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:

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

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

**VALIDITY:** ARE THE RESULTS OF THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW / META-ANALYSIS VALID OR CREDIBLE?

1. Did the overview address a focused clinical question?  
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown
   Comments: ____________________________

2. Was the search for relevant studies detailed and exhaustive?  
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown
   - Was it unlikely that important, relevant studies were missed?
   Comments: ____________________________

3. Were the included studies appraised and assigned a high level of quality?  
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown
   Comments: ____________________________

4. Were the methods consistent or homogeneous from study to study, such as the bullets below?  
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown
   - Did the overview describe the study populations at a well-defined point in the course of disease?
   - Were the patients sufficiently homogeneous with respect to prognostic risk?
   - Were objective and unbiased outcome criteria used?
   - Was the follow-up sufficiently complete?
   Comments: ____________________________
5. Were the outcomes quantifiable and precisely measurable?  
   - Was the outcome assessed independent of knowledge of prognostic factors?  
     Comments:

6. Was there freedom from conflict of interest?  
   - Sponsor/Funding Agency or Investigators  
     Comments:

RELIABILITY: ARE THESE VALID STUDY RESULTS IMPORTANT?

7. Were the statistical analysis methods appropriate?  
   - 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:

8. 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?)  

9. Were the results statistically significant?  
   Comments:

10. Were the results clinically significant?  
    Comments:
**APPLICABILITY:** CAN I APPLY THESE VALID, IMPORTANT STUDY RESULTS TO TREATING MY PATIENTS?

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

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

13. Would you include this study/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 Systematic Review [1a]  
☐ Lesser Quality Systematic Review [1b]  
☐ 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Review</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Prospective Cohort</td>
<td>Case-Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Sectional Study</td>
<td>Descriptive Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Series Case Control</td>
<td>2/3/4 a/b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Methods Study</td>
<td>Decision Analysis / Economic Analysis / Computer Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Series</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Consensus / Published Abstracts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Development for this appraisal form is based on: