## SIMPLIFIED TREATMENT AND PROGNOSIS LITERATURE EBM EVALUATION

1.	Title:										
2.	Author/Yr/Journal:										
3.	Primary Hypothesis:										
4.	4. Secondary Hypothesis:										
5. Tertiary Hypothesis:											
COMPARATIVE STUDY DESIGN (check appropriate box)											
Pro	ospective	RCT	RCT			Initial n =			"Avg Age" =		
Ref	trospective	Coh	Cohort			Length f/u =			M/F =		
Journal	LOE =	Case	Case Control			% of f/u =()					
OUTCOME EVALUATION											
				I COME EV	ALUAI					T	
Comparison Groups						Evaluation of Absolute Difference					
						_	Р	If not,			
				Absolu		Stats	value	power		Alter*	
Out	come Measured	Grp 1	Grp 2	Difference		Significant?	=	ok?	Clinically relevant?	Practice?	
		1		1				I			

KPS:lsc 02/17/11 (Simp EBM Eval) Ref: JAAOS, Spindler 2005

All ? answered Y (yes), N (no), M (maybe), or U (unsure)
\* To alter practice the difference should at minimum be statistically and clinically relevant differences.