

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool

Appendix F

Does this evidence answer the EBP question?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes → Continue appraisal <input type="checkbox"/> 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...
	<input type="checkbox"/> A clinical practice guideline or a consensus/position statement ?	Level IV evidence, go to Section I: Level IV Appraisal to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> A literature review or integrative review ?	Level V evidence, go to Section II, A: Level V Appraisal to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> An expert opinion ?	Level V evidence, go to Section II, B: Level V Appraisal to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> Case report ?	Level V evidence, go to Section II, C: Level V Appraisal to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> An organizational experience (including quality improvement, financial or program evaluations)?	Level V evidence, go to Section II, D: Level V Appraisal to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> Community standard, clinician experience, or consumer preference ?	Level V evidence, go to Section II, E: Level V Appraisal to determine quality

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

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)

After selecting the type of Level IV evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:

Are the types of evidence included identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of recommendations?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are groups to which recommendations apply and do not apply clearly defined?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are recommendations clear?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Circle the appropriate quality rating below:

Quality	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
----------------	---

Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page 1

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool

Appendix F

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)

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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is literature relevant and up-to-date (most sources are within the past five years or classic)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are gaps in the literature identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are recommendations made for future practice or study?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Additionally, for Integrative Reviews only:		
Was the literature search strategy clearly described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Was the literature appraised for strength and quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Of the literature reviewed, is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions across the articles included in the review?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Circle the appropriate quality rating below:

Quality

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

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Appraisal (continued)

B Select the type of article:

Expert opinion (opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise)

After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:

Quality	Does the author have relevant education and training?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Do they have relevant professional and academic affiliations?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Have they previously been published in the area of interest?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Is there thorough citing of recent literature (within the past 5 years)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Have they been recognized by state, regional, national, or international groups for their expertise?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
	Are their publications well-cited by others?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 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

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

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)

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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the case report clearly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Quality

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

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

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)

After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:

Quality	Was the aim of the project clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Was a formal QI method used for conducting or reporting the project (e.g., PDSA, SQUIRE 2.0)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Was the method fully described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Were process or outcome measures identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Were results fully described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Was the interpretation clear and appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	Are components of cost/benefit or cost-effectiveness data described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> 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

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Appraisal (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:

After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:

Source of information has credible experience	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Opinions are clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Evidence obtained is consistent	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Quality

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