|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary Report for Documents Reviewed at the  APIC Greater NY Chapter 13 Journal Club** | | | | | | | | **Date: meeting date Reviewer: your name here Appraisal 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 result  Sufficient sample size  Adequate control  Definitive conclusions  Consistent 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 result  Sufficient sample size for the study design  Some control  Fairly definite conclusions  Reasonably 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 results  Insufficient sample size for the study design  Conclusions 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