

LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY

– GUIDELINE –

PROJECT / TOPIC OF YOUR CLINICAL QUESTION: _____

Reviewer: _____ **Today's Date (mm/dd/yy):** _____ **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: _____

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>

SCOPE AND PURPOSE

1. Were the overall objective(s) of the recommendation specifically described? Yes No Unknown

Comments:

2. Were the health question(s) covered by the recommendation specifically described? Yes No Unknown

Comments:

3. Was the population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the recommendation is meant to apply specifically described? Yes No Unknown

Comments:

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

4. Did the guideline development group include individuals from all the relevant professional groups? Yes No Unknown

Comments:

5. Were the views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) sought? Yes No Unknown

Comments:

6. Were the target user(s) of the guideline clearly defined? Yes No Unknown

Comments:

LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY

– GUIDELINE –

RIGOR OF DEVELOPMENT

7. Were systematic methods used to search for evidence? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
8. Were the criteria for selecting the evidence clearly described? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
9. Were the strengths and limitations of the body of evidence clearly described? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
10. Were the methods used for formulating the recommendations clearly described? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
11. Were the health benefits, side effects, and risks been considered in formulating recommendations? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
12. Was there an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
13. Was the guideline been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
14. Was a procedure for updating the guideline provided? Yes No Unknown
Comments:

CLARITY AND PRESENTATION

15. Were the recommendations specific and unambiguous? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
16. Were the different options for management of the condition or health issue clearly presented? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
17. Were key recommendations easily identifiable? Yes No Unknown
Comments:

APPLICABILITY

18. Did the guideline describe facilitators and barriers to its application? Yes No Unknown
Comments:

LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY

– GUIDELINE –

19. Did the guideline provide advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
20. Were the potential resource implications of applying the recommendations considered? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
21. Did the guideline present monitoring and/or auditing criteria? Yes No Unknown
Comments:

EDITORIAL INDEPENDENCE

22. Was the content of the guideline free from any influence of views of the funding body? Yes No Unknown
Comments:
23. Were competing interests of guideline development group members recorded and addressed? Yes No Unknown
Comments:

24. Would you include this guideline in development of a care recommendation? Yes No Unknown
Comments:

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 Guideline** (5a)
 Lesser Quality Guideline (5b)
 Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable

TABLE OF EVIDENCE LEVELS	
DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN
	Expert Opinion / Case Reports
Guidelines	5a
	5b

Development of this form is based on:

1. The AGREE Collaboration. Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation (AGREE) Instrument. www.agreecollaboration.org
2. Guyatt, G., D. Rennie, et al. (2002). *Users' guides to the medical literature: a manual for evidence-based clinical practice*. Chicago, IL, AMA Press.
3. 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>.
4. Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs*, 2(3): 157-60, 2005.

Copyright (C) 2006-2011 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center; all rights reserved. [March 7, 2011]
Anderson Center for Health Systems Excellence / Center for Professional Excellence / Edward L. Pratt Research Library
Evidence-Based Decision Making – <http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBDMAppForms.htm>