

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

Evidence Level & Quality: \_\_\_\_\_

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

<b>Organizational Experience:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Quality Improvement:</b> Cyclical method to examine organization-specific processes at the local level. <b>LEVEL V</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Financial Evaluation:</b> Economic evaluation that applies analytic techniques to identify, measure, and compare the cost and outcomes of two or more alternative programs or interventions. <b>LEVEL V</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Program Evaluation:</b> Systematic assessment of the processes and/or outcomes of a program and can involve both quantitative and qualitative methods. <b>LEVEL V</b>			
<b>Setting:</b>		<b>Sample (composition/size):</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the aim of the project clearly stated?</li> <li>• Was the method adequately described?</li> <li>• Were process or outcome measures identified?</li> <li>• Were results adequately described?</li> <li>• Was interpretation clear and appropriate?</li> <li>• Are components of cost/benefit analysis described?</li> </ul>		<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"/> <b>Case Report:</b> In-depth look at a person, group, or other social unit. <b>LEVEL V</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the case report clearly stated?</li> <li>• Is the case report clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings of the case report supported by relevant theory or research?</li> <li>• Are the recommendations clearly stated and linked to the findings?</li> </ul>		<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
<b>Community Standard, Clinician Experience, or Consumer Preference</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Community Standard:</b> Current practice for comparable settings in the community <b>LEVEL V</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Clinician Experience:</b> Knowledge gained through practice experience <b>LEVEL V</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consumer Preference:</b> Knowledge gained through life experience <b>LEVEL V</b>			
Information Source(s):		Number of Sources:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source of information has credible experience.</li> <li>• Opinions are clearly stated.</li> <li>• Identified practices are consistent.</li> </ul>		<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
<b>Findings that help you answer the EBP question:</b>			

# 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