

Evidence level and quality rating:		_____
Article title:	Number:	
Author(s):	Publication date:	
Journal:		
Setting:	Sample (composition and size):	
Does this evidence address my EBP question?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No Do not proceed with appraisal of this evidence.

Clinical Practice Guidelines LEVEL IV

Systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel

Consensus or Position Statement LEVEL IV

Systematically developed recommendations, based on research and nationally recognized expert opinion, that guide members of a professional organization in decision-making for an issue of concern

▪ Are the types of evidence included identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
▪ Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of recommendations?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
▪ Are groups to which recommendations apply and do not apply clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
▪ Have potential biases been eliminated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
▪ Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
▪ Are recommendations clear?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Complete the corresponding quality rating section.

<input type="checkbox"/> Literature review LEVEL V Summary of selected published literature including scientific and nonscientific such as reports of organizational experience and opinions of experts		
<input type="checkbox"/> Integrative review LEVEL V Summary of research evidence and theoretical literature; analyzes, compares themes, notes gaps in the selected literature		
■ Is subject matter to be reviewed clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Is literature relevant and up-to-date (most sources are within the past five years or classic)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Of the literature reviewed, is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions across the articles included in the review?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Are gaps in the literature identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Are recommendations made for future practice or study?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Complete the corresponding quality rating.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Expert opinion LEVEL V Opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise		
■ Has the individual published or presented on the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Is the author's opinion based on scientific evidence?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Is the author's opinion clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
■ Are potential biases acknowledged?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Complete the corresponding quality rating.		
Organizational Experience		
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality improvement LEVEL V Cyclical method to examine workflows, processes, or systems with a specific organization		
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial evaluation LEVEL V Economic evaluation that applies analytic techniques to identify, measure, and compare the cost and outcomes of two or more alternative programs or interventions		
<input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation LEVEL V Systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program; can involve both quantitative and qualitative methods		

Setting	Sample Composition/Size		
▪ Was the aim of the project clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Was the method fully described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Were process or outcome measures identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Were results fully described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Was interpretation clear and appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Are components of cost/benefit or cost effectiveness analysis described?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Complete the corresponding quality rating.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Case report LEVEL V			
In-depth look at a person or group or another social unit			
▪ Is the purpose of the case report clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Is the case report clearly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Complete the corresponding quality rating.			
Community standard, clinician experience, or consumer preference LEVEL V			
<input type="checkbox"/> Community standard: Current practice for comparable settings in the community			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clinician experience: Knowledge gained through practice experience			
<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer preference: Knowledge gained through life experience			
Information Source(s)	Number of Sources		
▪ Source of information has credible experience.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
▪ Opinions are clearly stated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
▪ Evidence obtained is consistent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Findings that help you answer the EBP question:			

Quality Rating for Clinical Practice Guidelines, Consensus, or Position Statements (Level IV)

A. High quality

Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, or private organization or a government agency; documentation of a systematic literature search strategy; consistent results with sufficient numbers of well-designed studies; criteria-based evaluation of overall scientific strength and quality of included studies and definitive conclusions; national expertise clearly evident; developed or revised within the past five years.

B. Good quality

Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, or private organization or a government agency; reasonably thorough and appropriate systematic literature search strategy; reasonably consistent results, sufficient numbers of well-designed studies; evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies with fairly definitive conclusions; national expertise clearly evident; developed or revised within the past five years.

C. Low quality or major flaw

Material not sponsored by an official organization or agency; undefined, poorly defined, or limited literature search strategy; no evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies; insufficient evidence with inconsistent results; conclusions cannot be drawn; not revised within the past five years.

Quality Rating for Organizational Experience (Level V)

A. High quality

Clear aims and objectives; consistent results across multiple settings; formal quality improvement or financial evaluation methods used; definitive conclusions; consistent recommendations with thorough reference to scientific evidence.

B. Good quality

Clear aims and objectives; formal quality improvement or financial evaluation methods used; consistent results in a single setting; reasonably consistent recommendations with some reference to scientific evidence.

C. Low quality or major flaws

Unclear or missing aims and objectives; inconsistent results; poorly defined quality; improvement/financial analysis method; recommendations cannot be made.

Quality Rating for Case Report, Integrative Review, Literature Review, Expert Opinion, Community Standard, Clinician Experience, Consumer Preference (Level V)

A. High quality

Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.

B. Good quality

Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides logical argument for opinions.

C. Low quality or major flaws

Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.