LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study
All Domains
Guideline

Cincinnati Children's™
changing the outcome together

Reviewer:	**Today's Date:**	**Final Evidence Level:**
Project/Topic of your Clinical Question:		
Article Title:		
Year:	**First Author:**	**Journal:**

Do the aim/purpose/objectives and inclusion/exclusion criteria assist in answering your clinical question?	☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Unknown**

- Study Aim/Purpose/Objectives:

- Inclusion Criteria:

- Exclusion Criteria:

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.

Scope and Purpose

1.	**Were overall objective(s) of the recommendation specifically described?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
2.	**Were the health question(s) covered by the recommendation specifically described?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
3.	**Was the population** (patients, public, etc.) **to whom the recommendation is meant to apply specifically described?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Stakeholder Involvement

4.	**Did the guideline development group include individuals from all the relevant professional groups?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
5.	**Were the views and preferences of the target population** (patients, public, etc.) **sought?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
6.	**Were the target user(s) of the guideline clearly defined?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Rigor of Development

7.	**Were systematic methods used to search for evidence?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
8.	**Were the criteria for selecting the evidence clearly described?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
9.	**Were the strengths and limitations of the body of evidence clearly described?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
10.	**Were the methods used for formulating the recommendations clearly described?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
11.	**Were the health benefits, side effects, and risks considered in formulating recommendations?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
12.	**Was there an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
13.	**Was the guideline externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
14.	**Was a procedure for updating the guideline provided?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Clarity and Presentation

15.	**Were the recommendations specific and unambiguous?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
16.	**Were the different options for management of the condition or health issue clearly presented?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
17.	**Were key recommendations easily identifiable?**	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Applicability

18.	Did the guideline describe facilitators and barriers to its application?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
19.	Did the guideline provide advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
20.	Were the potential resource implications of applying the recommendations considered?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
21.	Did the guideline present monitoring and/or auditing criteria?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

Editorial Independence

22.	Was the content of the guideline free from any influence of views of the funding body?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
23.	Were competing interests of guideline development group members recorded and addressed?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
24.	Would you include this guideline in development of a care recommendation?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

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

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 Guideline** [**5a**]
☐ **Lesser Quality Guideline** [**5b**]

☐ **Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable**

Table of Evidence Levels																				
	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN																				
DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	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 Epidemiology Case Series	Quality Improvement	Mixed Methods Study	Decision Analysis Economic Analysis Computer Simulation	Guidelines	Case Reports N-of-1 Study	Bench Study	Published Expert Opinion	Local Consensus Published Abstracts
All Domains	1a 1b											4a 4b		2/3/4 a/b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5

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

Development for this appraisal form is based on:
1. The AGREE Collaboration. Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation (AGREE) Instrument. www.agreecollaboration.org
2. 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
3. Fineout-Overholt, E. and L. Johnston (2005). "Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions." Worldviews Evid Based Nurs 2(3): 157-60.
4. 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.
5. 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.