### Project/Topic of your Clinical Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Today’s Date</th>
<th>Final Evidence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Author</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do the aim/purpose/objectives assist in answering your clinical question?  
- Aim/Purpose/Objectives:  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  - [ ] Unknown

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](http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBDMHelp.htm)

Unfamiliar terms can be found in the LEGEND Glossary: [http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBCFiles/GLOSSARY-EBDM.pdf](http://groups/ce/NewEBC/EBCFiles/GLOSSARY-EBDM.pdf)

---

**BASIC ELEMENTS OF AN EXPERT OPINION / REVIEW ARTICLE**

1. **Is the author a known expert in the field being studied?**  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown
   - What are the author’s credentials?  
   - Comments:

2. **Does the author have a known bias?**  
   - Comments:  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown

3. **Is the patient population, problem, or issue clearly described?**  
   - Comments:  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown

4. **Is the literature search clearly described?**  
   - Comments:  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown

5. **Is the date range of the cited literature appropriate and current?**  
   - Comments:  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown

6. **What types of research are cited (e.g., animal model, basic science, clinical studies)?**  
   - Comments:  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown

7. **Is more than one point of view explained, reported, or referenced?**  
   - Comments:  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No  
   - [ ] Unknown
8. Were any conclusions clearly presented in the article?  
   - If applicable, were any adverse events clearly described?  
     Comments:  
     ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

9. Was there freedom from conflict of interest?  
   - Sponsor/Funding Agency or Authors  
     Comments:  
     ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

**APPLICABILITY: CAN I APPLY THIS EXPERT OPINION / GENERAL REVIEW INFORMATION?**

10. Can the results be applied to my population of interest?  
    - Is the setting described in the article applicable to my population of interest?  
    - Do the patient outcomes apply to my population or question of interest?  
    - Were the patients in this article similar to my population of interest?  
     Comments:  
     ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

11. Are my patient’s and family’s values and preferences satisfied by the knowledge  
    gained from this article (such as outcomes considered)?  
     Comments:  
     ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

12. Would you include this article in development of a care recommendation?  
     Comments:  
     ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

**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 Expert Opinion / General Review [5a]
- [ ] Lesser Quality Expert Opinion / General Review [5b]
- [ ] Not Applicable

---

**Table of Evidence Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN</th>
<th>All Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Review</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT[1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT[2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometric Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort – Prospective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort – Retrospective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case – Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Longitudinal Study (Before/After, Time Series) | 4a
| Cross – Sectional            | 4b          |
| Descriptive Study            |             |
| Epidemiology                 |             |
| Quality Improvement (PSA)    |             |
| Case Series                  |             |
| Mixed Methods Study          |             |
| Decision Analysis            |             |
| Economic Analysis            |             |
| Computer Simulation          |             |
| Guidelines                   |             |
| Case Reports                 |             |
| N-of-1 Study                 |             |
| Benchmark Study              |             |
| Published Expert Opinion     |             |
| Published Abstracts          |             |
| Local Consensus              |             |

* RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; CCT = Controlled Clinical Trial

---

Development for this appraisal form is based on:
5. Local Consensus