AORN RESEARCH EVIDENCE APPRAISAL TOOL - SUMMARY

DATE_____

REVIEWER_____

APPRAISAL SCORE _____

RW#	CITATION

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

Does this evidence have a major flaw?
☐ No   ☐ Yes - Determine level of evidence and score quality as C.
Provide explanation of flaw in comments.

LEVEL OF EVIDENCE

Summary of multiple research studies?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No (If No, go to the AORN Research Evidence Appraisal Tool - Study)

Comprehensive search strategy and rigorous appraisal?
☐ Yes (Systematic Review) ☐ No (If No, go to the AORN Non-Research Appraisal Tool)

Results from studies combined and analyzed to generate new statistic or effect size (measure of strength of relationship between two variables)	☐ Yes – Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis ☐ No
Concepts from Qualitative studies analyzed and synthesized	☐ Yes – Systematic Review with Meta-Synthesis ☐ No
All studies are randomized controlled trials (RCTs)	☐ LEVEL I
All studies are Quasi-Experimental or a combination of RCTs and Quasi-Experimental	☐ LEVEL II
All studies are Non-Experimental or a combination of RCTs, Quasi-Experimental, and Non-Experimental	☐ LEVEL III
Any or all studies are Qualitative	☐ LEVEL III

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	A HIGH	B GOOD	C LOW	NA
PURPOSE/BACKGROUND				
• Was the purpose of the systematic review clearly defined?				■
• Was the research question clear?				■
• Did the researcher(s) identify what is known and not known about the research question and how the systematic review would address any gaps in knowledge?				■
SEARCH				
• Was the search strategy reproducible?				■
• Were the key search terms stated?				■
• Were multiple databases searched and identified?				■
• Was the inclusion/exclusion criteria described?				■
• Was both published and unpublished literature identified and retrieved where possible?				■
• Are the types of studies to be included in the review described?				■
EVIDENCE REVIEW				
• Was there an explanation of the number of studies eliminated at each level of review?				■
• Were the details of the included studies presented (design, sample, methods, results, outcomes, strengths, limitations)?				■
• Were methods for appraising the strength of evidence (level and quality) rigorous?				■
• Was the evidence reviewed and appraised by at least two members of the research team?				■
• Were the supporting references the most current available?				■
• Were the supporting references relevant to the research question?				■
DATA COLLECTION				
• Were methods of statistical analysis described?				
• Were methods of retrieving data from the individual studies described?				
• Was the data extracted by at least two members of the research team?				
RESULTS/CONCLUSIONS				
• Were the conclusions of the researcher(s) consistent with the results of the studies and the overall strength of the evidence?				■
• Was the strength of the phenomenon being studied quantified in a summary statistic (ie, effect size) that can be compared across the studies?		■	■	
LIMITATIONS/FUTURE RESEARCH				
• Were limitations of the review discussed?				■
FINAL QUALITY SCORE				