Respiratory Effectiveness Group

REal Life EVidence AssessmeNt Tool (RELEVANT)

If all primary sub-items are satisfied, then the study may be suitable for use in guideline development; otherwise, the study may not be suitable. If all primary sub-items are satisfied, then the user evaluates secondary sub-items to enable further descriptive appraisal of the relative strengths and weaknesses.

PRIMARY ITEMS: ***To determine suitability for use in guideline development***		**Yes/No**	**Comments**
1. Background	1.1. Clearly stated research question		
2. Design	2.1 Population defined		
	2.2. Comparison groups defined and justified		
3. Measures	3.1. Exposure (e.g. treatment) is clearly defined (if not relevant, write NA)		
	3.2. Primary outcomes defined		
4. Analysis	4.1. Potential confounders are addressed		
	4.2. Study groups are compared at baseline		
5. Results	5.1. Results are clearly presented for all primary and secondary endpoints as well as confounders		
6. Discussion / Interpretation	6.1. Results consistent with known information or if not, an explanation is provided		
	6.2 The clinical relevance of the results is discussed		
7. Conflict of interests	7.1. Potential conflicts of interest, including study funding, are stated		
	Total number of "Yes" responses (or NA for item 3.1)		
	Total number of "No" responses		
	Total Score (% of all criteria met)		

Respiratory Effectiveness Group

REal Life EVidence AssessmeNt Tool (RELEVANT)

SECONDARY ITEMS: *For general appraisal of a study*		Yes/No	Comments
1. Background	1.1. The research is based on a review of the background literature (ideal standard is a systematic review)		
2. Design	2.1. Evidence of a priori design, e.g. protocol registration in a dedicated website		
	2.2 Population justified		
	2.3 The data source (or database), as described, contains adequate exposures and outcome variables to answer the research question. (If not relevant, write NA)		
	2.4 Setting justified		
3. Measures	3.1 Sample size / Power pre-specified		
4. Analysis	***NO SECONDARY ITEMS***	N/A	
5. Results	5.1. Flow chart explaining all exclusions and individuals screened or selected at each stage of defining the final sample		
	5.2. The authors describe the statistical uncertainty of their findings (e.g. p-values, confidence intervals)		
	5.3. The extent of missing data is reported		
6. Discussion / Interpretation	6.1. Possible biases and/or confounding factors described		
7. Conflict of interests	***NO SECONDARY ITEMS***	N/A	
	Total number of "Yes" responses (or NA for item 2.3)		
	Total number of "No" responses		
	Total Score (% of all criteria met)		