

Evaluation of Primary Literature Checklist

Article Title:

	Checklist item	Y/N	S/W	Justification
1.	Is the journal in which the article appears considered to be a reputable one?			
2.	Is the title consistent with the scope of the summary?			
3.	Are the investigators considered to be reliable and was the study conducted in a reputable medical center or university teaching hospital? If not, is the location adequate for application of good scientific experimental method?			
4.	Are the objectives and/or hypothesis (i.e., purpose) of the study clearly defined?			
5.	Was a power calculation performed?			
6.	How many patients were enrolled in the study?	N=___	X	
7.	Were inclusion and exclusion criteria appropriate for the purposes of the study?			
8.	In addition to inclusion/exclusion criteria, was adequate pertinent patient information provided? (e.g. disease severity, demographics, previous treatment failure, smoking status, lifestyle habits, etc.)?			
9.	Were recruitment methods targeted toward persons likely to be representative of the applicable population?			
10.	Was the trial prospective or retrospective?			
11.	Was a control established?			
12.	If so, was the type of control appropriate?			
13.	Were the study drug and control treatments allocated in a random manner? (If given, what was the method of randomization used?)			
14.	Were characteristics of the groups similar after randomization?			
15.	Was the study blinded?			
16.	If so, were blinding techniques appropriate to the study?			
17.	Were drug doses and regimens appropriate? (e.g. within known therapeutic ranges, safe, proper interval, equally effective doses when active drugs are compared?)			
18.	Was the treatment duration adequate for assessing the treatment effect?			
19.	Were any drugs used concurrently?			

	Checklist item	Y/N	S/W	Justification
20.	Was concurrent drug use discussed?			
21.	Were outcome measures subjective or objective?			
22.	Were the persons responsible for assessment of outcome measures described adequately (e.g. authors, physicians, pharmacists, nurses, non-clinicians, etc.)?			
23.	Did authors discuss any factors or influences that may have affected the results of the outcome measures? (If applicable, please note any that were not discussed by the authors)			
24.	Were there any problems in the reporting or accuracy of the results (e.g. did text and table/graph data agree, any missing data?)			
25.	Were side effects reported?			
26.	Were the nature and incidence of the side effects reported?			
27.	Were dropouts reported?			
28.	Were the precise reasons for dropouts discussed?			
29.	Were dropouts accounted for statistically (e.g. intent-to-treat analysis)?			
30.	If a power calculation was performed, was power met at the end of the study?			
31.	Were all statistical tests used appropriate for the type of data (nominal, ordinal, or interval) being analyzed?			
32.	Were the authors' conclusions and/or recommendations consistent with the results obtained?			
33.	Does the article provide a reference list to verify footnoted citations?			
Other strengths/weakness specific to this article				
1.				
2.				
3.				

