**Appendix E2**

**Single Study Evidence Appraisal Tool**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section I: Level of Support for Practice Change** |
| Complete the decision tree below to determine the level of support for practice change. |

Is this a report of a single study?

Do not use this tool, use **Appendix D: Appraisal Tool Selection Algorithm** to determine the correct appraisal tool.

YES

NO

Does the evidence report a formal study design?

YES

Did the study team implement an intervention?

Moderate support for decision-making

YES

Was there an explicitly stated and analyzed control group?

NO

YES

\*For definitions of terms in **bold print** see **Appendix F: Evidence Terminology and Considerations Guide**

Strong support for decision-making

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fill in this data collection table after completing the quality assessment below (see Instructions in **Appendix G2: Individual Evidence Summary Tool** for more information) | | | | | | | | |
| Article  Number | Author, date, title | Type of evidence | Population, size, and setting | Intervention | Findings that help answer the EBP question | Measures used | Limitations | Level of support for decision-making |
| Enter # | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text |

Determine if the research is **qualitative** (Section IIA), **quantitative** (Section IIB), or **mixed methods** (Section IIC) and complete the corresponding quality appraisal checklist.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section II: Quality Appraisal** | | | | | | |
| Complete the checklist below for the corresponding type of evidence. | | | | | | |
| **Section IIA: Qualitative Evidence** | | | | | | |
|  | | Yes | No | | Unclear | N/A |
| **Introduction/Background** | | | | | | |
| 1. Is a logical background and rationale for the study explained using **current** literature? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the purpose/objective of the study clear? | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Methods** | | | | | | |
| 1. Is the **study design** and guiding theory or model provided with the reason it was chosen? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the **study setting** clearly described (including location, dates, and other important details) to enhance **transferability**? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the process for recruiting participants (**sampling**) explained clearly and does it match with the study aim(s)? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Do **eligibility** criteria (rules for who can join the study) make sense and are they easy to understand? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the **sample size** adequate, as shown by reaching data **saturation?** | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are important characteristics of the group they studied (**sample)** provided (e.g. how many participants or encounters were involved, demographics, or other details about the participants or things being studied)? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Did the authors address **reflexivity** (how their background or experience might have affected the study)? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are the **data collection** methods clear and appropriate (this includes how they gathered and recorded the information)? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are **data processing** methods clear and appropriate (this includes how the data was transcribed and checked) to enhance **credibility**? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are the methods to **analyze** the data well explained (this includes what computer programs they used and how they coded the data to find patterns or themes) to enhance **confirmability**? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are the **intervention**(s) clearly described? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is there information on the **ethical review** provided? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. In addition to the items above, did the authors answer all of your questions about how they conducted their study [include notes about additional concerns]? | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Results/Findings** | | | | | | |
| 1. Do the findings make sense and are they easy to understand? | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | | Yes | No | | Unclear | N/A |
| 1. Are **themes or patterns** identified clearly? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors provide enough quotations, detailed observations, or other proof to support their findings? | |  |  | |  |  |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | |
| 1. Does the discussion match what is reported in the results section? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors examine what they found and compare it to other literature on the topic? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are **limitations** included with an explanation of how they were handled? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors provide implications of their study for practice and future investigation? | |  |  | |  |  |
| **General** | | | | | | |
| 1. Is all the information in the paper **congruent** (consistent throughout the aims, methods, results, and discussion sections)? | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are funding and **conflicts of interest** addressed? | |  |  | |  |  |
| Consider all of your responses above. Do you think the quality of this article is adequate to provide dependable information to answer your EBP question? | | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | | |
| **Section IIB: Quantitative Evidence** | | | | | | |
|  | Yes | | No | | Unclear | N/A |
| **Introduction/Background** | | | | | | |
| 1. Is a logical background and rationale for the study explained using **current** literature? |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the purpose/objective of the study clear? |  | |  | |  |  |
| **Methods** | | | | | | |
| 1. Is the **study design** clearly stated? |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the **study setting** clearly described (including location, dates, and other important details) to enhance **generalizability**? |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the process for recruiting participants (**sampling**) explained clearly and does it match with the study aim(s)? |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. Do **eligibility** criteria (rules for who can join the study) make sense and are they easy to understand? |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. Is the **sample size** **powered** adequately (a calculation or other explanation for how the authors decided how many participants or observations to include)? |  | |  | |  |  |
|  | Yes | | No | | Unclear | N/A |
| 1. Did the authors clearly state what they wanted to measure? |  | |  | |  |  |
| 1. Are the **data collection** methods clear and appropriate (this includes how they gathered and recorded the information)? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If applicable, were all the tools **reliable**? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If applicable, were all the tools **valid**? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the methods to analyze the data well explained (this includes what computer programs they used, how they made calculations or anything else they did to explore the data)? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If applicable, are the intervention(s) clearly described? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If there was **randomization,** |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. Was true **randomization** used to put people in the **control** and **intervention** groups? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. Other than the intervention being studied, were the **intervention** and **control** groups treated similarly? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there information on the **ethical review** provided? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. In addition to the items above, did the authors answer all of your questions about how they conducted their study [include notes about additional concerns]? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. **Results/Findings** |  | | |  |  |  |
| Do the findings make sense and are they easy to understand? | | | | | | |
