LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study
Meaning, KAB (Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs)
Meta-Synthesis

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:

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.

General Questions

1.	**Were qualitative designs identified?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

- What were the qualitative designs? *(Check all that apply.)*
  - ☐ Ethnography   ☐ Focus Group
  - ☐ Grounded Theory   ☐ Narrative
  - ☐ Phenomenology   ☐ Other*:

  * Case studies and descriptive studies with open ended questions provide qualitative information, but are not qualitative studies. Terms defined in EBDM Glossary

2.	**Was the area of study clearly stated in one sentence?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
3.	**Were the designs appropriate to explore the area of study being studied?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
4.	**Was a guiding framework identified?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
5.	**Was the guiding framework appropriate for the area of study being evaluated?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
6.	**Were participants selected in accordance with the needs of the study?** *(i.e., purposeful sampling)*	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
7.	**Were the settings clearly identified for the area of study being studied?** • Were the settings appropriate for the area of study being studied?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
8.	**Were the contexts of the participants analyzed using the words of the participants in all included studies?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

Comments on Study Validity:

Evaluation Criteria for Qualitative Studies

Credibility   *Are the findings credible?*

9.	**Was the credibility of included studies reported?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

Confirmability   *Are the Findings verified within the context?*

10.	**Did the researchers report how findings** *(themes)* **were confirmed?**	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

- How were findings confirmed? *(Check all that apply.)*
  - ☐ Participants   ☐ Reflections with Participants throughout Study
  - ☐ Experts   ☐ Use of Field Notes

Meaning In Context   *Are the Findings reported within the context of the area of study?*

11.	Did the researchers discuss the essence *(meaning)* of the findings *(themes)* within the socio-cultural context?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

- Were the findings reported in terms of the context:
  - ☐ of the participants
  - ☐ of the culture / group
  - ☐ of the environment

Saturation   *Was the data collected until there was no new information coming forth?*

12.	Was saturation discussed and reached in the included studies?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

Recurrent Patterning   *Is there consistency in repeated patterns, themes, & acts over time?*

13.	Were the data analysis methods identified in the included studies?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
14.	Were the themes reported in terms of the theoretical framework?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

- Were the themes supported by the raw data?
- Did the raw data fall into patterns?
- Were patterns reported as themes?

Transferability   *Are the findings transferable?*

15.	Was this information gained from the study applicable to my patient population?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown

Comments on Evaluation Criteria:

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 Meta-Synthesis**   [**1a**]
- ☐ **Lesser Quality Meta-Synthesis**   [**1b**]
- ☐ **Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable**

Table of Evidence Levels								
	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN							
DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	Meta–Synthesis	Qualitative Study	Mixed Methods Study	Guidelines	Case Reports N-of-1 Study	Bench Study	Published Expert Opinion	Local Consensus Published Abstracts
Meaning / KAB⁺	1a 1b	2a 2b	2/3/4 a/b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5a 5b	5

⁺ *KAB = Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs*

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study
Meaning, KAB (Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs)

Meta-Synthesis

Development for these appraisal forms are 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. 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.
5. 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.
6. Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs,* 2(3): 157-60, 2005.
7. 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.
8. Denzen, N. & Lincoln. Y. (2005). The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.
9. Freshwater, D. (2004). Deconstructing Evidence Based Practice, Routledge: New York: New York.
10. Guba, Y. & Lincoln, E. (1989). Fourth Generation Evaluation, Sage Publications: Newbury Part, California.
11. Leininger, M (1991). Culture care diversity and universality: A theory of Nursing, National League for Nursing Press: New York
12. Leininger, M. & McFarland, M. (2006). 2nd Ed. Culture care diversity and universality: A worldwide nursing theory. Jones & Bartlett Publishers: Sudbury, Mass.
13. Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, California.
14. Morse, J., Swanson, J., & Kuzal, A. (2001). The Nature of Qualitative Evidence, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.