RAPID CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW/ META ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE STUDIES

PROIECT DESCRIPTION/LEVEL OF STUDY

	TROJECT DESCRIT TION, BEVE	
Projec	ct title:	Systematic review or meta-analysis of RCTs
Date:		RCT Level II Controlled Trial without Level III
Revie	ewer(s) name(s):	Randomization Case-Control and Cohort Study Level IV
PICO	T Question:	Systematic review or meta-synthesis of descriptive or qualitative studies Descriptive or Qualitative Study, Clinical Practice Guideline Literature Review, QI or EBP Project Expert Opinion Level VII
Article	e citation (APA):	
Indica	ate the level of the study you are appraising:	
Recor	mmendation for article inclusion in the body of evider	nce to answer your question:
	GENERAL DESCRIPTION O	F STUDY
OVERV	/IEW	
1. P	urpose of study, including research question(s) or hy	potheses:
2. D	Design/Method:	
3. S	Sample:	
4. S	Setting:	

Page | 1

QUALITY OF STUDY	
ALIDITY: Are the results of this study valid?	
 Did the systematic review /meta analysis address a focused clinical question? What was the focused clinical question? 	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow
2. Was the search for relevant studies detailed and exhaustive?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow
 3. Did the systematic review/meta analysis include RCTs? • Was criteria used to select articles for inclusion? Yes No • What were the criteria for inclusion? 	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow
 Random assignment to treatment groups? Yes No Analyzed in assigned groups? Yes No Complete follow-up of subjects? Yes No Blind? Yes No Double-blind? Yes No 	
 4. Did the systematic review/meta analysis include non-RCTs? • Was criteria used to select articles for inclusion? ☐ Yes ☐ No • What were the criteria for inclusion? 	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow
 Analyzed in assigned groups? Yes No Complete follow-up of subjects? Yes No Blind? Yes No Double-blind? Yes No 	
5. Were the included studies appraised to be high quality	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow

© Copyright 2013-2018, The Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare. Adapted with permission, from Evidence-based practice in nursing and healthcare. (Appendix B; p. 539-50), by Melnyk, Bernadette Mazurek, and Fineout-Overholt, Ellen. Wolters Kluwer Health, 2015 and with permission, from Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Evidence-based Decision Making Group: LEGEND system, 2006-2013.

Page | 2



	 Were the methods consistent from study to study? Were the populations in the included studies comparable? ☐ Yes ☐ No Were the outcomes, interventions, and exposures measured the same way in the groups being compared in the included studies? ☐ Yes ☐ 	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unkno
	Were the results consistent across the included studies?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unkno
	Was there freedom from conflict of interest? • Sponsor/funding agency • Investigators	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unkno
•	Was the date range of the cited literature current? • What date ranges were included? to o If older literature was included, why was it included?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow
	ABILITY: Are these valid study results important? What were the main results of the systematic review/meta analysis? • For each individual study:	
	 Statistical Significance (p value) Confidence Interval and/or Standard Deviations How precise was the intervention/treatment? Narrow? Wide? Effect size 	
	 For the summary statistic: Statistical significance (z statistic): Were the studies heterogeneous? Yes No Confidence Interval: Effect size: Did it favor the intervention? Yes No 	

by Melnyk, Bernadette Mazurek, and Fineout-Overholt, Ellen. Wolters Kluwer Health, 2015 and with permission, fror Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Evidence-based Decision Making Group: LEGEND system, 2006-2013.

Page | 3



	o Did it favor the control? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	e results clinically significant? Were the following reported: NNT, NNH, OR, RR? ☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknow
•	otential confounders identified? Were the potential confounders discussed in relationship to the results?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknov Yes ☐ No
13. Were ac	dverse events identified?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknov
14. Can the	Y/GENERALIZABILITY: Can I apply these valid, important study reserved to my population of interest?	ults?
• [• <i>H</i>	s the treatment feasible in my care setting? Yes No Oo the outcomes apply to my population of interest? Yes No Are the likely benefits worth the potential harm and costs? Yes No Are the subjects/participants in this study similar to my population of interest Were all clinically important outcomes considered? Yes No	st?
differen	u use the study/article in your practice to make a ce in outcomes? If yes, why would you do this & how would you do this? If no, why would you not include the results to make a difference?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

© Copyright 2013-2018, The Helene Fuld Health Trust National Institute for Evidence-based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare. Adapted with permission, from Evidence-based practice in nursing and healthcare. (Appendix B; p. 539-50), by Melnyk, Bernadette Mazurek, and Fineout-Overholt, Ellen. Wolters Kluwer Health, 2015 and with permission, from Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Evidence-based Decision Making Group: LEGEND system, 2006-2013.

Page | 4



STRENGTH OF STUDY				
Level of study: I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII	(Circle one)			
Quality of study: High Medium Low	(Circle one)			
TRENGTH = LEVEL + QUALITY				
	(place article on evaluation & synthesis tables)			
☐ Include this article in the body of evidence ☐ Do NOT include this article in the body of e				
☐ Include this article in the body of evidence	(place article on evaluation & synthesis tables)			

Page **| 5**

