If applicable, were any adverse events clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
9.	Was there freedom from conflict of interest? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sponsors, Funding Agency, Investigators	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Comments:

Applicability

Can I apply this Expert Opinion / General Review Information?

10.	Can the results be applied to my population of interest? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the setting described in the article applicable to my population of interest?• Do the patient outcomes apply to my population or question of interest?• Were the patients in this article similar to my population of interest?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
11.	Are my patient's and family's values and preferences satisfied by the knowledge gained from this article (such as outcomes considered)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
12.	Would you include this article in development of a care recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Comments on Applicability:

Additional Comments or Conclusions ("Take-Home Points")

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

All Domains

Expert Opinion / General Review Article

Quality Level / Evidence Level

- Consider each "No" answer and the degree to which this limitation is a threat to the validity of the results, then check the appropriate box to assign the level of quality for this study/article.
- Consider an "Unknown" answer to one or more questions as a similar limitation to answering "No," if the information is not available in the article.

The Evidence Level is:

- ☐ **Good Quality Expert Opinion/General Review** [5a]
- ☐ **Lesser Quality Expert Opinion/General Review** [5b]
- ☐ **Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable**

Table of Evidence Levels																		
DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN																	
	Systematic Review Meta-Analysis	Meta-Synthesis	RCT*	CCT*	Qualitative Study	Psychometric Study	Cohort – Prospective	Cohort – Retrospective	Case – Control	Longitudinal (Before/After, Time Series)	Cross – Sectional	Descriptive Study Epidemiologic Study Case Series	Quality Improvement	Mixed Methods Study	Decision Analysis Economic Analysis Computer Simulation	Guidelines	Case Reports N-of-1 Study	Bench Study
All Domains	1a											4a		2/3/4 a/b	5a	5a	5a	5a
	1b											4b			5b	5b	5b	5b
																	Published Expert Opinion	Local Consensus Published Abstracts
																	5a	5

* RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; CCT = Controlled Clinical Trial

Development for this appraisal form is based on:

- Guyatt, G.; Rennie, D.; Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group.; and American Medical Association.: Users' guides to the medical literature : a manual for evidence-based clinical practice. *Users' guides to the medical literature : a manual for evidence-based clinical practice*: "JAMA & archives journals." Chicago, IL, 2002
- Melnik, B. M. and E. Fineout-Overholt (2005). Evidence-based practice in nursing & healthcare : a guide to best practice. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Phillips, et al: Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine Levels of Evidence, 2001. Last accessed Nov 14, 2007 from <http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=1025>.
- Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs*, 2(3): 157-60, 2005.
- Clark, E., Burkett, K., & Stanko-Lopp, D. (2009, Dec). Let Evidence Guide Every New Decision (LEGEND): an evidence evaluation system for point-of-care clinicians and guideline development teams [CCHMC LEGEND development]. *J Eval Clin Pract*, 15(6), 1054-1060.
- Local Consensus.