

Appendix Table of Contents

Section One Article Review Form..... 5-3

Section Three Article Evaluation Form 5-9

Page intentionally left blank.

Section One Article Review Form

TRACKING INFORMATION

Reviewer Name: _____

Tracking Number: _____

Phone Number: _____ E-mail: _____

Citation: _____

PART I. STUDY DESCRIPTION

1. Study design:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Randomized trial (experiment) | <input type="checkbox"/> Retrospective cohort study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Group | <input type="checkbox"/> Case-control study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-randomized "trial" (with ≥ 1 comparison group) | <input type="checkbox"/> Time series study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Group | <input type="checkbox"/> Before-after study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prospective cohort study | <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-sectional study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other designs with concurrent comparison groups | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-comparative study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ | |

2. System targets of quality improvement interventions: (Check all that apply)

- Community resources and policies (e.g., service availability, benefit coverage)
- Patient/Consumer education systems/methods
- Provider roles; organization of care delivery
- Provider education systems/methods
- Guideline/literature dissemination
- Specialty support
- Information systems (e.g., registries, reminders, feedback, care planning)

3. Primary clinical measure(s) addressed: (Check all that apply)

- Glycemic monitoring/control (e.g., hemoglobin A1c)
- Lipid monitoring/control
- Blood pressure monitoring/control
- Renal disease monitoring/treatment
- Eye exams/treatment
- Foot exams/treatment
- Other Specify: _____

7. What groups were studied and what was the sample size at baseline and follow-up?

<i>Sample Size</i>						
	Pre	Post	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual physicians						
<input type="checkbox"/> Physician offices/clinics						
<input type="checkbox"/> Other clinicians						
<input type="checkbox"/> Organizations (e.g., an HMO)						
<input type="checkbox"/> Group practices						
<input type="checkbox"/> Patients						
<input type="checkbox"/> Others _____						

8. Results

Measures (Write in)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Significant Results*

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

*p≤.05

PART II. STUDY QUALITY

Note: Check "yes" or "no" for each of the following.

1. Descriptions

- A. Was the study population (i.e., the intervention and comparison population) well described? The study population should be described by time (e.g., when the study population received the intervention), place, and person. Information about "person" should include at least age (for all studies) and should include other relevant characteristics of participants that are key to a particular study (e.g., SES, gender, other). Important potential confounding factors should also be described. Yes No
- B. Was the quality improvement intervention well described? The intervention should be described in terms of what was done, how it was delivered, who was targeted, and where it was done. *Examples of intervention include case management by nurses and use of a documentation flow sheet.* Yes No

2. Sampling

- A. Did the authors specify (i.e., describe characteristics and size of) the sampling frame or universe of selection for the study population? Yes No
- B. Did the authors specify the screening criteria for study eligibility (if applicable)? Yes No
- C. Was the population that served as the unit of analysis either 1) the entire eligible population; or 2) a probability sample? Yes No
- D. Are there other selection bias issues not identified above? This might include a very low participation rate (or a high refusal rate), an all-volunteer sample (as opposed to a convenience sample selected by the investigators), or extremely restricted sampling inappropriate for measuring the effectiveness of the intervention being studied. List: Yes No

3. Measurement

- A. Were the outcome and other independent (or predictor) variables valid measures of the outcome of interest? The authors should have reported one or more of the following: Yes No
- Clear definition of the outcome variable.
 - Measurement of the outcome in different ways.
 - Citations or discussion as to why the use of these measures is valid.
 - Other
- B. Were the outcome and other independent (or predictor) variables reliable (consistent and reproducible) measures of the outcome of interest? The authors should have reported one or more of the following: Yes No
- Measures of internal consistency.
 - Measurement of the outcome in different ways.
 - Considered consistency of coding, scoring, or categorization between observers (e.g., inter-rater reliability checks) or between different outcome measures. Example: percent agreement, Kappa
 - Considered how setting and sampling of study population might affect reliability.
 - Citations or discussion as to why the use of these measures is reliable.

4. Data Analysis

- A. Did the authors conduct appropriate analysis by:
- 1. Conducting statistical testing (when appropriate)? Yes No
 - 2. Reporting which statistical tests were used? Yes No
 - 3. Controlling for design effects in the statistical model? Yes No
- Examples:*
- a. *The study population was sampled using complex stratified sampling, however, the authors did not control for the sampling method in the analysis.*
 - b. *The answer should be “no” if the study had a matched design but an unmatched analysis.*
- 4. Controlling for repeated measures in the analysis, for study designs in which the same population was followed with repeated measurements over time? Yes No
 - 5. Accounting for different levels of exposure in segments of the study population in the analysis? Yes No
- B. Were there other problems with data analysis that limit interpretation of the results of the study? Specify. Yes No

5. Interpretation of Results

- A. Did at least 80% of enrolled participants complete the study? This may be reported as a “lost-to-follow-up” or “drop-out” rate. For many study designs, this criterion is not applicable (i.e., time series, before-after designs with or without a concurrent comparison group, surveys); for these studies, check the response option “Yes.” Yes No
- B. Confounding: Considering the study design, were appropriate methods for controlling confounding variables and limiting potential biases used? Confounding can be addressed by appropriate use of randomization, restriction, matching, stratification, or multi variable methods. Yes No
- C. Biases: Did the authors identify and discuss potential biases or unmeasured confounders? Yes No
- Example: The comparison group may have been affected by release of a guideline from a specialty society. List examples identified in the study:*

6. Other

Yes No

Are there other issues that limit your ability to interpret the results of the study that were not identified, handled in one of the other categories? Please limit your comments in this box to those limitations of the study that cannot be evaluated in other categories.

7. Recommendation for inclusion/exclusion in the compendium of best practices:

Your recommendation should be based on

- The validity of the measures;
- Adequacy of sample size;
- Meaningful results; and
- Appropriate study design.

Your recommendation should NOT be based on

- Feasibility or cost; or
- Generalizability to “average” care settings.

- Yes, I recommend that this study be included in the compendium of exemplary practices.
- No, the study should not be included.

8. If you answered “no” to question #7 above, were there any compelling secondary results that would argue for inclusion of this study even though primary objectives were not met (e.g., success in a key sub-group although no overall significant results, success with involvement of community partners)?

Section Three Article Evaluation Form

Title			
<i>Author, citation.</i>			
1.	Was the project population well described (by time, place, and person)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2.	Were there selection bias issues that should be considered when the results are evaluated? <i>list any</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
3.	Was the intervention well described (including what was accomplished, how, where, and who was targeted)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
4.	Were the quality indicators valid and reliable process or outcomes measures?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
5.	Was appropriate statistical analysis conducted?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
6.	Did the study control for design effects in the statistical model?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
7.	Were there problems with data analysis that should be considered when the results are evaluated? <i>list any</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
8.	Did the authors identify and discuss potential biases or unmeasured confounders?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
9.	Are there any other issues that limit the ability to interpret the results of the study or that should be considered in an evaluation of the results? <i>list any</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
10.	Recommend article for inclusion in the compendium?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
11.	Comments/notes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No