### Project/Topic of your Clinical Question:

**Reviewer:**
**Today’s Date:**
**Final Evidence Level:**

**Article Title:**
**Year:**
**First Author:**
**Journal:**

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:

Is a cross-sectional study congruent with the author’s study aim/purpose/objectives above?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Unknown

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: [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)

### VALIDITY: ARE THE RESULTS OF THE CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY VALID OR CREDIBLE?

1. **Were the study methods appropriate for the question?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Unknown

   - Were the study methods clearly described *(e.g., setting, sample population)*?
   - Were the instruments clearly described?
   - Were the data collected at one point in time?

   Comments:

2. **Were instruments used to measure the outcomes valid and reliable?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Unknown

   - Were the instruments tested to be valid and reliable?

   Comments:

3. **Were all appropriate variables *(e.g., potential confounders, exposures, predictors)* and interventions clearly described?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Unknown

   Comments:

4. **Were all appropriate outcomes clearly described?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Unknown

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

6. Was there freedom from conflict of interest?
   - Sponsor/Funding Agency or Investigators
   Comments:
   [☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown]

RELIABILITY: ARE THESE VALID STUDY RESULTS IMPORTANT?

7. Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate?
   - Were the statistical analysis methods clearly described?
   Comments:
   [☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown]

8. Did the study have a sufficiently large sample size?
   - 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 6-12 participants)?
   Comments:
   [☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown]

9. What are the main results of the study? (e.g., Helpful data: Page #, Table #, Figures, Graphs)
   - What is the effect size? (How large was the treatment effect?)
   - What were the measures of statistical uncertainty (e.g., precision)?
     (Were the results presented with Confidence Intervals or Standard Deviations?)

10. Were the results statistically significant?
    Comments:
    [☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown]

11. Were the results clinically significant?
    - If potential confounders were identified, were they discussed in relationship to the results?
    Comments:
    [☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown]
12. Were adverse events assessed?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
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 treatment feasible in my care setting?  
- Do the patient outcomes apply to my population or question of interest?  
- Are the likely benefits worth the potential harm and costs?  
- 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 treatment and its consequences?  
☐ 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”):**
### 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 Cross-Sectional Study
- Lesser Quality Cross-Sectional Study
- Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable

### Table of Evidence Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Clinical Question</th>
<th>Systematic Review</th>
<th>Meta-Analysis</th>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>CCT</th>
<th>Qualitative Study</th>
<th>Cohort – Prospective</th>
<th>Cohort – Retrospective</th>
<th>Case – Control</th>
<th>Longitudinal (Series/Time Series)</th>
<th>Cross – Sectional</th>
<th>Descriptive Study</th>
<th>Epidemiology</th>
<th>Case Series</th>
<th>Quality Improvement (QTS)</th>
<th>Mixed Methods Study</th>
<th>Decision Analysis</th>
<th>Economic Analysis</th>
<th>Computer Simulation</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Case Reports</th>
<th>N-of-1 Study</th>
<th>Bench Study</th>
<th>Published Expert Opinion</th>
<th>Local Consensus</th>
<th>Published Abstracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>2/3/4a/b</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Development for this appraisal form is based on: