Quality Assessment Tool
Review Articles

health-evidence.ca
Promoting evidence-informed decision making

First Author:_____

Year:_____

Journal:_____

Reviewer:_____

Instructions for completion: Please refer to the attached dictionary for definition of terms and instructions for completing each section. For each criteria, score by placing a check mark in the appropriate box.

CRITERION	YES	NO
1. Did the authors have a clearly focused question [population, intervention (strategy), and outcome(s)]?		
2. Were appropriate inclusion criteria used to select primary studies?		
3. Did the authors describe a search strategy that was comprehensive? (Circle all strategies used) 　　　health databases　　　　　handsearching 　　　psychological databases　　key informants 　　　social science databases　　reference lists 　　　educational databases　　　unpublished 　　　other _____		
4. Did search strategy cover an adequate number of years?		

For questions 5, 6, and 8, please choose the column relating to the appropriate methodology. Strike a line through the column that does not apply.

		YES	NO
5. Quantitative reviews: Did the authors describe the level of evidence in the primary studies included in the review? Level I　(RCTs only) Level II　(non-randomized, cohort, case-control studies) Level III　(uncontrolled studies)	*5. Qualitative reviews:* Do the authors provide a clear description of the range of methods in each of the primary studies included in the review?		
6. Quantitative reviews Did the review assess the methodological quality of the primary studies, including: (minimum requirement: 4/7 of the following) ▪ research design ▪ study sample ▪ participation rates ▪ sources of bias (confounders, respondent bias) ▪ data collection (measurement of independent/dependent variables) ▪ follow-up/attrition rates ▪ data analysis	*6. Qualitative reviews* Did the review assess the methodological quality of the primary studies, including: (minimum requirement: 4/7 of the following) ▪ suitability of methodology/paradigm to the research question ▪ sampling (selection of participants/settings /documentation) ▪ clear description of context, data collection and data analysis ▪ rigor:　i)audit trail 　　　　ii)some coding by 2 or more coders, if appropriate 　　　　iii)deviant case analysis (negative cases) 　　　　iv)respondent validation (member checking) ▪ triangulation ▪ reflexivity (researcher and research process) ▪ relevance (credibility, consistency, applicability, transferability)		
7. Are the results of the review transparent?			
8. Quantitative review: Was it appropriate to combine the findings of results across studies?	8. Qualitative review: Is there a description of how reviewers determined results were similar enough across studies to compare or combine them?		
9. Were appropriate methods used for combining or comparing results across studies?			
10.Do the data support the author's interpretation?			

TOTAL SCORE:_____

QUALITY ASSESSMENT RATING (circle one)

(total score 8-10)	(total score 5-7)	(total score 4 or less)
STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK