

# Canadian Prehospital Evidence Based Practice (PEP) Project

## EXAMPLE Individual Study Appraisal Sheet

**Appraiser:** Ed Cain

**Date:** July 9, 2012

**Protocol Category:** Pediatric Shock

**Protocol:** Pediatric Hypovolemic Shock

**Intervention:** Mechanical Intraosseous Insertion

**Citation:** *Banerjee S, Singhi SC, Singh S, (1994). The IO Route is a suitable alternative to IV Route for fluid Resuscitation in Severely Dehydrated Children. Ind Ped 31; 1513-20.*

### Appraisal:

Is this article applicable?

Yes  No

(If yes, please fill out the form and submit. If no, please submit and this will be removed from your queue.)

### **Study design:**

- Randomized controlled trial
- Systematic Review with Meta-analysis( RCTs only)
- Systematic Review ( RCTs and others)
- Prospective Cohort Study
- Case Control Study
- Retrospective Cohort study
- Case Series/ Case reports

### **Design Flaws and Biases Affecting Internal Validity:**

- 1.
- 2.

### **Design flaws and Biases Affecting External Validity:**

- Study Population (Sampling):
- Setting Location:

### **Additional Comments:**

**Level of Evidence (I, II, III):**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Level I           | Evidence obtained from adequately powered properly designed randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on live human participants, or systematic reviews or meta-analysis with RCTs. No pilot studies are to be included here.   |
| Level II          | Evidence obtained from adequately powered non-randomized studies with a comparison group of live human participants, or systematic reviews/meta-analyses of non-randomized studies with a comparison group.<br>Prospective or retrospective registry-type studies in which comparisons are made; cohort and case control studies are included here. |
| Level III         | Evidence from studies with no randomization and no comparison group, simulation/manikin studies and animal studies. Pilot studies and inadequately powered studies to be included here.   |
| Excluded from PEP | Opinion articles, editorials, epidemiological reports, surveys, or articles not reporting primary studies.  |

**Direction of Evidence Primary Outcome:**

Supportive:

Neutral:

Against:

**Primary Outcome (The outcome listed as “main” or “primary” or first listed):**

Please review the current recommendation within the 3x3 and if there is strong evidence for a change here please write a summary of your suggestion.