

LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study Etiology, Risk Factors, Prevalence, Incidence Systematic Review / Meta-Analysis

Project/Topic of your Clinical Question:										
Rev	viewer:	Today's Date: Fi								
	ticle Title:									
Yea	ar: 	First Author: Jo								
Do	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:									
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										
VA	ALIDITY: ARE THE RESULTS OF THE S	ystematic Review / Meta–Analysis Va	LID OR CREDIBLE?							
1.	Did the overview address a focused Comments:	d clinical question?	Yes No Unknown							
2.	 Was the search for relevant studies Was it unlikely that importate Comments: 	s detailed and exhaustive? int, relevant studies were missed?	Yes No Unknown							
3.	Were the included studies appraise Comments:	ed and assigned a high level of quality?	Yes No Unknown							
4.	 bullets below? Did the overview describe the course of disease? Were the participants sufficient factors of interest (e.g., demo 	the study populations at a well-defined cliently similar (homogeneous) with respect graphic, exposure, risk, treatment, or etiology)?	Yes No Unknown							
5.	Comments:		Yes No Unknown							



LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study Etiology, Risk Factors, Prevalence, Incidence Systematic Review / Meta-Analysis

RE	LIABILITY: Are these Valid Study Results Important?								
6.	 Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate? Were the statistical analysis methods clearly described? If subgroups were evaluated, was a statistical adjustment made for the differences? Comments: 								
7. What are the main results of the study? (e.g., Helpful data: Page #, Table #, Figures, Graphs)									
	• For an Etiology Study: How strong is the association/correlation between exposure and outcome?								
	• For a Prevalence or Incidence Study: What is the rate? (e.g., number per population [prevalence] or number per population per year or other time period [incidence])								
	 What were the measures of statistical uncertainty (e.g., precision)? (Were the results presented with Confidence Intervals or Standard Deviations?) 								
8.	Were the results statistically significant? Comments: Yes No Unknown								
9.	Were the results clinically significant? Comments: Yes No Unknown								
AP	PLICABILITY: Can I Apply these Valid, Important Study Results to Treating my Patients?								
10.	 Can the results be applied to my population of interest? Do the exposures or outcomes apply to my population or question of interest? Were the participants or populations in this study similar to my population of interest? Comments: 								
11.	Are my patient's and family's values and preferences satisfied by the knowledge gained from this study (such as outcomes considered)? Comments: Yes No Unknown								



LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study Etiology, Risk Factors, Prevalence, Incidence **Systematic Review / Meta-Analysis**

Guide

5a

5b

5a

5b

5a

5b

5a

5b

5a 5a

5b

5a 5a

5b

5a

5b

5b

5b

5a

5b

5

5

5a

5b

5a

5b

5a

5b

	uld you include this Comments:	stud	y/art	icle ii	n deve	lopme	ent of	f a ca	re recon	mmend	ation?	□ Y	es 🗌] No		Unknown
Additio	NAL COMMENTS OR (Concl	USIOI	NS (" 7	Гаке-Н	Іоме Б	POINT	·s"):								
QUALIT	Y LEVEL / EVIDENC	CE LEV	VEL													
 Consider each "No" answer and the degree to which this land appropriate box to assign the level of quality for this study. Consider an "Unknown" answer to one or more questions available in the article. THE EVIDENCE LEVEL IS: 							dy/art	Goo Less	ar limitat od Qualit ser Quali	ion to a		<i>"No,"</i> eview	if the l			
	Table of Evidence Levels															
	TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN															
	DOMAIN OF	tematic Review ta–Analysis	+:	+	ort Prospective	ort etrospective	e – Control	ss – Sectional	criptive Study demiology e Series	ed Methods Study	ision Analysis nomic Analysis nputer Simulation	delines	e Reports f-1 Study	ich Study	lished Expert Opinion	al Consensus ilished Abstracts

3b RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; CCT = Controlled Clinical Trial

3a

4a

4b

Development for this appraisal form is based on:

CLINICAL QUESTION

Etiology /

Incidence

Prevalence

Risk Factors

1. Guyatt, G.; Rennie, D.; Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group.; and American Medical Association.: Users' guides to the medical literature: a manual for evidencebased clinical practice. Users' guides to the medical literature: a manual for evidence-based clinical practice: "JAMA & archives journals." Chicago, IL, 2002

4a

4b

3a

3b

Epide

4a

4b

4a

4b

4a

4b

2/3/4

a/b

- 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.

2a

2b

1a

1b

1a

1b

1a

1b

3a

3b

3a

3b

2a

2b

4a

4b

3a

3b