**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? |
| Enter # | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | Enter text | *Limited* |
| \*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? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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)? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are recommendations clear? |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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? | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **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)? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there a thorough explanation of diagnostic and/or therapeutic intervention(s)? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did the patient or caregiver provide informed consent? |  |  |  |  |
| **Discussion** | | | | |
| 1. Is their meaningful interpretation of the patient information (see above)? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are “lessons learned” clearly stated and based on the provided patient information? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there an insightful discussion of the case presentation regarding relevant medical literature? |  |  |  |  |
| **General** | | | | |
| 1. Are funding and **conflicts of interest** addressed? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programmatic Experiences** | | | | |
|  | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
| **Introduction** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there a short introduction to the project, including why it is relevant or important? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is what the project team did (interventions) clearly described? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Was a tool, model, or framework used to plan and implement the project? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are “lessons learned” clearly stated? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the review question clear? |  |  |  |  |
| **Methods** | | | | |
| 1. Did the review follow a model or guideline? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do the authors clearly state what they are trying to measure or describe? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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? | Yes  *Include, complete data collection table on page 1* | | | |
| No  *Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking* | | | |