

Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Appendix F: Non-Research Evidence Appraisal Tool

Evidence Level & Quality: _____

Article Title:		Number:	
Author(s):		Publication Date:	
Journal:			
Does this evidence address the EBP question?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No Do not proceed with appraisal of this evidence	
<input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Practice Guidelines: Systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel. LEVEL IV			
<input type="checkbox"/> Consensus or Position Statement: Systematically developed recommendations based on research and nationally recognized expert opinion that guides members of a professional organization in decision-making for an issue of concern. LEVEL IV			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the types of evidence included identified? • Were appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of recommendations? • Are groups to which recommendations apply and do not apply clearly stated? • Have potential biases been eliminated? • Were recommendations valid (reproducible search, expert consensus, independent review, current, and level of supporting evidence identified for each recommendation)? • Were the recommendations supported by evidence? • Are recommendations clear? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<input type="checkbox"/> Literature Review: Summary of published literature without systematic appraisal of evidence quality or strength. LEVEL V			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is subject matter to be reviewed clearly stated? • Is relevant, up-to-date literature included in the review (most sources within last 5 years or classic)? • Is there a meaningful analysis of the conclusions in the literature? • Are gaps in the literature identified? • Are recommendations made for future practice or study? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<input type="checkbox"/> Expert Opinion: Opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise. LEVEL V			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the individual published or presented on the topic? • Is author's opinion based on scientific evidence? • Is the author's opinion clearly stated? • Are potential biases acknowledged? 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Appendix F: Non-Research Evidence Appraisal Tool

Organizational Experience:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Improvement: Cyclical method to examine organization-specific processes at the local level. LEVEL V			
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Evaluation: Economic evaluation that applies analytic techniques to identify, measure, and compare the cost and outcomes of two or more alternative programs or interventions. LEVEL V			
<input type="checkbox"/> Program Evaluation: Systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program and can involve both quantitative and qualitative methods. LEVEL V			
Setting:		Sample (composition/size):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the aim of the project clearly stated? • Was the method adequately described? • Were process or outcome measures identified? • Were results adequately described? • Was interpretation clear and appropriate? • Are components of cost/benefit analysis described? 		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Report: In-depth look at a person, group, or other social unit. LEVEL V			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the purpose of the case report clearly stated? • Is the case report clearly presented? • Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research? • Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings? 		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No
Community Standard, Clinician Experience, or Consumer Preference			
<input type="checkbox"/> Community Standard: Current practice for comparable settings in the community LEVEL V			
<input type="checkbox"/> Clinician Experience: Knowledge gained through practice experience LEVEL V			
<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer Preference: Knowledge gained through life experience LEVEL V			
Information Source(s):		Number of Sources:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source of information has credible experience. • Opinions are clearly stated. • Identified practices are consistent. 		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Findings that help you answer the EBP question:			

Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Appendix F: Non-Research Evidence Appraisal Tool

QUALITY RATING FOR CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES, CONSENSUS OR POSITION STATEMENTS (LEVEL IV)

A High quality: Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, private organization, or 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 is clearly evident; developed or revised within the last 5 years.

B Good quality: Material officially sponsored by a professional, public, private organization, or 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 is clearly evident; developed or revised within the last 5 years.

C Low quality or major flaws: 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 last 5 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 LITERATURE REVIEW, EXPERT OPINION, COMMUNITY STANDARD, CLINICIAN EXPERIENCE, CONSUMER PREFERENCE (LEVEL V)

A High quality: Expertise is clearly evident; draws definitive conclusions; provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field

B Good quality: Expertise appears to be credible; draws fairly definitive conclusions; provides logical argument for opinions

C Low quality or major flaws: Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn