

Supplemental Material. Resident article evaluation rubric with four new questions in *bold and italics*.

A Worksheet for Articles about Treatment

Determine *Relevance*

Is this article worth taking the time to read? If the answer to any of these questions is No, it may be better to read other articles first.

Based on the conclusion of the abstract:

- A. Did the authors study an outcome that patients would *care* about? (Be careful to avoid results that require extrapolation to an outcome that truly matters to patients)

Yes (go on)

No (**stop**)

- B. Is the problem studied one that is *common* to your practice and the intervention

feasible? Yes (go on) No (**stop**)

- C. Will this information, if true, require you to *change* your current

practice? Yes (go on) No (**stop**)

Determine *Validity*:

If the answers to all three questions above are Yes, then continued assessment of the article is mandatory

D. Population

- | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------|
| 1. Are the studied patients similar enough to your patients that you can apply the results in your practice? | Yes | No (Stop) |
| 2. <i>Is the study sample representative of the study's target population (do the authors report sample characteristics including age, gender, race, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, and socioeconomic status)?</i> | Yes | No |
| A. <i>If the sample is not representative, do the authors address this in the limitations section of the paper?</i> | Yes | No |

E. Study design

- | | | |
|--|------|-----------|
| 1. Was it a controlled trial (were the subjects divided into at least 2 groups?) | Yes. | No (Stop) |
| 2. Were the subjects randomly assigned? | Yes | No (Stop) |
| 3. Were steps taken to conceal the eventual treatment assignment from study personnel entering patients into the study? | Yes | No |
| 4. Were patients, providers and outcome assessors masked (blinded) to treatment assignment? | Yes | No |
| 5. <i>Do the authors describe engaging or partnering with the community they are studying as part of their research?</i> | Yes | No |
| A. <i>If so, at what stage(s) (e.g., developing the research question, study design, data collection, data analysis, sharing results, etc.)?</i> | | |
-

F. Study conduct

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Were all patients who entered the trial properly accounted for at its conclusion? | Yes | No |
| A. Was follow-up complete? | Yes | No |
| B. Were patients analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized (“intention-to-treat” analysis)? | Yes | No |
| 2. Were the intervention and control groups similar? (Table 1) | Yes | No |
| 3. <i>Are there any instances of non-inclusive language used to describe people or groups of people (e.g. “Caucasian” instead of White, “Non-white” instead of reporting specific racial or ethnic groups, etc.)?</i> | Yes | No |

G. Study results

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. What were the results? _____ | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| 2. Are the results clinically relevant as well as statistically significant? | Yes | No |
| 3. If a negative trial, was the power of the study adequate? | Yes | No |
| 4. Were there other factors that might have affected the outcome? | Yes | No |
| 5. <i>Do the authors report outcomes based on race?</i> | Yes | No |
| A. <i>Do they discuss race as a biological factor?</i> | Yes | No |
| B. <i>Do they account for social determinants of health or racism as an alternate cause of the outcomes?</i> | Yes | No |
| 6. How will it change your practice? | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| <hr/> | | |

Revision 2013: Information Mastery Working Group. Adapted from material developed at McMaster University