

**PRIMARY AUTHOR NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**POSTER TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I: Study Critique**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Title:</b> Suggests key variables & population?			
<b>Abstract:</b> Clear? Concise? Includes problem, methods, research conclusions?			
<b>Introduction/Background:</b> Problem stated clearly? Expresses a relationship between 2 or more variables? Does it identify population under study? Is there adequate background material referenced to substantiate the problem?			
<b>Purpose/Objective(s):</b> Narrow, clear, measurable? Identify research variables, population, and setting?			
<b>Hypotheses/Research questions:</b> Stated objectively without value laden words? Testable?			
<b>Variables &amp; Outcomes:</b> Clearly defined operationally? Adequate demographic variables examined in study?			
<b>Ethics:</b> Human subjects protection noted? IRB review noted?			
<b>Design-Intervention/Treatment/Education:</b> Does the study include a treatment or intervention? If so is the treatment defined operationally? Clearly described? Consistently implemented/used? Was the control of comparison condition adequately explained? Was any control or comparison group intervention described? Were groups being compared equivalent before the intervention/treatment? Were blinding procedures used? If not, is there an explanation? Are statistical analyses used and appropriate?			
<b>Setting/Sample:</b> Setting appropriate? Sample described (gender, age, ethnicity, wound etiology, duration, location, size)? Sample size adequate (only one wound/patient)? Inclusion/exclusion criteria clear and appropriate? Is consent rate reported? Withdrawals reported with reason?			
<b>Instruments:</b> Validity/Reliability examined or reported? If <u>survey/questionnaires</u> used, are they described in terms of reading level of questions, how developed, respondent burden? Techniques to administer, complete, and score tools provided? If <u>observations</u> conducted, was there an observational guide? Any reason to believe the observations affected the subjects' behavior? If <u>interview</u> , did the design or sequence of questions avoid bias of subjects responses? If <u>physiologic instruments</u> , is calibration addressed? Is accuracy, precision, sensitivity/specificity addressed?			
Data collection procedures described and the same for all subjects? Any bias possible in those who collected data? training noted?			
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data analysis procedures clearly described? Statistical analyses reported with significance levels? Descriptive analyses used to describe sample?			

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Results:</b> Understandable?			
Tables & figures clear?			
Is there enough information to judge the results?			
Are the analyses interpreted appropriately?			
Are the biases in the study identified?			
Are any generalizations made? IF so, are they within the scope of the findings?			
<b>Discussion/Conclusions:</b> Does the researcher identify limitations?			
Are generalizations made that are not warranted on the basis of the sample used?			
Are any unwarranted interpretations of causality made?			
Are given implications appropriate given the study's limitations and given the body of evidence from other studies?			

**Part II: Summary statement (1-2 paragraphs)**

Briefly describe the study. Provide an overview of the strengths and limitations of the study in light of the review. Identify how the study could be improved.