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**Directions for use of the Individual Evidence Summary Tool**

**Purpose:** Use this form to document and collate the results of the review and appraisal of each piece of evidence in preparation for evidence synthesis. The table headers indicate important elements of each article that will contribute to the synthesis process. The data in each cell should be complete enough that the other team members are able to gather all relevant information related to the evidence without having to go to each source article.

**See Chapter 11, Lessons from Practice, for examples of completed tools.**

**Reviewer name(s):**

Record the member(s) of the team who are providing the information for each article. This will provide tracking if there are follow-up items or additional questions on an individual piece of evidence.

**Article number:**

Assign a number to each piece of evidence included in the table. This organizes the individual evidence summary and provides an easy way to reference articles.

**Author, date, and title:**

Record the last name of the first author of the article, the publication/communication date, and the title. This will help track articles throughout the literature search, screening, and review process. It is also helpful when someone has authored more than one publication included in the review.

**Type of evidence:**

Indicate the type of evidence for each source. This should be descriptive of the study or project design (e.g., randomized control trial, meta-analysis, mixed methods, qualitative, systematic review, case study, literature review) and not simply the level on the evidence hierarchy.

**Population, size, and setting:**

For research evidence, provide a quick view of the population, number of participants, and study location. For non-research evidence population refers to target audience, patient population, or profession. Non-research evidence may or may not have a sample size and/or location as found with research evidence.

**Intervention:**

Record the intervention(s) implemented or discussed in the article. This should relate to the intervention or comparison elements of your PICO question.

**Findings that help answer the EBP question:**

List findings from the article that directly answer the EBP question. These should be succinct statements that provide enough information that the reader does not need to return to the original article. Avoid directly copying and pasting from the article.

**Measures used**:

These are the measures and/or instruments (e.g., counts, rates, satisfaction surveys, validated tools, subscales) the authors used to determine the answer to the research question or the effectiveness of their intervention. Consider these measures as identified in the evidence for collection during implementation of the EBP team’s project.

**Limitations:**

Provide the limitations of the evidence—both as listed by the authors as well as your assessment of any flaws or drawbacks. Consider the methodology, quality of reporting, and generalizability to the population of interest. Limitations should be apparent from the team’s appraisals using the Research and Non-Research Evidence Appraisal Tools (Appendices E and F). It can be helpful to consider the reasons an article did not receive a “high” quality rating because these reasons are limitations identified by the team.

**Evidence level and quality:**

Using the Research and Non-Research Evidence Appraisal tools (Appendices E and F), record the level (I-V) and quality (A, B or C) of the evidence. When possible, at least two reviewers should determine the level and quality.

**Notes to team:**

The team uses this section to keep track of items important to the EBP process not captured elsewhere on this tool. Consider items that will be helpful to have easy reference to when conducting the evidence synthesis.