A. Purpose, Questions, Hypotheses and Literature Review

1. Was the study purpose clearly stated? What is it?

2. What are the sources of evidence in the literature review? (Peer-reviewed? Primary sources? Conceptually linked to the study purpose?)

3. Were specific, directional hypotheses stated? If no, do you think they should be included?

4. What methods were used to answer the questions?

B. FOR RCTs: Are there any differences between the two groups in terms of selection bias or confounding variables which could explain the differences between them? (factors like age, sex, social class)\(^1\)

5. Was the assignment of subjects to treatments randomised? Y / N

6. Blinding: Were the subjects, workers, study personnel "blind to the treatment"?

7. Were the groups similar at the start of the trial?

8. Aside from the experimental intervention, were the groups treated equally?
**C. What are the results?**

9. Were the measurements used clearly explained and appropriate?

10. Did the study have appropriate power for the statistics used? Did the analyses reach significance? Is reporting of non-significance a detriment to your judgment of the quality of the study?

11. How large are the effects? (consider what outcomes were recorded, and how the differences between the groups or relationships between variables were expressed).

12. Were the results clearly explained? Were they discussed in reference to general clinical relevance?

**D. Will the results help locally?**

13. Can the results be applied to your work? (e.g., How different are the subjects in the study compared to the population you are interested in?)

14. Were all the important outcomes considered? (If any were neglected, does this affect the interpretation?)

15. Are the benefits worth the harms and costs? (This is a bit of an "extra" and much research will not include cost benefit analyses, but such a critique may be useful for your evidence-based practice).