

# LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

## All Domains

### Mixed Methods Study (Qualitative & Quantitative)



Reviewer:

Today's Date:

Final Evidence Level:

Project/Topic of your Clinical Question:

Article Title:

Year:

First Author:

Journal:

Do the study aim/purpose/objectives and inclusion/exclusion criteria assist in answering your clinical question?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

• Study Aim/Purpose/Objectives:

• Inclusion Criteria:

• Exclusion Criteria:

Is a mixed methods study congruent with the author's study purpose above?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

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](#).

## Validity

*Are the results of the Qualitative and Quantitative Studies valid?*

1. Were two different methods or approaches used in the study?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Core Component:

Supplemental Component:

☐ Qualitative

☐ Qualitative

☐ Quantitative

☐ Quantitative

2. Complete the appropriate Evidence Appraisal Forms for each component (e.g., RCT, Descriptive, Qualitative Study).

3. If applicable, was (were) the **qualitative** components of the study well-developed (i.e., [a] not [b]), based on appraisal using the Meaning/KAB – Qualitative Study Evidence Appraisal Form?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

- Evidence Level(s):

4. If applicable, was (were) the **quantitative** components of the study well-developed (i.e., [a] not [b]), based on appraisal using the appropriate Evidence Appraisal Form for that study design?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

- Evidence Level(s):

Comments on Validity:

## Reliability

*Are these valid study results important?*

5. Were the two components used to inform each other for joined, comprehensive results or discussion?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

**Note:** A mixed methods study includes combined data analysis or separate analysis with merged discussion. Separate analysis and separate discussion would not qualify as a "mixed methods" study.

6. What were the main mixed results of the study? (e.g., Helpful data: Page #, Table #, Figures, Graphs)

7. Were the mixed results significant?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Comments on Reliability:

## LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

### All Domains

### Mixed Methods Study (Qualitative & Quantitative)

#### Applicability

Can I apply these valid, important study results to my patients?

8. Can the results be applied to my population of interest? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
- Is the setting of the study applicable to my population of interest?
  - Do patient exposures, experiences, and outcomes apply to my population or question of interest?
  - Were the patients in this study similar to my population of interest?
9. Are my patient's and family's values and preferences satisfied by the knowledge gained from this study? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
10. Would you include this study/article in development of a recommendation? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Comments on Applicability:

#### Additional 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 Core Component determines the number of the Evidence Level [2, 3, 4].
- In order to assign an Evidence Level with an [a] for the mixed methods appraisal, at least 1 of the components must be assigned an Evidence Level with an [a].
- Consider overall how well the mixed methods study was done, when assigning the final level.

The Evidence Level is:

Good Quality Mixed Methods Study  
Lesser Quality Mixed Methods Study  
☐ Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable

☐ 2a ☐ 3a ☐ 4a  
☐ 2b ☐ 3b ☐ 4b

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 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

# LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

## All Domains

## Mixed Methods Study (Qualitative & Quantitative)



Development for this appraisal form is based on:

1. Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.
2. Freshwater, D. (2004). *Deconstructing Evidence Based Practice*, Routledge: New York: New York.
3. Guba, Y. & Lincoln, E. (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, California.
4. Leininger, M (1991). *Culture care diversity and universality: A theory of Nursing*, National League for Nursing Press: New York
5. Leininger, M. & McFarland, M. (2006). 2nd Ed. *Culture care diversity and universality: A worldwide nursing theory*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers: Sudbury, Mass.
6. Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, California.
7. Morse, J., Swanson, J., & Kuzal, A. (2001). *The Nature of Qualitative Evidence*, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.
8. Morse, J. M. & Niehaus, L. (2009). *Mixed Method Design: Principles and Procedures*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press Inc.
9. Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
10. Creswell, J., and Tashakkori, A.: Developing Publishable Mixed Methods Manuscripts. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2): 107-111, 2007. Sudbury, Mass.
11. Lowe, J.: Clear as mud: results and the use of mixed methods. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 34(4): 344-5, 2010.
12. Palinkas, L. A.; Aarons, G. A.; Horwitz, S.; Chamberlain, P.; Hurlburt, M.; and Landsverk, J.: Mixed method designs in implementation research. *Administration & Policy in Mental Health*, 38(1): 44-53, 2011.
13. 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
14. Melnyk, B. M. and E. Fineout-Overholt (2005). *Evidence-based practice in nursing & healthcare : a guide to best practice*. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
15. Lohr, K. N. and T. S. Carey (1999). "Assessing "best evidence": issues in grading the quality of studies for systematic reviews." *Joint Commission Journal on Quality Improvement* 25(9): 470-9.
16. Jerosch-Herold, C. (2005). "An evidence-based approach to choosing outcome measures: a checklist for the critical appraisal of validity, reliability and responsiveness studies." *British Journal of Occupational Therapy* 68(8): 347-53.
17. 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>.
18. Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs*, 2(3): 157-60, 2005.
19. 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.