# Appendix F
## Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence level and quality rating:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article title:</td>
<td>Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
<td>Publication date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td>Sample (composition and size):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this evidence address my EBP question?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] 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?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of recommendations?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- Are groups to which recommendations apply and do not apply clearly stated?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- Have potential biases been eliminated?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- Are recommendations clear?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question

Complete the corresponding quality rating section.
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### Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

#### Literature review LEVEL V
Summary of selected published literature including scientific and nonscientific such as reports of organizational experience and opinions of experts

#### 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?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Is literature relevant and up-to-date (most sources are within the past five years or classic)?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Of the literature reviewed, is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions across the articles included in the review?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Are gaps in the literature identified?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Are recommendations made for future practice or study?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

### Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question

### Complete the corresponding quality rating section.

#### Expert opinion LEVEL V
Opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise

- **Has the individual published or presented on the topic?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Is the author’s opinion based on scientific evidence?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Is the author’s opinion clearly stated?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Are potential biases acknowledged?**
  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

### Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question

### Complete the corresponding quality rating section.
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**Non-Research Evidence Appraisal**

### Organizational Experience

- **Quality improvement LEVEL V**
  Cyclical method to examine workflows, processes, or systems with a specific organization

- **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

- **Program evaluation LEVEL V**
  Systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program; can involve both quantitative and qualitative methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting:</th>
<th>Sample Size/Composition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was the aim of the project clearly stated?</td>
<td>❑ Yes  ❑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was the method fully described?</td>
<td>❑ Yes  ❑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were process or outcome measures identified?</td>
<td>❑ Yes  ❑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were results fully described?</td>
<td>❑ Yes  ❑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was interpretation clear and appropriate?</td>
<td>❑ Yes  ❑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are components of cost/benefit or cost effectiveness analysis described?</td>
<td>❑ Yes  ❑ No  ❑ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question**

**Complete the corresponding quality rating section.**
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### Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case report LEVEL V</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-depth look at a person or group or another social unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is the purpose of the case report clearly stated?</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is the case report clearly presented?</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research?</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings?</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community standard, clinician experience, or consumer preference LEVEL V</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ <strong>Community standard:</strong> Current practice for comparable settings in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ <strong>Clinician experience:</strong> Knowledge gained through practice experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ <strong>Consumer preference:</strong> Knowledge gained through life experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source(s)</th>
<th>Number of Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Source of information has credible experience</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
<td>□ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Opinions are clearly stated</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
<td>□ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Evidence obtained is consistent</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
<td>□ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings That Help You Answer the EBP Question

---

Complete the corresponding quality rating section.
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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.


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.