## CIVAS SYSTEMATIC REVIEW: QUALITY ASSESSMENT – OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES

| Population (tick one box) PAPER ID:   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Sample size:   |  |
| a) Strong – power calculation provided   ◆  |  |
| b) Strong – included all OPAT patients  |  |
| c) Strong – appropriate size for qualitative study  |  |
| d) Insufficient – no power calculation or selective/small study                           |  |
| e) Unclear – not enough information provided  |  |
| Methodology: (tick one box)   |  |
| 2. Method to ascertain data:  |  |
| a) Strong – not open to selection bias*   ◆   |  |
| b) Strong – appropriate qualitative methodology   |  |
| c) Moderate – open to some bias but appropriate method used                               |  |
| d) Insufficient – inappropriate method used to ascertain data                             |  |
| e) Unclear – not enough information provided  |  |
| Analysis: (tick one box)  |  |
| 3. Data analysis:   |  |
| a) Strong – reports statistically significant differences in outcomes   ◆                 |  |
| b) Strong – relevant qualitative analytic techniques                                      |  |
| c) Moderate – used only comparative analysis with no statistical testing of differences O |  |
| d) Moderate – reported only descriptive statistics  |  |

## **ASSESSMENT OF THE RISK OF BIAS:**

| Potential bias: | Selection | Analysis   |  |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|--|
|                 | Method    | ASSESSMENT |  |

<sup>\*</sup> Systematic differences between comparison groups in terms of selection, prognosis or treatment; differences in group characteristics.