

Name:	
Date:	

Please save this document with the following file name: **hsl_task8_W_first-last-name_YYYY-MM-DD**

Conduct a quality and local applicability assessment of the Cochrane review conducted by Gruen et al. about specialist outreach clinics, using Table 1 and Table 2 (below) to document your work, then describe any points of disagreement from the results of your assessments

	Description of any points of disagreement
<p>In Table 1 below, assess the quality of the Cochrane review conducted by Gruen et al.* using the AMSTAR criteria, and compare the instructor’s assessment to your assessment. We have provided the AMSTAR criteria and the instructor’s assessment in Table 1. After completing your appraisal, provide a description of any points of disagreement and summarize them in the adjacent box.</p> <p>*The full text of the article is freely available at the following url: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD003798.pub2/pdf</p>	<p>Summary of the points of disagreement from Table 1:</p>
<p>In Table 2 below, assess the local applicability of the Cochrane review by Gruen et al., and compare your results to the results provided by the instructor. We have provided the local applicability assessment criteria and the instructor’s assessment in Table 2.</p>	<p>Summary of the points of disagreement from Table 2:</p>

****If you are completing this task as part of the Health Systems Learning online training course, remember to copy and paste your answers into the online form for instructor review****

Table 1: Summary of the assessment of quality for the review by Gruen et al.

<p>Assess the quality of the Cochrane review conducted by Gruen et al.* using the AMSTAR criteria, and compare the instructor’s assessment (provided below) to your assessment. State whether you agree or disagree with the instructor, and provide a description about why you agree or disagree.</p> <p>*The full text of the article is freely available at the following url: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD003798.pub2/pdf</p>

Citation: Lavis JN. Finding and using research evidence: Assessing systematic reviews – Task 8: Assess. Hamilton, Canada: McMaster Health Forum; 2014.

Instructor’s assessment of the quality of the Cochrane Review conducted by Gruen et al.	To conduct your assessment, type your answer (yes, no, can’t answer or N/A) to each question below, then provide your points of disagreement.
<p>1. Was an ‘a priori’ design provided? The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can’t answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: Unfortunately there is no mention of a protocol in the review so we have to say ‘Can’t answer.’ However, all Cochrane reviews must have a protocol established before the conduct of the review.</p>	<p>1. Was an ‘a priori’ design provided? Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>2. Did the authors undertake duplicate study selection and data extraction? There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can’t answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: See page 4 of the Gruen et al. review, left column, bottom of page. Reviewers worked in three pairs each evaluating one third of comparative studies. In each pair, both reviewers independently assessed the studies for inclusion ... as well as the quality and findings of the study. Any discrepancies between reviewers were resolved through discussion.</p>	<p>2. Did the authors undertake duplicate study selection and data extraction? Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? At least two electronic sources should be searched. The report must include years and databases used (e.g. Central, EMBASE and MEDLINE). Key words and/or MESH terms must be stated and where feasible the search strategy should be provided. All searches should be supplemented by consulting current content, reviews, textbooks, specialized registers, or experts in the particular field of study, and by reviewing the references in the studies found. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can’t answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? Points of disagreement:</p>

<p>Explanation: See page 3, right column, bottom of page and page 4, left column, top of page. Five general electronic databases and two topic-specific databases (i.e., specialized registers) were searched and the years for the search are provided. The search strategy is provided for MedLine. The reference list of each retrieved article was scanned.</p>	
<p>4. Was the status of the publication NOT used as an inclusion criterion? The authors should state that they searched for reports regardless of their publication type. The authors should state whether or not they excluded any reports (from the systematic review), based on their publication status, language, etc.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: Could not identify a statement in the review to answer this question.</p>	<p>4. Was the status of the publication NOT used as an inclusion criterion?</p> <p>Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>5. Was the list of studies (included and excluded) provided? A list of included and excluded studies should be provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: See pages 15-16 for a list of included studies and pages 16-19 for a list of excluded studies.</p>	<p>5. Was the list of studies (included and excluded) provided?</p> <p>Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>6. Were the characteristics of included studies provided? In an aggregated form such as a table, data from the original studies should be provided on the participants, interventions and outcomes. The ranges of characteristics in all the studies analyzed (e.g. age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity, or other diseases) should be reported.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: See pages 21-25 for the characteristics of included studies and see pages 25-26 for the characteristics of excluded studies.</p>	<p>6. Were the characteristics of included studies provided?</p> <p>Points of disagreement:</p>

<p>7. Was the scientific quality of included studies assessed? 'A priori' methods of assessment should be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s) chose to include only randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment as inclusion criteria); for other types of studies alternative items will be relevant. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: See page 4, right column, middle-to-bottom of page for the reference to the quality criteria used to assess the three eligible study types (randomized controlled trials, interrupted time series, and controlled before/after studies).</p>	<p>7. Was the scientific quality of included studies assessed? Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>8. Was the scientific quality of included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? The results of the methodological rigour and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review, and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: See page 8, right column, top of page and page 10, left column, bottom of page for a general description of the quality of studies. Also, see page 14, left column, bottom of page for the implications, which do not mention scientific quality as explicitly as one might have hoped.</p>	<p>8. Was the scientific quality of included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>9. Were the methods used to combine study findings appropriate? For the pooled results, a test should be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e. Chi-squared test for homogeneity, I^2). If heterogeneity exists, a random effects model should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e. is it sensible to combine?). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>9. Were the methods used to combine study findings appropriate? Points of disagreement:</p>

