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

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

Comments:

VALIDITY:  ARE THE RESULTS OF THE COHORT STUDY VALID OR CREDIBLE?

1. Were data collected prospectively?  
Comments:  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

2. Was the study sample representative of patients with the disease in question?  
Comments:  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

3. Were all participants at the same well-defined point in the course of the disease?  
Comments:  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

4. At the start of the study, were the participants similar with respect to known prognostic factors (e.g., demographic and clinical variables)?  
Comments:  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

• Were the patients sufficiently homogeneous with respect to prognostic risk?  
Comments:

5. Were all potentially important prognostic factors assessed?  
Comments:  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

When reading the bolded questions, consider the bulleted questions to help answer the main question.

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

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
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6. Were the outcomes quantifiable and precisely measurable? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Were instruments used to measure the outcomes valid and reliable?
   - Was the assessment of the outcome made independent of knowledge of prognostic factors?
   Comments:

7. Were participants followed long enough for outcomes to occur? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
   - Was the follow-up process clearly described?
   - Was the follow-up process complete?
   Comments:

8. 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:

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

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

10. 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:

11. Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate? □ Yes □ No □ Unknown
    - Were the statistical analysis methods clearly described?
    - If subgroups in the sample had different prognostic factors (e.g., demographics, disease specifics, comorbidity), was an adjustment made for the differences between groups?
    - Was an adjustment made for changes that occur as the patient ages, if any?
    Comments:
12. What are the main results of the study? (e.g., Helpful data: Page #, Table #, Figures, Graphs)

- How likely are the outcomes over time?
  - Absolute results (e.g., 5 year survival rate) or Relative results (e.g., risk from prognostic factor) or Survival Curves (e.g., cumulative events)

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

13. Were the results statistically significant?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

Comments:

14. 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?**

15. 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:

16. 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:

17. Would you include this study/article in development of a care recommendation?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown

Comments:

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR CONCLUSIONS (“TAKE-HOME POINTS”):**
• 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 [2a]
- □ Lesser Quality Prospective Cohort Study [2b]
- □ Good Quality Retrospective Cohort Study [3a]
- □ Lesser Quality Retrospective Cohort Study [3b]
- □ Not Valid, Reliable, or Applicable

### Table of Evidence Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Clinical Question</th>
<th>Type of Study / Study Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prognosis</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 4b, 2/3/4a/b, 5a, 5b, 5a, 5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Development for this appraisal form is based on: