

Appendix G1

Best Evidence Summary Tool



Purpose: This tool collates information from pre-appraised evidence identified in the best evidence search and other data obtained from a targeted search. It brings all the data into a central document to help the EBP team with the next step of the EBP process, synthesis.

Section I: Pre-Appraised Evidence

Complete the data collection tool below for all included pre-appraised evidence.

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

Section II: Reports of Single Studies from the Targeted Evidence Search

Was there additional evidence identified in the targeted search?

☐ No → Skip to Section II of Appendix H

☐ Yes → Record information from evidence that provides strong or moderate support for decision-making in the table below.

Article number	Reviewer names	Author, date, and title	Type of evidence	Population, size, and setting	Intervention	Findings that help answer the EBP question	Measures used	Limitations	Moderate, or strong support for decision-making

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

Complete Section II of Appendix H									

Instructions for the Best Evidence Summary Tool

Section I: Pre-Appraised Evidence						
Record information from the pre-appraised evidence.						
Article number	Author (organization), date, title	Type of pre-appraised evidence	Topic or Intervention	Population	Setting	Recommendations that answer the EBP question
<i>Assign a unique number to each resource included in the table. This will help with tracking in subsequent steps</i>	<i>Record the name of the organization or authors who produced the evidence. Also include the title and date.</i>	<i>Record the type of pre-appraised evidence. This should be a Clinical Practice Guideline (CPG), literature review with a systematic approach (LRS), or evidence summary</i>	<i>Record the specific topic or intervention addressed in the pre-appraised evidence. This may be exactly the same as the topic or intervention the team identified in their EBP question, or may be broader and encompass an answer to the EBP team's question.</i>	<i>Record the population(s) the pre-appraised evidence addresses</i>	<i>Record the setting(s) the pre-appraised evidence applies to</i>	<i>List recommendations from the evidence that directly answer the EBP question. These should be considered the "take-away" points from the evidence that help the team better understand solutions to their given problem. When the pre-appraised evidence is broader than the team's scope, only record recommendations that apply to the question at hand.</i>

Section II: Reports of Single Studies from the Targeted Evidence Search									
Record information from the targeted search evidence.									
Article number	Reviewer names	Author, date, and title	Type of evidence	Population, size, and setting	Intervention	Findings that help answer the EBP question	Measures used	Limitations	Moderate, or strong support for decision-making?
<i>Assign a unique number to</i>	<i>Record the names of</i>	<i>Record the last name of the first</i>	<i>Indicate the type of evidence</i>	<i>Provide a quick review of the population,</i>	<i>Record the intervention(s) implemented</i>	<i>List findings, or results, from the article that directly answer the EBP</i>	<i>These are the measures and/or</i>	<i>Provide the limitations of the evidence, both as</i>	<i>Record the type of support for decision-making.</i>

Johns Hopkins Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines

<i>each resource included in the table. This will help with tracking in subsequent steps.</i>	<i>the team members who read the article. This is needed for any follow-up questions and to ensure everyone has complete d their assigned readings.</i>	<i>author of the article, the publication /communication date, and the title. This will help track articles throughout the literature search, screening, and review process. It is also helpful when someone has authored more than one publication included in the review.</i>	<i>provided in this source. This should be descriptive of the study or project design. Consider using descriptors from the word bank below.</i>	<i>number of participants, and study location. Location can include the state and country, and additional descriptors such as urban, rural, community-based, etc. Consider how the population, size, and setting relate to your EBP question. This may inform the level of detail you choose to record here.</i>	<i>or discussed in the article. This should relate to the intervention or comparison elements of your EBP question. Some studies, such as observational studies, may not have an intervention. However, you can record the focus of the study team’s query. Restating the intervention from your EBP question, as the “Intervention” in the summary table, is not useful. Additional details are required.</i>	<i>question. These should be succinct statements that provide enough information that the reader does not need to return to the original article. Avoid directly copying and pasting from the article. These should be considered the “take-away” points from the evidence that help the team better understand solutions to their given problem.</i>	<i>instruments (e.g., satisfaction surveys, patient interviews, focus groups, validated tools, subscales, biometric data, clinical data) the authors used to determine the answer to the research question or the effectiveness of their intervention. These are not the results of what was measured but rather the tool or approach to quantify or qualify the metric(s) of interest.</i>	<i>listed by the authors as well as your assessment of any flaws or drawbacks. Consider not only how well the study or project was implemented, but also how well it was reported. Limitations should be apparent from the team’s appraisal checklists. Keep in mind, some limitations are inherent to the type of evidence and don’t necessarily negate its findings (e.g., lack of control in an observational study).</i>	
---	---	---	---	--	--	---	---	--	--

Word bank for type of evidence:

No individual study will use a term from each column. Within each grouping, select only one term.

Methodology	Design	Timing
Quantitative Qualitative Mixed-Methods	Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) Quasi-experimental Interventional Observational (non-experimental) Descriptive Correlational	Prospective Retrospective Cross-Sectional Longitudinal