

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study Intervention Case-Control Study

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 case-control study congruent with the author's study aim, purpose, or objectives 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 Case-Control Study valid?

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Were the study methods appropriate for the question? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Were the study methods clearly described (e.g., setting, sample population)?• Were cases and controls matched appropriately for confounders or comorbidities?• Were appropriate numbers of control participants matched to the case participants? | | | |
| 2. Were instruments used to measure the outcomes valid and reliable? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Were the instruments tested to be valid and reliable? | | | |
| 3. Were all appropriate variables (e.g., potential confounders, exposures, predictors) and interventions clearly described? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| 4. Were all appropriate outcomes clearly described? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| 5. Were all participants accounted for at the conclusion of the study? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Were missing data explained? | | | |
| 6. Was there freedom from conflict of interest? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sponsors, Funding Agency, Investigators | | | |

Comments on Study Validity:

Reliability

Are these valid study results important?

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 7. Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Were the statistical analysis methods clearly described? | | | |
| 8. Did the study have a sufficiently large sample size? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Was a power analysis described?• Did the sample size achieve or exceed that resulting from the power analysis?• Did each subgroup also have sufficient sample size (e.g., at least 6 to 12 participants)? | | | |
| 9. What were the main results of the study? (e.g., Helpful data: Page #, Table #, Figures, Graphs) | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What was the effect size? (How large was the treatment effect?)• What were the measures of statistical uncertainty (e.g., precision)?
(Were the results presented with Confidence Intervals or Standard Deviations?) | | | |

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study Intervention Case-Control Study

10. Were the results statistically significant?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
11. Were the results clinically significant? • If potential confounders were identified, were they discussed in relationship to the results?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
12. Were adverse events assessed?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Comments on Study Reliability:

Applicability

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

13. Can the results be applied to my population of interest? • Is the treatment feasible in my care setting? • Do the patient outcomes apply to my population or question of interest? • Are the likely benefits worth the potential harm and costs? • Are the patients in this study similar to my population of interest?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
14. Are my patient's and family's values and preferences satisfied by the treatment and its consequences?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
15. Would you include this study/article in development of a care recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Comments on Study 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 Evidence Level is:

- ☐ Good Quality Case-Control Study [4a]
☐ Lesser Quality Case-Control Study [4b]
☐ Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable

Table of Evidence Levels

DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN																	
	Systematic Review Meta-Analysis	RCT *	CCT *	Qualitative Study	Cohort – Prospective	Cohort – Retrospective	Case – Control	Longitudinal (Before/After, Time Series)	Cross – Sectional	Descriptive Study Epidemiology Case Series	Quality Improvement (PDSA)	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
Intervention Treatment, Therapy, Prevention, Harm, Quality Improvement	1a 1b	2a 2b	3a 3b	4a 4b	3a 3b	4a 4b	4a 4b	4a 4b	4a 4b	4a 4b	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 Intervention Case-Control Study



Development for this appraisal form is based on:

1. 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
2. Melnyk, B. M. and E. Fineout-Overholt (2005). Evidence-based practice in nursing & healthcare : a guide to best practice. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
3. 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.
4. Fineout-Overholt, E. and L. Johnston (2005). "Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions." *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs* 2(3): 157-60.
5. 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.
6. 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>.
7. Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs*, 2(3): 157-60, 2005.
8. 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.