

Appendix F
Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

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- <i>Do not proceed with appraisal of this evidence</i>	

<input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Practice Guidelines LEVEL IV Systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Are the types of evidence included identified?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of recommendations?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Are groups to which recommendations apply and do not apply clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Have potential biases been eliminated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Are recommendations clear?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question		
Complete the corresponding quality rating section.		

Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<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		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is subject matter to be reviewed clearly stated? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are gaps in the literature identified? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are recommendations made for future practice or study? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question		
Complete the corresponding quality rating section.		

<input type="checkbox"/> Expert opinion LEVEL V Opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the individual published or presented on the topic? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the author's opinion based on scientific evidence? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the author's opinion clearly stated? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are potential biases acknowledged? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question		
Complete the corresponding quality rating section.		

Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

Organizational Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Size/Composition:	
• 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
Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question			
<p>Complete the corresponding quality rating section.</p>			

Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<input type="checkbox"/> Case report LEVEL V In-depth look at a person or group or another social unit		
<input type="checkbox"/> Is the purpose of the case report clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Is the case report clearly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question		
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	
<input type="checkbox"/> Source of information has credible experience	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Opinions are clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> 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			
Complete the corresponding quality rating section.			

Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

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.