AORN NON-RESEARCH EVIDENCE APPRAISAL TOOL

DATE_____
REVIEWER_____
APPRAISAL SCORE _____

RW#	CITATION

Does this evidence address the perioperative practice question?
☐ Yes ☐ No - Do not proceed with evidence appraisal.

LEVEL OF EVIDENCE		
Systematically developed recommendations from recognized experts based on evidence or consensus opinion that guides members of a professional organization in decision-making related to practice or a particular issue of concern	☐ LEVEL IV	Clinical Practice Guideline Consensus or Position Statement
Summary of published literature on a topic of interest without a systematic appraisal of the strength and quality of the evidence	☐ LEVEL V	Literature Review
In-depth analysis of an individual, group, social unit, issue, or event	☐ LEVEL V	Case Report
Advice from an individual(s) with knowledge and expertise on a particular topic or issue	☐ LEVEL V	Expert Opinion
Initiative with a goal to improve the processes or outcome of care being delivered within a particular institution	☐ LEVEL V	Organizational Experience

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	A HIGH	B GOOD	C LOW	NA
CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINE/POSITION STATEMENT				
• Was the purpose of the guideline or position statement clearly stated?				
• Was the guideline or position statement developed, reviewed, or revised within the past five years?				
• Were stakeholders involved in the development of the guideline or position statement representative of the specialty?				
• Were the groups to which the recommendations apply and do not apply clearly defined?				
• Was the strategy for developing the guideline or position statement rigorous?				
• Was there a reproducible literature search or other systematic method used to search for evidence?				
• Was a rating scheme or grading method used to determine the quality and strength of the evidence included in the guideline or position statement?				
• Was there an objective description of the type of studies or the consensus process used to support the recommendations?				
• Were the recommendations of the author(s) unbiased and consistent with the literature reviewed?				
• Were the strengths and limitations of the body of evidence clearly described?				
• Were the supporting references the most current available?				
• Were the supporting references relevant to the recommendations?				
• Was the guideline or position statement subjected to a peer review process?				
LITERATURE REVIEW				
• Was the purpose of the literature review clearly stated?				
• Did the author(s) identify what is known and not known about the practice question and how the literature review will address any gaps in knowledge?				
• Were the supporting references the most current available?				
• Were the supporting references relevant to the subject being reviewed?				
• Did the author(s) provide a meaningful analysis and synthesis of the literature reviewed?				
• Were conclusions of the author(s) unbiased and consistent with the literature reviewed?				
• Were the findings of the literature review accurately summarized in tables or figures?				
• Were recommendations made for future practice or study?				
CASE REPORT				
• Was the purpose of the case report clearly stated?				
• Was the case report clearly presented?				
• Were the findings of the case report evidence-based?				
• Was follow-up sufficiently long and complete?				
• Was there a literature review?				
• Did the author(s) provide recommendations for practice?				
• Were the recommendations for practice clearly stated and linked to the findings of the case report?				
EXPERT OPINION				
• Has the individual published or presented on the topic?				
• Was the individual opinion evidence-based?				
• Was the individual opinion clearly stated?				
• Was the individual opinion unbiased and consistent with the evidence?				
ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE				
• Was the aim of the organizational project clearly stated and focused on assessing and improving current practice?				
• Was the methodology of the project adequately described?				
• Were process or outcome measures for the organizational project identified?				
• Were the results of the organizational project adequately described?				
• Were components of cost/benefit analysis described?				
• Were multiple sites involved?				
FINAL QUALITY SCORE				