Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Does this evidence answer the EBP question?	☐ Yes → Continue appraisal ☐ No → STOP, do not continue evidence appraisal

Article Summary Information	
Article Title:	
Author(s):	Number:
Population, size, and setting:	Publication date:

Complete after appraisal:	
Evidence level and quality rating:	
Study findings that help answer the EBP question:	

Article Appraisal Workflow

	Is this evidence:	**This is…**
Level	☐ A **clinical practice guideline** or a **consensus/position statement**?	**Level IV** evidence, go to **Section I: Level IV Appraisal** to determine quality
	☐ A **literature review** or **integrative review**?	**Level V** evidence, go to **Section II, A: Level V Appraisal** to determine quality
	☐ An **expert opinion**?	**Level V** evidence, go to **Section II, B: Level V Appraisal** to determine quality
	☐ **Case report?**	**Level V** evidence, go to **Section II, C: Level V Appraisal** to determine quality
	☐ An **organizational experience** (including **quality improvement**, **financial** or **program evaluations**)?	**Level V** evidence, go to **Section II, D: Level V Appraisal** to determine quality
	☐ **Community standard, clinician experience,** or **consumer preference?**	**Level V** evidence, go to **Section II, E: Level V Appraisal** to determine quality

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section I: Level IV Appraisal

Select the type of Level IV evidence

☐ **Clinical practice guidelines** (systematically developed recommendations from nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel)

☐ **Consensus or position statement** (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)

After selecting the type of Level IV evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:

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 defined?	☐ Yes	☐ No
Does each recommendation have an identified level of evidence stated?	☐ Yes	☐ No
Are recommendations clear?	☐ Yes	☐ No

Quality

Circle the appropriate quality rating below:

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: 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.

Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1**

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Quality Appraisal

A   Select the type of article:

☐ **Literature review** (summary of selected published literature including scientific and nonscientific, such as reports of organizational experience and opinions of experts)

☐ **Integrative review** (summary of research evidence and theoretical literature; analyzes, compares themes, notes gaps in the selected literature)

Quality	After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:		
	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
	Circle the appropriate quality rating below:		
	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:** Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.		
	Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1**		

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Quality Appraisal (continued)

B   Select the type of article:

☐ **Expert opinion** (opinion of one or more individuals based on clinical expertise)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="11" style="writing-mode: vertical-rl;">Quality</td><td colspan="3">After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:</td></tr>
<tr><td>Does the author have relevant education and training?</td><td>☐ Yes</td><td>☐ No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Do they have relevant professional and academic affiliations?</td><td>☐ Yes</td><td>☐ No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Have they previously published in the area of interest?</td><td>☐ Yes</td><td>☐ No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Have they been recognized by state, regional, national, or international groups for their expertise?</td><td>☐ Yes</td><td>☐ No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Are their publications well cited by others?</td><td>☐ Yes</td><td>☐ No</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">*A web search can provide information about expertise*</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Circle the appropriate quality rating below:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">**A High quality:** Expertise is clearly evident, draws definitive conclusions, and provides scientific rationale; thought leader in the field.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">**B Good quality:** Expertise appears to be credible, draws fairly definitive conclusions, and provides logical argument for opinions.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">**C Low quality:** Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.</td></tr>
</table>

Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1**

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Quality Appraisal (continued)

C   Select the type of article:

☐ **Case report** (an in-depth look at a person or group or another social unit)

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="8">Quality</td>
<td colspan="3">After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:</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>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Circle the appropriate quality rating below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">

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: Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1**</td>
</tr>
</table>

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Quality Appraisal (continued)

D Select the type of article:

☐ **Quality improvement** (cyclical method to examine workflows, processes, or systems within a specific organization)

☐ **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)

☐ **Program evaluation** (systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program; can involve both quaNtitative and quaLitative methods)

Quality	After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:			
	Was the aim of the project clearly stated?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
	Was a formal QI method used for conducting or reporting the project (e.g., PDSA, SQUIRE 2.0)?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
	Was the method fully described?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
	Were process or outcome measures identified?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
	Were results fully described?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
	Was interpretation clear and appropriate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
	Are components of cost/benefit or cost effectiveness data described?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A

Circle the appropriate quality rating below:

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: Unclear or missing aims and objectives; inconsistent results; poorly defined quality improvement/financial analysis method; recommendations cannot be made.

Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1**

Nonresearch Evidence Appraisal Tool
Appendix F

Section II: Level V Quality Appraisal (continued)

E Select the type of article:

☐ **Community standard** (current practice for comparable settings in the community)
☐ **Clinician experience** (knowledge gained through practice experience from the clinician perspective)
☐ **Consumer preference** (knowledge gained through life experience from the patient perspective)

Record the sources of information and the number of sources:

Quality	After selecting the type of Level V evidence, determine the quality of evidence using the considerations below:			
	Source of information has credible experience	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
	Opinions are clearly stated	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
	Evidence obtained is consistent	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
	Circle the appropriate quality rating below:			
	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:** Expertise is not discernable or is dubious; conclusions cannot be drawn.			
	Record findings that help answer the EBP question on page **1**			