

Appendix E1**Pre-Appraised Evidence Appraisal**

Fill in this data collection table after completing the suitability and quality assessments below.

Article number	Author, date, title	Type of pre-appraised evidence	Topic or intervention	Population	Setting	Recommendations that answer the EBP question

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

Section I: Suitability

Only complete this section if you are using this evidence as potential independent support for decision-making. **If you gathered this evidence in an exhaustive search, this offers strong support for decision-making, skip to Section II: Quality Appraisal.**

	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
Is the topic or intervention the same or similar to the topic of interest?				
Is the population the same or similar to your population of interest?				
Is the setting the same or similar to your setting of interest?				
If applicable, are the outcomes the same or similar to your outcomes of interest?				
How recent are the references? (<i>provide date</i>)				
Are the references recent enough to be reasonably applied to the practice setting? (this will depend on the intervention and changing nature of the topic at hand)				

Notes:

*For independent support for decision-making, all responses must be YES. If the topic, population, setting, or outcome is similar, but not the same, include in the notes section the team's rationale for how the provided information can be reasonably compared to the elements in the team's EBP question. **If suitable, complete the corresponding quality assessment below.**

If the evidence is not fully suitable, but it informs the EBP question, complete the appraisal below. If the quality is adequate, this is **strong support** for decision-making. Record the information on Appendix G2: The Individual Evidence Summary Tool.

Section II: Quality Appraisal				
Complete the checklist below for the corresponding sub-type of evidence.				
Evidence Summary (point-of-care clinical decision support produced by a reputable organization)				
	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
1. Was the summary produced by a reputable organization?				
2. Does the organization use a clear, systematic, and comprehensive method for selecting evidence?**				
3. Does the organization use a clear, well-established process for evaluating evidence (e.g., rapid review protocol, systematic review)?**				
4. Is the review question or summary topic clearly stated?				
5. Are the details of the included evidence provided (including types of studies, intervention(s), settings, populations, and grading)?				
6. Is there a direct and obvious link between recommendations and the provided evidence?				
7. Are recommendations clear and complete (including a level of certainty/confidence)?				
8. Does the level of certainty/confidence of each of the recommendations align with the evidence used to support them?				
9. Did the review undergo an independent peer review?				
10. Are funding and conflicts of interest addressed?				
** This may be directly provided or available on the organization's website.				
Consider all of your responses above. Do you think the quality of this article is adequate to provide independent support for decision-making?		☐ Yes → Include, complete data collection table on page 1		
		☐ No → Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking		
Clinical Practice Guidelines				
	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
1. Is the review group made up of experts who have proven expertise or skills related to the topic?				
2. Is the target population of the recommendations clear?				
3. Is the process for making the recommendations provided (e.g., evidence review, reaching consensus)?				
4. Are recommendations clear and complete (including a level of certainty/confidence)?				

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
5. Was there an external, peer review of the guidelines?				
6. Does the level of certainty/confidence of each of the recommendations align with the evidence used to support them?				
7. Are funding and conflicts of interest addressed?				
Complete the checklist below to determine the quality of the literature review used to generate the guidelines.				
Literature Reviews with a Systematic Approach (LRSAs)				
	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 (e.g. PRISMA , AMSTAR II , etc.)?				
2. Do the authors clearly state what they are trying to measure or describe?				
3. Was the literature search thorough and could it be replicated (this includes providing keywords, inclusion/exclusion criteria , and at least 2 formal databases searched)?				
4. Was there an independent double-check system in the review process (this includes an independent assessment for eligibility , critical appraisal, and data extraction by at least 2 reviewers for each article)?				
5. Was the quality of each included study formally assessed and listed?				
6. Was the risk of introducing bias into the literature selection and review process addressed and minimized?				
7. If applicable, were data pooling (meta-analysis or meta-synthesis) methods clear and appropriate?				
8. In addition to the items above, did the authors answer all of your questions about how they conducted their review [include notes about additional concerns]?				
Results				
1. Was there a flow diagram that included the number of studies eliminated at each stage of the review?				
2. Were details of included studies provided (e.g. design , sample , methods, results, outcomes, limitations , the strength of evidence)?				
3. If applicable, are themes identified?				
4. If applicable, are statistics shown clearly?				

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A
Discussion				
1. Does the discussion match what is reported in the results section?				
2. Do the authors examine what they found and compare it to other literature on the topic?				
3. Are limitations included with an explanation of how they were handled?				
4. 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)?				
2. Are funding and conflicts (s) of interest addressed?				
Consider all of your responses above. Do you think the quality of this article is adequate to provide independent support for decision-making?	☐ Yes → <i>Include, complete data collection table on page 1</i>			
	☐ No → <i>Exclude, set aside, and note exclusion for tracking</i>			