## System for Grading the Strength of a Body of Qualitative Evidence

*Use this section for a final grade for a Body of Evidence by evaluating overall type & number, rigor, credibility, & relevance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Evidence</th>
<th>Fair Evidence</th>
<th>Insufficient Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type &amp; Number Of Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type &amp; Number Of Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type &amp; Number Of Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • At least one well-designed and conducted Meta-synthesis (MS) of qualitative theories, grand narratives, generalizations, or interpretive translations (consider heterogeneity/homogeneity).  
  OR  
• Two or more well-designed and conducted prospective qualitative studies that meet all criteria of the specific design methodology.  
  OR  
• At least two well-designed and conducted qualitative studies from different design methodologies that meet all criteria of each specific design methodology AND come to common descriptions/themes. | • Single well-designed and conducted Meta-synthesis (MS) of qualitative theories, grand narratives, generalizations, or interpretive translations (consider heterogeneity/homogeneity).  
  OR  
• One well-designed and conducted prospective qualitative study that meets all criteria of the specific design methodology.  
  OR  
• One lower quality qualitative study. | 

(Use this section to grade individual studies by evaluating each study’s rigor, credibility, & relevance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Evidence</th>
<th>Fair Evidence</th>
<th>Insufficient Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rigor/Quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rigor/Quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rigor/Quality</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Description is consistent with identified tradition of inquiry  
• Systematic approach to data collection, data analysis, and description of findings  
• Adequate sample selection method and size for study design method  
• Multiple sources of data; triangulation used when appropriate  
• Multiple levels of abstraction for data analysis  
• Risk of bias clearly identified  
• No major methodological concerns | • Description is consistent with identified tradition of inquiry  
• Systematic approach to data analysis and description of findings  
• Questions concerning sample selection method and size for study design method  
• At least 2 levels of abstraction for data analysis  
• Bias risk eluded to or implied  
• Minor methodological concerns | • Unable to identify tradition of inquiry  
• Little-to-no systematic approach to data collection, data analysis, and description of findings  
• Questions concerning sample selection method and size for study design method  
• Little-to-no abstraction for data analysis  
• Bias evident  
• Major methodological concerns |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Evidence</th>
<th>Fair Evidence</th>
<th>Insufficient Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility/Consistency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credibility/Consistency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credibility/Consistency</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • For MS, no major conflict in results (consider heterogeneity/homogeneity). If significant heterogeneity exists, drop to “Insufficient.”  
  • No major conflict in results or prognosis in similar populations. If major conflicts exist, drop to “Insufficient.”  
  • Meets all Validity Criteria:  
    o **Authenticity**: Multiple realities of participants have been synthesized.  
    o **Confirmability**: Presented data is objective and neutral; external judges used when consistent with design methodology.  
    o **Credibility**: Confidence in data truth and interpretation.  
    o **Criticality**: Low risk of personal biases, preconceived notions, and other influencing elements.  
    o **Dependability**: Data remains stable over time & conditions; is reproducible.  
    o **Transferability**: Findings can be easily transferred to other settings or groups. | • For MS, no major conflict in results (consider heterogeneity/homogeneity). If significant heterogeneity exists, drop to “Insufficient.”  
  • No major conflict in results or prognosis in similar populations. If major conflicts exist, drop to “Insufficient.”  
  • Meets the following Validity Criteria:  
    o **Authenticity**: Multiple realities of participants have been analyzed.  
    o **Confirmability**: Presented data is objective and neutral; external judges used when consistent with design methodology.  
    o **Dependability**: Data remains stable over time & conditions; is reproducible. | • Studies are well designed and conducted, but with major conflict in results and/or heterogeneity.  
• Major conflict in results and heterogeneity exists.  
• Fails to meet any Validity Criteria:  
  o **Authenticity**  
  o **Confirmability**  
  o **Credibility**  
  o **Criticality**  
  o **Dependability**  
  o **Transferability** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Evidence</th>
<th>Fair Evidence</th>
<th>Insufficient Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevancy/Feasibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relevancy/Feasibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relevancy/Feasibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Benefits of practice change outweigh the risks to the patients.  
• No compelling reason not to transfer results of the published work to the target KP population. | • Some benefits of practice change outweigh the risks to the patients.  
• Some compelling reasons not to transfer results of the published work to the target KP population. | • Risks to the patients outweigh the benefits of the practice change.  
• Compelling reasons not to transfer results of the published work to the target KP population. |
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