

EBCAI Criteria for Reviewing Critically Appraised Topics (Adapted from Coomerasamy et al., 2001)

General domains	Quality domains and items	Criteria for adequacy
A. Relevance	1. Was the question well-built?	Three or more parts – patient, intervention, comparison, outcome (PICO) (Richardson et al., 1995) or person, environments, stakeholders, intervention, comparison, outcome (PESICO) (Schlosser & O’Neil-Pirozzi, 2006). For some questions not all components apply.
	2. Was the search method adequate?	An electronic bibliographic search alone or in combination with other methods (e.g., hand search); identification during passive browsing or by personal recommendation is inadequate
	3. Were appropriate keywords, quality filters, and limiters selected for literature searching?	Use of thesaurus-based terms where available for the problem or intervention at hand based on the question. Appropriate free text words when thesaurus-based terms are not available or are ineffective. Appropriate quality filters and limiters were employed (Schlosser, Wendt, Angermeier, & Shetty, 2005)
	4. Was the selection of specific bibliographic databases adequate?	At a minimum a combination of databases with pre-filtered evidence (e.g., DARE, Cochrane Central Registry of Controlled Trials and Dissertation Abstracts; Campbell Collaboration-SPECTR) and appropriate general-purpose databases (e.g., CINAHL, EMBASE, ERIC, LLBA, MEDLINE, PsycINFO) – a minimum of two general-purpose databases appropriate to the question. The specific databases to be combined will depend on the nature of the question (see Dennis & Abbott, 2006; Schlosser et al., 2005)
	5. Were appropriate papers obtained?	If the appraised articles were at least 80% consistent with those selected by independent reviewers. If systematic review available but an individual study was selected this is judged inadequate.
Validity	6. Was the study design accurately described?	The study design described for each study is consistent with the actual study design used (this may not be how the authors labeled the design)
	7. Was the study design accurately appraised?	The study design for each study was appraised accurately in terms of its inherent shortcomings (design hierarchy) as well as its implementation
	8. Were other relevant issues affecting internal validity considered	Issues such as reliability of the dependent measure and treatment integrity are considered for each study in the appraisal as well

	appropriately?	
	9. Were correct data extracted from the results?	Correct extraction
	10. Were these correctly converted to clinically meaningful measures?	Correct conversion
Usability	11. Were clinically meaningful summary statistics used?	Intervention: Number needed to treat Diagnosis: likelihood ratio Prognosis: a quality-adjusted measure <i>Note: This is not applicable for single-subject experimental designs</i>
	12. Was the bottom-line appropriate?	If it arose directly from the appraised article/s?
	13. Was the bottom-line clearly stated?	Precise description, directly addressing the question raised
Attribution	14. Was there a clear reference to data source?	Any three of the following: title, author, journal publication date, volume, page number
Currency	15. Was there a creation date?	At least the year
	16. Was there a kill-by date?	At least the year
Contact	17. Was authorship of appraisal stated?	At least the name
	18. Were contact details given?	E-mail, address, phone

Cited References:

- Coomarasamy, A., Latthe, P., Papaioannou, S., Publicover, M., Ghee, H., & Khan, K. S. (2001). Critical appraisal in clinical practice: sometimes irrelevant, occasionally invalid. *Journal of The Royal Society of Medicine*, 94, 573-577.
- Dennis, J., & Abbott, J. (2006). Information retrieval: Where's your evidence? *Contemporary Issues in Communication Sciences and Disorders*, 33, 11- 20.
- Richardson, W., Wilson, M., Nishikawa, J., & Hayward, R. (1995). The well-built clinical question: A key to evidence-based decisions. *ACP Journal Club*, 123, A12-13.
- Schlosser, R. W., & O'Neil-Pirozzi, T. (2006). Problem formulation in evidence-based practice and systematic reviews. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Sciences and Disorders*, 33, 5-10.
- Schlosser, R. W., Wendt, O., Angermeier, K., & Shetty, M. (2005). Searching for and finding evidence in augmentative and alternative communication: Navigating a scattered literature. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 21, 233-255.