Do the study aim/purpose/objectives and inclusion/exclusion criteria assist in answering your clinical question?  

- Study Aim/Purpose/Objectives: 
  - Inclusion Criteria: 
  - Exclusion Criteria:

Is a cohort study congruent with the author’s study aim/purpose/objectives above?  

Comments:

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
Unfamiliar terms can be found in the LEGEND Glossary.

VALIDITY: ARE THE RESULTS OF THE COHORT STUDY VALID?

1. At the start of the study, were the participants similar (homogeneous) with respect to known factors of interest (e.g., demographic, exposure, risk, treatment, or etiology)?  

Comments:

2. Were treatments/exposures and clinical outcomes measured in the same way in each group?  

Comments:

3. Was the assessment of outcomes objective or blinded to factors of interest?  

Comments:

4. Were participants followed long enough for outcomes to occur?  

- Was the follow-up process clearly described?  
- Was the follow-up process complete?  

Comments:
5. If the study addresses causation, was there a plausible association between exposure and outcome? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Does the association make biological sense?
   - Is it clear that the exposure preceded the onset of the outcome?
   - Was the amount of exposure associated with the severity of outcome (i.e., dose-response)?
   - Was re-exposure associated with the outcome (i.e., challenge or dechallenge–rechallenge)?
   Comments:

6. Were all participants accounted for at the conclusion of the study? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Were withdrawals from the study explained?
   - Was the rate of attrition acceptable?
   Comments:

7. Was there freedom from conflict of interest? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Sponsor/Funding Agency or Investigators
   Comments:

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

8. Did the study have a sufficiently large sample size? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Was a power analysis described?
   - Did the sample size achieve or exceed that resulting from the power analysis?
   - Did each subgroup also have sufficient sample size (e.g., at least 6 to 12 participants)?
   Comments:

9. Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Were the statistical analysis methods clearly described?
   - If subgroups were evaluated, was a statistical adjustment made for the differences?
   Comments:

10. 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 between exposure and outcome?
      (What is the correlation or estimate of risk?)
• **For an Incidence Study**: What is the rate?
  (e.g., number per population per year or other time period)

• What were the measures of statistical uncertainty *(e.g., precision)*?
  *(Were the results presented with Confidence Intervals or Standard Deviations?)*

11. **Were the results statistically significant?**
   □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   
   *Note: This question may not be applicable in all incidence studies.*

   **Comments:**

12. **Were the results clinically significant?**
   □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   
   • If potential confounders were identified, were they discussed in relationship to the results?

   **Comments:**

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

13. **Can the results be applied to my population of interest?**
   □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   
   • Is the setting of the study applicable to my population of interest?
   • Do the patient outcomes apply to my population or question of interest?
   • Were the patients in this study similar to my population of interest?

   **Comments:**

14. **Are my patient’s and family’s values and preferences satisfied by the knowledge gained from this study *(such as outcomes considered)*?**
   □ Yes □ No □ Unknown

   **Comments:**

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

   **Comments:**

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR CONCLUSIONS (“TAKE-HOME POINTS”):**
LEGEND: Evidence Appraisal of a Single Study
Etiology, Risk Factors, Incidence
Cohort Study – Prospective or Retrospective

**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 Prospective Cohort Study:**
  - [3a] [2a]

- **Lesser Quality Prospective Cohort Study:**
  - [3b] [2b]

- **Good Quality Retrospective Cohort Study:**
  - [4a] [3b]

- **Lesser Quality Retrospective Cohort Study:**
  - [4b] [3b]

- **Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Evidence Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Study / Study Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systematic Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Etiology / Risk Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incidence</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Development for this appraisal form is based on: