

**LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY**  
**– PROGNOSIS: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW / META-ANALYSIS –**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

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>

**VALIDITY: ARE THE RESULTS OF THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW / META-ANALYSIS VALID OR CREDIBLE?**

**1. Did the overview address a focused clinical question?**  Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

**2. Was the search for relevant studies detailed and exhaustive?**  Yes  No  Unknown

• Was it *unlikely* that important, relevant studies were missed?

*Comments:*

**3. Was the quality of the included studies appraised?**  Yes  No  Unknown

*Comments:*

**4. Were the methods consistent or homogeneous from study to study (such as bullets below)?**  Yes  No  Unknown

• Did the overview describe the study populations at a well-defined point in the course of disease?

• Were the patients sufficiently homogeneous with respect to prognostic risk?

• Were objective and unbiased outcome criteria used?

• Was the follow-up sufficiently complete?

*Comments:*

**5. Was there freedom from conflict of interest?**  Yes  No  Unknown

• Sponsor/Funding Agency or Investigators

*Comments:*

**LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY**  
**– PROGNOSIS: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW / META-ANALYSIS –**

**RELIABILITY: ARE THESE VALID STUDY RESULTS IMPORTANT?**

**6. Were the outcomes quantifiable and precisely measurable?**  Yes  No  Unknown

- Was the outcome assessed independent of knowledge of prognostic factors?

Comments:

**7. Does the prognosis change as the patient ages?**  Yes  No  Unknown

- How likely are the outcomes over time? (*Survival curves?*)

Comments:

**8. What are the main results of the systematic review/meta-analysis? (e.g., Helpful data: Page/Table #, Figures, Graphs)**

**9. Were the results statistically significant?**  Yes  No  Unknown

Comments:

**10. Were the results clinically significant?**  Yes  No  Unknown

Comments:

**APPLICABILITY: CAN I APPLY THESE VALID, IMPORTANT STUDY RESULTS TO TREATING MY PATIENTS?**

**11. Can the results be applied to my population of interest?**  Yes  No  Unknown

- Were all important outcomes considered? (*Are substitute endpoints valid?*)
- Were the patients in this study similar to my population of interest?

Comments:

**12. Are your patient's values and preferences satisfied by the knowledge gained from this study (such as outcomes considered)?**  Yes  No  Unknown

Comments:

**13. Would you include this study/article in development of a recommendation?**  Yes  No  Unknown

Comments:

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR CONCLUSIONS (“TAKE-HOME POINTS”):** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**LEGEND: EVIDENCE APPRAISAL OF A SINGLE STUDY**  
**– PROGNOSIS: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW / META–ANALYSIS –**

**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 Systematic Review** (1a)  
 **Lesser Quality Systematic Review** (1b)  
 **Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable**

<b>TABLE OF EVIDENCE LEVELS</b>						
<b>DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION</b>	<b>TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN</b>					
	<b>Systematic Review Meta–Analysis</b>	<b>Cohort – Prospective</b>	<b>Cohort – Retrospective</b>	<b>Case – Control</b>	<b>Epidemiology Descriptive Case Series</b>	<b>Expert Opinion Case Reports</b>
<b>Prognosis</b>	<b>1a 1b</b>	<b>2a 2b</b>	<b>3a 3b</b>	<b>4a 4b</b>	<b>4a 4b</b>	<b>5</b>

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. 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.