|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Does this evidence answer the EBP question? | Yes  Continue appraisal  No  STOP, do not continue evidence appraisal | |
| **Article Summary Information** | | |
| Article Title: | | |
| Author(s): | | Number: |
| Population, size, and setting: | | Publication date: |
| Complete after appraisal: | | |
| Evidence level and quality rating: | | |
| Study findings that help answer the EBP question: | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Article Appraisal Workflow** | |
| Level | **Is this evidence:** | **This is…** |
| A **clinical practice guideline** or a **consensus/position statement**? | **Level IV** evidence, go to [**Section I: Level IV Appraisal**](#Section_I_Level_IV_Appraisal) to determine quality |
| A **literature review** or **integrative review**? | **Level V** evidence, go to [**Section II, A: Level V Appraisal**](#Section_IIA_Level_V_Appraisal) to determine quality |
| An **expert opinion**? | **Level V** evidence, go to [**Section II, B: Level V Appraisal**](#Section_IIB_Level_V_Appraisal) to determine quality |
| **Case report?** | **Level V** evidence, go to [**Section II, C: Level V Appraisal**](#Section_IIC_Level_V_Appraisal) to determine quality |
| An **organizational experience** (including **quality improvement**, **financial** or **program evaluations**)? | **Level V** evidence, go to [**Section II, D: Level V Appraisal**](#Section_IID_Level_V_Appraisal) to determine quality |
| **Community standard, clinician experience,** or **consumer preference?** | **Level V** evidence, go to [**Section II, E: Level V Appraisal**](#Section_IIE_Level_V_Appraisal) to determine quality |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section I: Level IV Appraisal** | | | | |
| Select the type of Level IV evidence | | | | |
| **Clinical practice guidelines** (systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel)  **Consensus or position statement** (systematically developed recommendations, based on research and nationally recognized expert opinion, that guide members of a professional organization in decision-making for an issue of concern) | | | | |
| Quality | After selecting the type of Level IV evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below: | | |
| Are the types of evidence included identified? | Yes | No |
| Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of recommendations? | Yes | No |
| Are groups to which recommendations apply and do not apply clearly defined? | Yes | No |
| Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated? | Yes | No |
| Are recommendations clear? | Yes | No |
| Circle the appropriate quality rating below: | | |
| **A High quality:** Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, or private organization or a government agency; documentation of a systematic literature search strategy; consistent results with sufficient numbers of well-designed studies; criteria-based evaluation of overall scientific strength and quality of included studies and definitive conclusions; national expertise clearly evident; developed or revised within the past five years.  **B Good quality:** Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, or private organization or a government agency; reasonably thorough and appropriate systematic literature search strategy; reasonably consistent results, sufficient numbers of well-designed studies; evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies with fairly definitive conclusions; national expertise clearly evident; developed or revised within the past five years.  **C Low quality:** Material not sponsored by an official organization or agency; undefined, poorly defined, or limited literature search strategy; no evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies; insufficient evidence with inconsistent results; conclusions cannot be drawn; not revised within the past five years. | | |
| Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section II: Level V Appraisal** | | | | | | |
| A Select the type of article:  **Integrative review** (summary of research evidence and theoretical literature; analyzes, compares themes, notes gaps in the selected literature)  **Literature review** (summary of selected published literature including scientific and nonscientific, such as reports of organizational experience and opinions of experts) | | | | | | |
| Quality | After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below: | | | | |
| Is the purpose of the review clearly stated? | Yes | | No | |
| Is literature relevant and up-to-date (most sources are within the past five years or classic)? | ☐ Yes | | No | |
| Are gaps in the literature identified? | ☐ Yes | | No | |
| Are recommendations made for future practice or study? | Yes | | No | |
| **Additionally, for Integrative Reviews only:** |  | |  | |
| Was the literature search strategy clearly described? | ☐ Yes | | No | |
| Was the literature appraised for strength and quality | Yes | | No | |
| Of the literature reviewed, is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions across  the articles included in the review? | Yes | | No | |
| Circle the appropriate quality rating below: | | | | |
| **Integrative Reviews:**  **A High quality:** Subject matter is clearly defined, literature search strategies are clear and thorough, the authors undertook a meaningful analysis of included evidence, conclusions are clear, gaps and limitations thoroughly addressed  **B Good quality:** Subject matter is defined, literature search strategy reasonably clear with possible gaps, the author undertook a somewhat meaningful analysis of included evidence, fairly clear conclusions, gaps and limitations reasonably addressed  **C Low quality:** Subject matter not clearly defined, literature search strategy lacking transparency or thoroughness, lack of meaningful analysis of included evidence, conclusions cannot be drawn, limitations not addressed  **Literature Reviews:**  **A High quality:** Subject matter is clearly defined, literature is up-to-date, gaps and limitations thoroughly addressed, recommendations for future practice or study are clearly identified  **B Good quality:** Subject matter is defined, literature is mostly up-to-date, gaps and limitations reasonably addressed, recommendations for future practice or study are identified  **C Low quality:** Subject matter not clearly defined, literature is out-of-date, gaps and limitations not addressed, recommendations are not provided | | | | |
| Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1** | | | | | |
| **Section II: Level VAppraisal (continued)** | | | | | | | | |
| B Select the type of article:  **Expert opinion** (opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise) | | | | | | | | |
| Quality | After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below: | | | | | | |
| Does the author have relevant education and training? | | Yes | | No | | |
| Do they have relevant professional and academic affiliations? | | Yes | | No | | |
| Have they previously been published in the area of interest? | | Yes | | No | | |
| Is there thorough citing of recent literature (within the past 5 years)? | | Yes | | No | | |
| Have they been recognized by state, regional, national, or international groups for their expertise? | | Yes | | No | | |
| Are their publications well-cited by others? | | Yes | | No | | |
| \*A web search can provide information about expertise\* | | | | | | |
| Circle the appropriate quality rating below: | | | | | | |
| **A High quality:** Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.  **B Good quality:** Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides a logical argument for opinions.  **C Low quality:** Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn. | | | | | | |
| Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1** | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section II: Level V Appraisal (continued)** | | | | |
| C Select the type of article:  **Case report** (an in-depth look at a person or group or another social unit) | | | | |
| Quality | After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below: | | |
| Is the purpose of the case report clearly stated? | Yes | No |
| Is the case report clearly presented? | Yes | No |
| Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research? | Yes | No |
| Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings? | Yes | No |
| Circle the appropriate quality rating below: | | |
| **A High quality:** Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.  **B Good quality:** Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides a logical argument for opinions.  **C Low quality:** Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn. | | |
| Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section II: Level V Appraisal (continued)** | | | | | |
| D Select the type of article:  **Quality improvement** (cyclical method to examine workflows, processes, or systems within a specific organization)  **Financial evaluation** (economic evaluation that applies analytic techniques to identify, measure, and compare the cost and outcomes of two or more alternative programs or interventions)  **Program evaluation** (systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program; can involve both quaNtitative and quaLitative methods) | | | | | |
| Quality | After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below: | | | |
| Was the aim of the project clearly stated? | Yes | No |  |
| Was a formal QI method used for conducting or reporting the project (e.g., PDSA, SQUIRE 2.0)? | Yes | No |  |
| Was the method fully described? | Yes | No |  |
| Were process or outcome measures identified? | Yes | No |  |
| Were results fully described? | Yes | No |  |
| Was the interpretation clear and appropriate? | Yes | No |  |
| Are components of cost/benefit or cost-effectiveness data described? | Yes | No | N/A |
| Circle the appropriate quality rating below: | | | |
| **A High quality:** Clear aims and objectives; consistent results across multiple settings; formal quality improvement or financial evaluation methods used; definitive conclusions; consistent recommendations with thorough reference to scientific evidence.  **B Good quality:** Clear aims and objectives; formal quality improvement or financial evaluation methods used; consistent results in a single setting; reasonably consistent recommendations with some reference to scientific evidence.  **C Low quality:** Unclear or missing aims and objectives; inconsistent results; poorly defined quality improvement/financial analysis method; recommendations cannot be made. | | | |
| Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1** | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section II: Level VAppraisal (continued)** | | | | | |
| E Select the type of article:  **Community standard** (current practice for comparable settings in the community)  **Clinician experience** (knowledge gained through practice experience from the clinician perspective)  **Consumer preference** (knowledge gained through life experience from the patient's perspective)  Record the sources of information and the number of sources: | | | | | |
| Quality | After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below: | | | |
| Source of information has credible experience | Yes | No | N/A |
| Opinions are clearly stated | Yes | No | N/A |
| Evidence obtained is consistent | Yes | No | N/A |
| Circle the appropriate quality rating below: | | | |
| **A High quality:** Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.  **B Good quality:** Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides a logical argument for opinions.  **C Low quality:** Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn. | | | |
| Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1** | | | | |