|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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?  Yes  No- *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. |