

Appendix E3**Anecdotal Evidence Appraisal Tool**

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?
								<i>Limited</i>

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

Section I: Quality Appraisal

Complete the checklist below for the corresponding sub-type of evidence. Note, that the headers within each checklist are used for organization and may not match the exact language from the article or report being appraised.

Expert Opinion, Position Statements, and Book Chapters

	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
Author(s) expertise				
1. Does the author(s) know about the topic of interest as evidenced by previous publications on the topic, relevant professional or academic affiliations , related education/training, or other activities that suggest their expertise ?				
Purpose/objectives				
1. Is the purpose/objective(s) clearly stated?				
Reference to evidence				
1. Is there a thorough reference to current literature on the topic?				
2. Do the author(s) provide meaningful analysis (through insights or commentary) of existing evidence on the topic?				
Summary/conclusions				
1. Is it clear and logical how the authors reached their conclusion(s)?				
2. Are recommendations clear?				

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
General				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes → <i>Include, complete data collection table on page 1</i>			
	<input type="checkbox"/> No → <i>Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking</i>			
Case Report				
	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
Introduction				
1. Is there a short introduction to the case, including why it is relevant or important?				
Patient information				
1. Is patient-level data provided to address the clinical focus of the case study (this can include patient history, clinical findings, diagnosis, or timeline)?				
2. Is there a thorough explanation of diagnostic and/or therapeutic intervention(s)?				
3. Did the patient or caregiver provide informed consent?				
Discussion				
1. Is their meaningful interpretation of the patient information (see above)?				
2. Are “lessons learned” clearly stated and based on the provided patient information?				
3. Is there an insightful discussion of the case presentation regarding relevant medical literature?				
General				
1. Are funding and conflicts of interest addressed?				
2. Is the information provided in a logical manner that is easy to follow?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes → <i>Include, complete data collection table on page 1</i>			
	<input type="checkbox"/> No → <i>Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking</i>			

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

Programmatic Experiences				
	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
Introduction				
1. Is there a short introduction to the project, including why it is relevant or important?				
2. Is the purpose/objective of the project clear?				
Project Information				
1. Is there adequate information regarding the context of the project, including the setting and people involved?				
2. Is what the project team did (interventions) clearly described?				
3. Was a tool, model, or framework used to plan and implement the project?				
4. Are the findings or impact of the project provided?				
Discussion				
1. Does the author(s) provide insights into the project's successes and areas for improvement?				
2. Are "lessons learned" clearly stated?				
3. Is the project discussed in the context of currently available information on the intervention or problem it was addressing?				
General				
1. Are funding and conflicts of interest addressed?				
2. Are you able to follow what the group did to implement and measure the success of the project?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes → Include, complete data collection table on page 1			
	<input type="checkbox"/> No → Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking			

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

Reviews with an Unsystematic Approach (e.g. Scoping, Critical, Literature Reviews)				
	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
Background/Introduction				
1. Is a logical background and rationale for the review explained using current literature?				
2. Is the review question clear?				
Methods				
1. Did the review follow a model or guideline?				
2. Do the authors clearly state what they are trying to measure or describe?				
3. Do the authors explain how they selected the articles included in their review?				
Results				
1. Are findings from the included articles presented clearly?				
Discussion				
1. Does the discussion match what is reported in the results section?				
2. Is it clear how the authors arrived at their conclusions?				
General				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes → <i>Include, complete data collection table on page 1</i>			
	<input type="checkbox"/> No → <i>Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking</i>			