<p>Explanation: See page 9, left column, end of each paragraph (2, 3 and 4) for the tests of homogeneity. However, it's important to point out that for many health system interventions/arrangements, it will not be possible to combine the findings of studies quantitatively.</p>	
<p>10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? An assessment of publication bias should include a combination of graphical aids (e.g., funnel plot, other available tests) and/or statistical tests (e.g., Egger regression test).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: Not assessed (at least not in the pages provided).</p>	<p>10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?</p> <p>Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>11. Did the authors include a statement about any conflicts of interest? Potential sources of support should be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the included studies.</p> <p>X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Can't answer <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Explanation: See page 15, left column, middle of page for a description of the involvement of some of the reviewers in an included study and how this was addressed. Also see page 15, right column, middle of page for the sources of support for the review. However, sources of support were not identified for the included studies.</p>	<p>11. Did the authors include a statement about any conflicts of interest?</p> <p>Points of disagreement:</p>
<p>Overall score = 7/11 (medium-quality review)</p>	<p>Your final score after considering agreements and disagreements with the instructor's assessment:</p> <p>As a reminder:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality = 8-11 • Medium quality = 4-7 • Low quality = 0-3

Table 2: Summary of the assessment of local applicability for the review by Gruen et al.

Assess the local applicability of the Gruen et al. review, and compare your results to the results provided by the instructor	
Instructor’s assessment of the local applicability of the Gruen et al. review	Description of your assessment and disagreements
<p>Were the studies included in a systematic review conducted in a different setting or were the findings not consistent across settings or time periods?</p> <p><u>Instructor’s assessment</u> The review included studies from a limited number of countries, which were conducted over several decades, during which time the health systems may have changed dramatically.</p> <p>Countries in which the included studies were conducted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United States (4) • United Kingdom (3) • Australia (1) • Holland (1) <p>The years in which data were collected were provided only for four countries, and these years spanned a fairly broad range: 1978-85 (U.K. study), 1986-91 (U.S. study), 1992-93 (U.S. study), and 1993-99 (Australia study).</p>	<p>Assessment of whether the studies included in the systematic review were conducted in a different setting or were not consistent across settings or time periods , as well as your points of disagreement with the instructor’s assessment:</p>
<p>Are there important differences in on-the-ground realities and constraints that might substantially alter the feasibility and acceptability of a policy or program option?</p> <p><u>Instructor’s assessment</u> The review does not provide information that allows for this type of assessment.</p>	<p>Assessment of whether there are important differences in on-the-ground realities and constraints that might substantially alter the feasibility and acceptability of a policy or program option, as well as your points of disagreement with the instructor’s assessment:</p>

McMaster Health Forum

1280 Main St. West, MML-417
 McMaster University
 Hamilton, ON Canada L8S 4L6

>> Contact us

Tel: +1.905.525.9140 x 22121
 Fax: +1.905.521.2721
 Email: hslearn@mcmaster.ca

>> Follow us

Mcmasterhealthforum.org
healthsystemsEVIDENCE.org
healthsystemsLEARNING.org

<p>Are there important differences in health system arrangements that may mean an option could not work in the same way?</p> <p><u>Instructor’s assessment</u> See page 11, left column, middle-to-bottom part of page. The three studies examining the effects on the risk of a psychiatric disorder persisting for six months were all done in a similar urban Seattle-based health maintenance organization (HMO) population, and this complex intervention, which relies heavily on collaborative care, patient and physician education, and protocol-driven management, may not work in the same way outside an HMO setting.</p>	<p>Assessment of whether there are important differences in health system arrangements that may mean an option could not work in the same way, as well as your points of disagreement with the instructor’s assessment:</p>
<p>Are there important differences in the baseline conditions that might yield different absolute effects even if the relative effectiveness were the same?</p> <p><u>Instructor’s assessment</u> See page 10, right column, bottom of page for the statement about how the available high-quality evidence is skewed to urban, non-disadvantaged populations, and page 11, left column, top of page for the statement about how most of the high-quality research is done in populations where the potential to benefit is marginal, and there is little evidence about the effectiveness of outreach in settings that have the most to gain (the same point is made on page 11, right column, bottom of page).</p>	<p>Assessment of whether there are important differences in the baseline conditions that might yield different absolute effects even if the relative effectiveness were the same, as well as your points of disagreement with the instructor’s assessment:</p>
<p>What insights can be drawn about scaling up, implementation and monitoring and evaluation?</p> <p><u>Instructor’s assessment</u> This is context dependent. What insights can be drawn for your setting?</p>	<p>Assessment of what insights can be drawn about scaling up, implementation and monitoring and evaluation:</p>

--	--

McMaster Health Forum

1280 Main St. West, MML-417
McMaster University
Hamilton, ON Canada L8S 4L6

>> Contact us

Tel: +1.905.525.9140 x 22121
Fax: +1.905.521.2721
Email: hslearn@mcmaster.ca

>> Follow us

Mcmasterhealthforum.org
healthsystemsEVIDENCE.org
healthsystemsLEARNING.org