

**Appendix F**  
**Non-Research Evidence Appraisal**

<b>Evidence level and quality rating:</b>	
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"/> <b>Clinical Practice Guidelines LEVEL IV</b> Systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consensus or Position Statement LEVEL IV</b> 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		
<b>Complete the corresponding quality rating section.</b>		

## Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Literature review LEVEL V</b> Summary of selected published literature including scientific and nonscientific such as reports of organizational experience and opinions of experts		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Integrative review LEVEL V</b> Summary of research evidence and theoretical literature; analyzes, compares themes, notes gaps in the selected literature		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is subject matter to be reviewed clearly stated?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is literature relevant and up-to-date (most sources are within the past five years or classic)?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the literature reviewed, is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions across the articles included in the review?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are gaps in the literature identified?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are recommendations made for future practice or study?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Findings That Help Answer the EBP Question		
<b>Complete the corresponding quality rating section.</b>		

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

## Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<b>Organizational Experience</b>			
<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			
<b>Complete the corresponding quality rating section.</b>			

## Appendix F Non-Research Evidence Appraisal

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Case report LEVEL V</b> 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		
<b>Complete the corresponding quality rating.</b>		

<b>Community standard, clinician experience, or consumer preference LEVEL V</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Community standard:</b> Current practice for comparable settings in the community <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Clinician experience:</b> Knowledge gained through practice experience <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consumer preference:</b> 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			
<b>Complete the corresponding quality rating section.</b>			

## 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.