

Critically Appraised Topic (CAT) Abstract Review Rubric

Project Title and Number:

Date of Review:

Evaluator's Name:

	5	4	3	2	1	0
<p>Clinical Scenario A sentence or two providing a clinical scenario or general introduction for the need to evaluate the evidence pertaining to a clinical question.</p>	<p>Thorough background provided. Establishes the gap in the field to be addressed. Study addresses an important clinical question. Clear, concise, engaging. Ends with a clear, concise, and relevant purpose statement that identifies the target population, intervention, comparison, and outcomes (as appropriate).</p>	<p>Thorough background provided. Establishes the gap in the field to be addressed. Study addresses an important clinical question. Clear, concise. Ends with a clear, and relevant purpose statement that identifies the target population, intervention, and outcomes (comparison as appropriate).</p>	<p>Adequate background provided. Establishes the gap in the field to be addressed. Study addresses a clinical question. Clear, concise. Ends with a clear purpose statement that identifies the target population, intervention, and outcomes (comparison as appropriate).</p>	<p>Minimal background provided. Suggests there may be a gap in the field to be addressed. Study addresses a clinical question. Clear, but not concise. Ends with a purpose statement that identifies the target population, intervention, and outcomes (comparison as appropriate).</p>	<p>Little background provided. No gap in the field addressed. Clinical question present but missing population or intervention or outcomes. Unclear, wordy, unengaging. Missing the target population, intervention, and outcomes (comparison as appropriate).</p>	<p>No background provided. No gap in the field addressed. No clinical question. Unclear, wordy, unengaging. Does not have a relevant purpose statement. Does not identify the target population, intervention, and outcomes (comparison as appropriate).</p>

	5	4	3	2	1	0
Focused Clinical Question The focused clinical question should reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format).	Explicitly states the focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Clearly states the focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Identifies a focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Missing one part of a focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Missing two or more parts of a focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	No clinical question identified.
Search Strategy peer-reviewed evidence criteria for inclusion/exclusion, databases used, hand search, etc., search terms (combination of terms), number of possible pieces of evidence.	Clearly describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used, hand search, etc.), search terms (combination of terms), and number of possible pieces of evidence	Describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used, hand search, etc.), search terms (combination of terms), and number of possible pieces of evidence but description is somewhat unclear.	Missing one of the key search strategy pieces: describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence, including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used, hand search, etc.), search terms (combination of terms), and number of possible pieces of evidence.	Missing two of the key search strategy pieces: describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence, including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used, hand search, etc.), search terms (combination of terms), and number of possible pieces of evidence.	Missing three or more of the key search strategy pieces: describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence, including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used, hand search, etc.), search terms (combination of terms), and number of possible pieces of evidence.	No search strategy identified.

	5	4	3	2	1	0
<p>Evidence Quality Assessment identify the method(s) used to appraise the evidence. The number of evaluators. How consensus on the article appraisals may have been achieved (if applicable). Recommended methods include PEDro based on the CONSORT statement (www.pedro.org.au/), QUADAS scale based on the STARD statement (www.quadas.org/), and STROBE (www.strobestatement.org/?id=available-checklists).</p>	Clearly and concisely describes the method used to appraise the evidence including the number of evaluators and how consensus may have been achieved (if applicable).	Clearly describes the method used to appraise the evidence including the number of evaluators and how consensus may have been achieved (if applicable).	Description of the method used to appraise the evidence including the number of evaluators and how consensus may have been achieved (if applicable) is present but may be confusing.	Missing one of the following items: the method used to appraise the evidence, the number of evaluators and how consensus may have been achieved (if applicable).	Missing two or more of the following items: the method used to appraise the evidence, the number of evaluators and how consensus may have been achieved (if applicable).	No evidence quality assessment included.
<p>Results and Summary of Search This section should synthesize what the researcher(s) found when conducting their search including key findings and the strengths/weaknesses of the evidence found. This should be in the researchers' own word and not a restatement of the words of the authors of the evidence used.</p>	Clear, concise and relevant synthesis of the results and summarizes the key findings. Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used to answer the clinical question.	A clear, and relevant synthesis of the results and summarizes the key findings. Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used to answer the clinical question.	A clear synthesis of the results and summarizes the key findings. Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used to answer the clinical question.	A summary of the results and the key findings. Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used to answer the clinical question.	A summary of the results and the key findings. Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used to answer the clinical question is missing.	Results and summary of search section missing.

	5	4	3	2	1	0
Clinical Bottom Line Clearly communicates an answer to the clinical question and includes the strength of the recommendation.	Clearly and concisely communicates the answer to the focused clinical question and clearly relates the findings to clinical practice. Strength of recommendation clearly identified. Results are accurately interpreted and applied.	Clearly communicates the answer to the focused clinical question and clearly relates the findings to clinical practice. Strength of recommendation clearly identified. Results are accurately interpreted and applied.	Communicates the answer to the focused clinical question and relates the findings to clinical practice. Strength of recommendation may be present. Results are accurately interpreted and applied.	Unclearly communicates the answer to the focused clinical question. Attempts to relate the findings to clinical practice. No strength of recommendation identified. Results are interpreted and applied.	Communicates the answer to the focused clinical question. No attempt made to relate the findings to clinical practice. No strength of recommendation identified. Attempt was made to interpret and apply results.	No clinical bottom line present.
Implications discusses the implications of this CAT for clinical practice, education, and research.	Study findings challenge or build on current knowledge. The impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is clearly identified.	Study findings challenge or build on current knowledge. The impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is identified.	Study findings relate to current knowledge. The impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is identified.	Unclear if study findings may relate to current knowledge. An attempt to identify the impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is made.	An attempt to identify the impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is made.	No implications identified.
Writing Appropriate verb tense (present/past when talking about study, future tense for contribution to the discipline).	Writing clear, concise, engaging and appropriate for the profession; Defines all acronyms at first use; Appropriate verb tense used.	Writing clear, engaging and appropriate for the profession; Defines all acronyms at first use; Appropriate verb tense used.	Writing clear, appropriate for the profession; Defines all acronyms at first use; Appropriate verb tense used.	Writing clear, appropriate for the profession; Defines all acronyms at first use; Appropriate verb tense used most of the time	Writing unclear or inappropriate for the profession; acronyms not defined; inappropriate verb tense used.	Writing unclear and inappropriate for the profession; acronyms not defined; inappropriate verb tense used.

Comments:

