The social care guidance manual appendix H

30 April 2013

Appendix H Examples of evidence tables

Appendix H includes examples of evidence tables for those study designs that are expected to be used in the evidence reviews for NICE social care guidance. Other evidence tables can found in the NICE clinical guidelines manual and Methods for the development of NICE public health guidance.

H1: Example of an evidence table for intervention studies

Title: (review question)

Bibliographic reference	Study type	Number of participants	Participant characteristics	Intervention	Setting(s)	Comparison	Length of follow-up	Outcome measures and effect size	Source of funding	Quality assessment	Additional comments
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]
.											

[1] Bibliographic reference: author(s), year, article title, journal, volume, pages.

[2] Study type: for example, randomised controlled trial, cohort or case-control studies.

[3] Number of participants: total number of participants included in the study, including number of participants in each arm, with inclusion and exclusion criteria. Also record the numbers of participants who started and completed the study.

[4] Participant characteristics: characteristics relevant to the area of interest: age, sex, ethnic origin, condition status and comorbidity.

[5] Intervention: treatment, service, procedure or test studied. If important for the study, specify duration of treatment.

[6] Setting: the setting(s) when the intervention(s) was delivered (for example care homes).

[7] Comparison: alternative treatment or 'standard care'.

[8] Length of follow-up: the length of time that participants take part in the study for, from first staging treatment until either a pre-specified end-point or the end of the data-gathering phase is reached. If the study is stopped earlier than originally planned for any reason, this should be noted here.

[9] Outcome measures: list all outcome measures defined in the review protocol, including associated harms.

Effect size: for example, raw data from the study that allow further analyses, as required. Give confidence intervals whenever possible.

[10] Source of funding: for example the Department of Health or Economic and Social Research Council. Also detail the role of funding organisations.

[11] Quality assessment: Provide an assessment of the overall quality of the study, rating the study for both internal and external validity (using ++, +, −). Rating of external validity should be prefixed with 'EV'.

[12] Additional comments: additional characteristics and/or interpretations of the studies that the reviewer wishes to record. These might include important flaws and limitations in the study not identifiable from other data in the table, and additional questions or issues that will need to be considered but do not figure in the results tables in the study.

H2: Example of an evidence table for qualitative studies

Title: (review question)

Reference	Research parameters				Population	Setting(s)	Outcomes	Funding	Quality assessment	Additional comments	
Bibliographic reference	Research question	Theoretical approach	Data collection	Method and process of analysis	Population and sample collection	Setting(s) where the study was undertaken	Key themes	Source of funding	Rate the study (using ++, +, −)	Limitations	Evidence gap
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]
.											

[1] Bibliographic reference: author(s), year, article title, journal, volume, pages.

[2] Research question: what was/were the research question(s)?

[3] Theoretical approach: what theoretical approach (for example, grounded theory, interpretive phenomenological analysis) does the study take (if specified)?

[4] Data collection: how were the data collected? Give details of:

- method(s)
- by whom
- when.

[5] Method and process of analysis: what methods were used to analyse the data (for example, constant comparative method)?

[6] Population and sample collection: what population was the sample recruited from? Include the following information:

- how they were recruited (for example, specify the type of purposive sampling)
- how many participants were recruited
- specific exclusion criteria
- specific inclusion criteria.

[7] Setting(s): The setting(s) where the qualitative study was undertaken (for example, care homes, hospice, day centre, service user's own home).

[8] Key themes: list all relevant to this review (with illustrative quotes if available).

[9] Source of funding: for example the Department of Health or Economic and Social Research Council, and the role of funding organisations.

[10] Quality assessment: provide an assessment of the overall quality of the study. Rate the study for internal validity (using ++, +, −).

Most qualitative studies by their very nature will not be generalisable. However, where there is reason to suppose the results would have broader applicability they should be assessed for external validity. Qualitative studies that are rated for external validity should be prefixed with 'EV' (external validity).

[11] Limitations: both those identified by the author(s) and those identified by the reviewer.

[12] Evidence gap and/or recommendations for future research.

H3: Example of an evidence table for economic evaluation studies

Study details	Population and setting	Intervention / comparator	Outcomes and methods of analysis	Results	Notes
Authors: **Year:** **Type of economic analysis:** **Quality score:** (++, +, −) Applicability:	**Source population(s):** Describe population characteristics (age, sex, ethnicity and other socioeconomic variables where available). **Setting:** Provide details on country (including developed or non-developed) and other setting features, e.g. public or private system, workplace, schools and location (urban / rural). **Data sources:** Whether through primary research, published studies or sources, meta-analyses or decision-analytic techniques.	**Intervention(s):** Describe in detail, including: • what delivered • by whom • to whom • how delivered • when/where • how often • how long for. **Comparator:** describe comparators or controls as for interventions, above. **Sample sizes:** Total n= Intervention n= Control n=	**Outcomes:** Include details of all relevant outcome measures, whether objective, subjected or otherwise validated. **Time horizon:** **Discount rates:** Benefits Costs **Perspective:** **Measures of uncertainty:** Modelling method:	**Primary results:** Benefits Costs ICER (for CUA, CEA) B:C ratio (for CBA) Separate B and C for each consequence of CCA Other measures to be confirmed with NICE for each topic **Secondary analysis:** Sensitivity analyses.	Limitations **identified by author:** **Limitations identified by review team:** **Evidence gaps and/or recommendations for future research:** **Source of funding:** For example, government (public sector), third sector, commercial companies, and the role of the funding organisations.

Please complete for all headings and note where data is 'Not reported' or 'Not applicable'.

The social care guidance manual

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
Level 1A, City Tower
Piccadilly Plaza
Manchester M1 4BT
www.nice.org.uk

Produced by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

First issued April 2013