Cincinnati Children's

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

Project/Topic of your Clinical Question: _____

Reviewer: _____ **Today's Date:** _____ **Final Evidence Level:** _____

Article Title: _____

Year: _____ **First Author:** _____ **Journal:** _____

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

- Study Purpose/Objective:
- Inclusion Criteria:
- Exclusion Criteria:

Is a qualitative study congruent with the author's study purpose above? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Comments:

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: http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBDMHelp.htm
Unfamiliar terms can be found in the LEGEND Glossary: http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBCFiles/GLOSSARY-EBDM.pdf

General Questions

1. **Was a qualitative design clearly identified?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
   - What was the qualitative design?
     - ☐ Ethnography
     - ☐ Grounded Theory
     - ☐ Phenomenology
     - ☐ Focus Group
     - ☐ Narrative
     - ☐ Other*:

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

   Comments:

2. **Is the area of study** *(domain of inquiry)* **clearly stated in one sentence?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

   Comments:

3. **Was the design appropriate to explore the domain of inquiry being studied?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

   Comments:

4. **Was the theoretical framework identified?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

   Comments:

Copyright © 2006-2012 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center; all rights reserved.

5. **Was the theoretical framework appropriate for the domain of inquiry being studied?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
   Comments:

6. **Was the setting clearly identified for the domain of inquiry being studied?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
   - Was the setting appropriate for the domain of inquiry being studied?

   Comments:

7. **Was the context of the participants analyzed using the words of the participants?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
   Comments:

Evaluation Criteria for Qualitative Studies

Credibility: Are the Findings Credible?

8. **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?

   Comments:

Confirmability: Are the Findings verified within the context?

9. **Did the researcher report how findings** *(themes)* **were confirmed?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
   - How were themes confirmed?
     - ☐ Key Participants
     - ☐ General Participants
     - ☐ Reflections with Participants throughout Study
     - ☐ Use of Field Notes

   Comments:

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

10. **Does the researcher discuss the findings** *(themes)* **within a socio-cultural context?** ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
    - Were the findings reported in terms of the context:
      - ☐ of the participants
      - ☐ of the culture / subculture
      - ☐ of the environment

    Comments:

Copyright © 2006-2012 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center; all rights reserved.

SATURATION: WAS THE DATA COLLECTED UNTIL THERE WAS NO NEW INFORMATION COMING FORTH?

11. 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≥10)*? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
- Was the sample size justified in the discussion? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Comments:

RECURRENT PATTERNING: IS THERE CONSISTENCY IN REPEATED PATTERNS, THEMES, & ACTS OVER TIME?

12. Was the data analysis method identified? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Unknown**

Comments:

13. Were the themes reported in terms of the theoretical framework? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Unknown**

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

Comments:

TRANSFERABILITY: ARE THE FINDINGS TRANSFERABLE?

14. Is this information gained from the study applicable to similar groups and contexts? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Unknown**

Comments:

- What is applicable to my patient population?

Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR CONCLUSIONS ("TAKE-HOME POINTS"):

Copyright © 2006-2012 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center; all rights reserved.

QUALITY LEVEL / EVIDENCE LEVEL

- *Consider each "No" answer and the degree to which this limitation is a threat to the rigor 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 Applicable or Credible**

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

Copyright © 2006-2012 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center; all rights reserved.