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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Purpose/Objective:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion Criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Is a qualitative study congruent with the author's study purpose above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

## GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. **Was a qualitative design clearly identified?**
   - What was the qualitative design?
     - [ ] Ethnography
     - [ ] Grounded Theory
     - [ ] Phenomenology
     - [ ] Focus Group
     - [ ] Narrative
     - [ ] Other*:

   *Case studies and descriptive studies with open ended questions provide qualitative information, but are not qualitative studies.

   Terms defined in EBP Glossary.

   Comments:

2. **Is the area of study clearly stated in one sentence?**

   Comments:

3. **Was the design appropriate to explore the area of study being studied?**

   Comments:

4. **Was the guiding framework identified?**

   Comments:
5. Was the guiding framework appropriate for the area of study being evaluated?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown
   Comments:

6. Was the setting clearly identified for the area of study being studied?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown
   Comments:

   • Was the setting appropriate for the area of study being studied?

7. Was the context of the participants analyzed using the words of the participants?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown
   Comments:

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR QUALITATIVE STUDIES

CREDIBILITY: ARE THE FINDINGS CREDIBLE?

8. Was the researcher known and trusted by the participants?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown
   Comments:

   • How was trust developed among the participants?
   • How long was the researcher in the environment of the participants prior to collecting data?

CONFIRMABILITY: ARE THE FINDINGS VERIFIED WITHIN THE CONTEXT?

9. Did the researcher report how findings (themes) were confirmed?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown
   Comments:

   • How were themes confirmed?
     □ Participants
     □ Experts
     □ Reflections with Participants throughout Study
     □ Use of Field Notes

MEANING IN CONTEXT: ARE THE FINDINGS REPORTED WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE AREA OF STUDY?

10. Does the researcher discuss the findings (themes) within a socio-cultural context?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Unknown
    Comments:

    • Were the findings reported in terms of the context:
      □ of the participants
      □ of the culture / group
      □ of the environment
### Saturation: Was the data collected until there was no new information coming forth?

11. Was saturation of data discussed and reached?
   - If yes, what was the sample size *(number of participants)*? __________
   - If no, were there at least 10 participants *(N>10)*?  
     - Yes  No  Unknown
   - Was the sample size justified in the discussion?  
     - Yes  No  Unknown

   Comments:

### Recurrent Patterning: Is there consistency in repeated patterns, themes, & acts over time?

12. Was the data analysis method identified?  
   Comments:  

   - Yes  No  Unknown

13. Were the themes reported in terms of the theoretical framework?
   - Were the themes supported by raw data?  
     - Yes  No  Unknown
   - Did the raw data fall into patterns?  
     - Yes  No  Unknown
   - Were patterns reported as themes?  
     - Yes  No  Unknown

   Comments:

### Transferability: Are the findings transferable?

14. Is this information gained from the study applicable to similar groups and contexts?  
   Comments:

   - What is applicable to my patient population?  
   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 rigor 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 Qualitative Study [2a]
- [ ] Lesser Quality Qualitative Study [2b]
- [ ] Not Applicable or Credible

Table of Evidence Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STUDY / STUDY DESIGN</th>
<th>Meta-Synthesis</th>
<th>Qualitative Study</th>
<th>Mixed Methods Study</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Case Reports</th>
<th>N=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>DOMAIN OF CLINICAL QUESTION</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2/3/4</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning / KAB*: 1a 1b 2a 2b 2/3/4 a/b 5a 5b 5a 5b 5a 5b 5a 5b

* KAB = Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs

Development for this appraisal form is based on: