|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary Report for Documents Reviewed at the APIC Greater NY Chapter 13 Journal Club** | **Date: meeting dateReviewer: your name hereAppraisal Score: single letter grade** |
| **Article/Research Study Being Evaluated:** type in article title/journal reference  |
| **LEVEL OF EVIDENCE** |
| **REPORT OF A SINGLE RESEARCH STUDY?** □ Yes □ No (if no go to summary) |
| **SETTING**: brief description here |
| **SAMPLE SIZE**: brief summary here |
| **COMPOSITION**: sample selection, brief 1-2 lines summary of article |
| **INTERVENTION(S)** □ Yes □ No  | **CONTROL** □ Yes □ No  |  **RANDOM ASSIGNMENT** □ Yes □ No  |
|  **YES** to intervention, control and random assignment | **□** **LEVEL I** Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) or Experimental Study |
|  **YES** to Intervention and either Control or Random Assignment | **□** **LEVEL II** Quasi-experimental (no manipulation of independent variable; may have Random Assignment or Control |
|  **YES** to intervention only **OR** **NO** to intervention, Control and Random Assignment | **□ LEVEL III** Non-experimental (no manipulation of independent variable; includes descriptive, comparative, and correlational studies; uses secondary data**□ LEVEL III** Qualitative (exploratory 〔e.g., interviews, focus groups〕) starting point for studies where little research exists; small samples sizes; results used to design empirical studies. |
|  | **QUALITY OF EVIDENCE: STUDY**  |
| Does the researcher identify what is known and what is not known about the problem and how the study will address any gaps in knowledge?  | **□Yes □No**  |  | **A****HIGH** | Consistent, generalized resultSufficient sample sizeAdequate controlDefinitive conclusionsConsistent recommendations based on comprehensive literature review that includes thorough reference to scientific evidence |
| Was the purpose of the study clearly presented? | **□Yes □No**  |
| Was the literature review current (most sources within last 5 years)? | **□Yes □No**  |
| Was sample size sufficient based on study design and rationale? | **□Yes □No**  |
| If there was a control group:* Were the characteristics and/or demographics similar in both control and intervention groups?
* If multiple settings were used, were the settings similar?
* Were all groups treated equally except for the intervention group(s)
 | **□Yes □No □NA****□Yes □No □NA****□Yes □No □NA** | **B** **GOOD** | Reasonably consistent resultSufficient sample size for the study designSome controlFairly definite conclusionsReasonably consistent recommendations based on fairly comprehensive literature review that includes some reference to scientific evidence |
| Are data collection methods described clearly? | **□Yes □No □NA** |
| Was instrument validity discussed? | **□Yes □No □NA** | **C****Low Quality Or Major Flaws** | Little evidence with inconsistent resultsInsufficient sample size for the study designConclusions cannot be drawn |
| Was the instrument reliable (e.g. Cronbach’s α ≥ 0.70)? | **□Yes □No □NA** |
| If survey/questionnaire was used, was response rate ≥ 25% | **□Yes □No □NA** |
| If tables were presented, was the narrative consistent with the table content? | **□Yes □No □NA** | **Additional Comments:** |
| Were the results presented clearly? | **□Yes □No □NA** |
| Were conclusions based on results? | **□Yes □No □NA** |
| Were study limitations identified and addressed? | **□Yes □No □NA** |

\*\*This appraisal tool has been modified from AORN Research Evidence Appraisal tool – Ref: Sadahiro S., Suzuki T., Tanaka A., et al. AORN Journal, July 2014 Vol 100 No 1