| 1. Are characteristics of the participants provided (this may include demographics or other important details about the participants or things being studied)? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If applicable, was the survey **response rate** provided? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If applicable, are **attrition** rates provided (this includes how many people remained with the study at each stage)? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. Is data provided for each item the authors stated they wanted to measure? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. If applicable, are the baseline characteristics of the **intervention** and **control** groups similar? |  | | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are any statistics shown clearly? |  | | |  |  |  |
|  |  | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Does the discussion match what is reported in the results section? | |  | | |  | |  | | |  |
| 1. Do the authors examine what they found and compare it to other literature on the topic? | |  | | |  | |  | | |  |
| 1. Are **limitations** included with an explanation of how they were handled? | |  | | |  | |  | | |  |
| 1. Do the authors provide implications of their study for practice and future investigation? | |  | | |  | |  | | |  |
|  | Yes | | No | | | Unclear | | N/A | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Is all the information in the paper **congruent** (consistent throughout the aims, methods, results, and discussion sections)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Are funding and **conflicts of interest** addressed? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| Consider all of your responses above. Do you think the quality of this article is adequate to provide dependable information to answer your EBP question? | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | | | | | | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Section IIC: Mixed Methods Evidence** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Yes | | | No | | Unclear | | | N/A | | |
| **Background/Introduction** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Is a logical background and rationale for the review explained using **current** literature? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Is the purpose/objective of the study clear? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| **Methods** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Is the **study design** and mixed methods approachclearly stated with an explanation of why it was chosen? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Is the **study setting** clearly described (including location, dates, and other important details) to enhance **generalizability?** |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Is the process for recruiting participants (**sampling**) explained clearly and does it match with the study aim(s)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Do **eligibility** criteria (rules for who can join the study) make sense and are they easy to understand? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Is the **sample size** adequate… |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. For the qualitative portion (this includes evidence of data saturation)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. For the quantitative portion (this includes adequate **power,** a calculation, or other explanation for how the authors decided how many participants or observations to include)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Did the authors clearly state what they wanted to measure or describe? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Did the authors address **reflexivity** (how their background or experience might have affected the study)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. If applicable, are the **intervention**(s) clearly described? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Are the **data collection** methods clear and appropriate (this includes how they gathered and recorded the information)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
|  | Yes | | | No | | Unclear | | | N/A | | |
| 1. If applicable, were all the tools **reliable**? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. If applicable, were all the tools **valid**? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. In the qualitative section, are data processing methods clear and appropriate (this includes how the data was transcribed and checked) to enhance **credibility**? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Are the methods to **analyze** the data well explained… |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. For the qualitative section (this includes coding and generation of themes)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. For the quantitative section (this includes what computer programs they used, how they made calculations, or anything else they did to explore the data)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. If there was **randomization,** |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Was true **randomization** used to put people in the **control** and **intervention** groups? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Other than the intervention being studied, were the **intervention** and **control** groups treated similarly? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Do the authors truly use and integrate both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to collect and analyze data? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Is there information on the **ethical review** provided? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. In addition to the items above, did the authors answer all of your questions about how they conducted their study? [include notes about additional concerns] |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| **Results** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Do the **findings** make sense and are they easy to understand? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Are characteristics of the participants provided (this may include demographics or other important details about the participants or things being studied)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. If applicable, was the survey **response rate** provided? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. If applicable, are **attrition** rates provided (this includes how many people remained with the study at each stage)? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Is data provided for each item the authors stated they wanted to measure or describe? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. In the qualitative section, do the authors provide enough quotations, detailed observations, or other proof to support their findings? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. In the quantitative section, are statistics shown clearly? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. If applicable, are the baseline characteristics of the **intervention** and **control** groups similar? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |
| 1. Are any statistics shown clearly? |  | | |  | |  | | |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
| **Discussion** | | | | |
| 1. Does the discussion match what is reported in the results section? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors fully integrate the qualitative and quantitative data to create a deeper understanding? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors examine what they found and compare it to other literature on the topic? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are **limitations** included with an explanation of how they were handled? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors provide implications of their study for practice and future investigation? |  |  |  |  |
| **General** | | | | |
| 1. Is all the information in the paper **congruent** (consistent throughout the aims, methods, results, and discussion sections)? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are funding and **conflicts of interest** addressed? |  |  |  |  |
| Consider all of your responses above. Do you think the quality of this article is adequate to provide dependable information to answer your EBP question? | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | |