

# 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
<b>Article Summary Information</b>		
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:		
<b>Article Appraisal Workflow</b>		
Level	<b>Is this evidence:</b>	<b>This is...</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> A <b>clinical practice guideline</b> or a <b>consensus/position statement</b> ?	<b>Level IV</b> evidence, go to <a href="#">Section I: Level IV Appraisal</a> to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> A <b>literature review</b> or <b>integrative review</b> ?	<b>Level V</b> evidence, go to <a href="#">Section II, A: Level V Appraisal</a> to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> An <b>expert opinion</b> ?	<b>Level V</b> evidence, go to <a href="#">Section II, B: Level V Appraisal</a> to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Case report</b> ?	<b>Level V</b> evidence, go to <a href="#">Section II, C: Level V Appraisal</a> to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> An <b>organizational experience</b> (including <b>quality improvement</b> , <b>financial</b> or <b>program evaluations</b> )?	<b>Level V</b> evidence, go to <a href="#">Section II, D: Level V Appraisal</a> to determine quality
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Community standard</b> , <b>clinician experience</b> , or <b>consumer preference</b> ?	<b>Level V</b> evidence, go to <a href="#">Section II, E: Level V Appraisal</a> 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:

**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

# 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
<b>Additionally, for Integrative Reviews only:</b>		
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:

#### **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)

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?	<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:		
	<p><b>A High quality:</b> Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.</p> <p><b>B Good quality:</b> Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides a logical argument for opinions.</p> <p><b>C Low quality:</b> Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.</p>		
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)

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?	<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
	Circle the appropriate quality rating below:		
	<p><b>A High quality:</b> Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.</p> <p><b>B Good quality:</b> Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides a logical argument for opinions.</p> <p><b>C Low quality:</b> Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.</p>		
	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:			
<b>A High quality:</b> 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>B Good quality:</b> 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.				
<b>C Low quality:</b> 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:

Quality	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
	Circle the appropriate quality rating below:			
	<p><b>A High quality:</b> Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.</p> <p><b>B Good quality:</b> Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides a logical argument for opinions.</p> <p><b>C Low quality:</b> Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.</p>			
	Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page 1			