|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Evidence level and quality rating:** |  |
| Article title: | Number: |
| Author(s): | Publication date: |
| Journal: |
| Setting: | Sample (composition and size): |
| Does this evidence address my EBP question?YesNo- *Do not proceed with appraisal of this evidence* |

|  |
| --- |
| * **Clinical Practice Guidelines LEVEL IV**

Systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel* **Consensus or Position Statement LEVEL IV**

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 |
| * 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 stated?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Have potential biases been eliminated?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Are recommendations clear?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question |
| **Complete the corresponding quality rating section.**  |

|  |
| --- |
| * **Literature review LEVEL V**

Summary of selected published literature including scientific and nonscientific such as reports of organizational experience and opinions of experts* **Integrative review LEVEL V**

Summary of research evidence and theoretical literature; analyzes, compares themes, notes gaps in the selected literature |
| * Is subject matter to be reviewed clearly stated?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Is literature relevant and up-to-date (most sources are within the past five years or classic)?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Of the literature reviewed, is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions across the articles included in the review?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Are gaps in the literature identified?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Are recommendations made for future practice or study?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question |
| **Complete the corresponding quality rating section.** |

|  |
| --- |
| * **Expert opinion LEVEL V**

Opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise |
| * Has the individual published or presented on the topic?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Is the author’s opinion based on scientific evidence?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Is the author’s opinion clearly stated?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| * Are potential biases acknowledged?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |
| Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question |
| **Complete the corresponding quality rating section.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Organizational Experience*** Quality improvement LEVEL V

Cyclical method to examine workflows, processes, or systems with a specific organization* Financial evaluation LEVEL V

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 LEVEL V

Systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program; can involve both quaNtitative and quaLitative methods |
| Setting: | Sample Size/Composition: |
| * Was the aim of the project clearly stated?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |  |
| * Was the method fully described?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |  |
| * Were process or outcome measures identified?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |  |
| * Were results fully described?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |  |
| * Was interpretation clear and appropriate?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 |  |
| * Are components of cost/benefit or cost effectiveness analysis described?
 | * Yes
 | * No
 | * N/A
 |
| Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question |
| **Complete the corresponding quality rating section.** |

|  |
| --- |
| * **Case report LEVEL V**

In-depth look at a person or group or another social unit |
| * 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
 |
| Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question |
| **Complete the corresponding quality rating.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Community standard, clinician experience, or consumer preference LEVEL V*** **Community standard:** Current practice for comparable settings in the community
* **Clinician experience:** Knowledge gained through practice experience
* **Consumer preference:** Knowledge gained through life experience
 |
| Information Source(s) | Number of Sources |
| * 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
 |
| Findings That Help You Answer the EBP Question |
| **Complete the corresponding quality rating section.** |

|  |
| --- |
| Quality Rating for Clinical Practice Guidelines, Consensus, or Position Statements **(Level IV)** |
| **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 or major flaw**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. |
| Quality Rating for Organizational Experience **(Level V)** |
| **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 or major flaws**Unclear or missing aims and objectives; inconsistent results; poorly defined quality; improvement/financial analysis method; recommendations cannot be made. |
| Quality Rating for Case Report, Integrative Review, Literature Review, Expert Opinion, Community Standard, Clinician Experience, Consumer Preference **(Level V)** |
| **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 logical argument for opinions.**C Low quality or major flaws**Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn. |