

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

Meaning, KAB (Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs)

Qualitative 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 qualitative 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](#).

General Questions

1. Was a qualitative design clearly 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. Was the design 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. Was the setting clearly identified for the area of study being studied?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unknown

- Was the setting appropriate for the area of study being studied?

7. Was the context of the participants analyzed using the words of the participants?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unknown

Comments on Study Validity:

Evaluation Criteria for Qualitative Studies

Credibility

Are the findings credible?

9. Was the researcher known and trusted by the participants?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unknown

- How was trust developed among the participants?

- How long was the researcher in the environment of the participants prior to collecting data?

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

Meaning, KAB (Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs)

Qualitative Study

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 of data discussed and reached? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
- If yes, what was the sample size (number of participants)?
 - If no, were there at least 10 participants ($N \geq 10$)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
 - Was the sample size justified in the discussion? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Recurrent Patterning

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

13. Was the data analysis method identified? ☐ 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 similar groups and contexts? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
- What is applicable to my patient population?

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 Qualitative Study [2a]
- ☐ Lesser Quality Qualitative Study [2b]
- ☐ Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study

Meaning, KAB (Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs)

Qualitative Study

Table of Evidence Levels								
DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN							
	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

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 Park, 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.