LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study
All Domains Guideline

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:

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:

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 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 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:

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																			
	Systematic Review Meta–Analysis	Meta–Synthesis	RCT[+]	CCT[+]	Psychometric Study	Qualitative Study	Cohort – Prospective	Cohort – Retrospective	Case – Control	Longitudinal (Before/After, Time Series)	Cross – Sectional	Descriptive Study Epidemiology Case Series	Quality Improvement (PDSA)	Mixed Methods Study	Decision Analysis Economic Analysis Computer Simulation	Guidelines	Case Reports N-of-1 Study	Bench Study	Published Expert Opinion	Local Consensus Published Abstracts
All Domains	**1a 1b**											**4a 4b**		**2/3/4 a/b**	**5a 5b**	**5a 5b**	**5a 5b**	**5a 5b**	**5a 5b**	**5**

[+] *RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; CCT = Controlled Clinical Trial*

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. Fineout-Overholt and Johnston: Teaching EBP: asking searchable, answerable clinical questions. Worldviews Evid Based Nurs, 2(3): 157-60, 2005.
4. 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.

