

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Was the Process Credible?

Did the Review Explicitly Address a Sensible Clinical Question?

Was the Search for Relevant Studies Detailed and Exhaustive?

Was the Risk of Bias of the Primary Studies Assessed?

Did the Review Address Possible Explanations of Between-Study Differences in Results?

Did the Review Present Results That Are Ready for Clinical Application?

Were Selection and Assessments of Studies Reproducible?

Did the Review Address Confidence in Effect Estimates?

Were Eligibility Criteria for Inclusion in the Systematic Review Appropriate?

Are results likely to be similar across the range of included patients (eg, older and younger, sicker and less sick)?

Are results likely to be similar across the range of studied interventions or exposures (eg, for therapy, higher dose or lower dose; for diagnosis, test results interpreted by experts or nonexperts)?

Are results likely to be similar across the range of ways the outcome was measured (eg, shorter or longer follow-up)?

Rating Confidence in the Estimates (The Quality of Evidence) The GRADE Approach

How Serious Is the Risk of Bias in the Body of Evidence?

Are the Results Consistent Across Studies?

How Precise Are the Results?

Do the Results Directly Apply to My Patient?

Is There Concern About Reporting Bias?

Are There Reasons to Increase the Confidence Rating?