

Critical appraisal form Richtlijn blauwe plekken

* Required

Reviewers name*

Date*

Month	▼	Day	▼	2015	▼	
-------	---	-----	---	------	---	---

Name author article*

Title article*

Study type*

- ☐ Case-control
- ☐ Cross-sectional
- ☐ Interrupted time series
- ☐ Uncontrolled before and after study
- ☐ Prospective cohort/longitudinal
- ☐ Retrospective cohort study
- ☐ Case-series
- ☐ Case-study

Is the study prospective or retrospective?

- ☐ Prospective
- ☐ Retrospective

Can you age bruises in live children?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Are there diagnostic or suggestive patterns of bruising in abused children?*

- ☐ Comparative paper that describes abusive/accidental bruising

- ☐ Abusive bruising only
- ☐ Accidental bruising only

What is the rank of abuse?*

How have the authors defined abuse? - Rank 1: Abuse confirmed at case conference, family, civil or criminal court proceedings, admitted by perpetrator, independently witnessed or described by victim. - Rank 2: Abuse confirmed by stated/referenced criteria including multi-disciplinary assessment. - Rank 3: Abuse defined by stated criteria. - Rank 4: Abuse stated but no supporting detail given. - Rank 5: Suspected abuse. - Mixed ranking

- ☐ Rank 1
- ☐ Rank 2
- ☐ Rank 3
- ☐ Rank 4
- ☐ Rank 5
- ☐ Mixed ranking
- ☐ NA

How have the authors defined abuse?

Please state criteria used

Are there any exclusion criteria present? If the answer is 'yes' (and the paper is excluded), go to the last question of critical appraisal form.*

- Does not address key questions - Formal consensus/expert opinion/personal practices/review article - Rank of abuse is 4 OR 5 OR mixed rank, where relevant cases cannot be extracted nor part of original exclusion criteria - Adult only data OR mixed adult & child data, where child data cannot be isolated - Methodologically flawed paper - Single case report.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Quality criteria

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

If your study does not contain any comparative data, (concerns NAI only) please tick for all the quality criteria questions N/A.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

Independently witnessed accidental cause or forensic recreation of scene

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

- ☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

By confirmation of organic disease (diagnostic test and/or diagnosis from clinical profile)

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

By multi-disciplinary assessment and child protection clinical investigation

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

Consistent account of accident by the same individual over time

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

By checking either the child abuse register or records of previous abuse

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

Accidental cause / organic diagnosis stated but no detail given

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

No attempt made to exclude abuse / no detail given

Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and/or organic cause)

☐ Yes

- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

Methodological quality criteria

Where the aims of the study clearly stated?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Was the study clearly focussed in terms of population selected, the comparative features assessed (where appropriate ie comparative studies) and outcomes considered?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Do the authors appear to have conducted a preparatory unbiased literature review or identify current state of knowledge?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Was the choice of study method appropriate?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Are the inclusion criteria explicit?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear

☐ N/A or I don't know

Have the results of the study been clearly stated?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Are the data in the tables or graphs and the text consistent?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Were all important outcomes/ results considered?

Methodological quality criteria

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Was the study size considered and is it unlikely to have affected the results?

Methodological quality criteria for COMPARATIVE STUDIES ONLY (eg cross sectional, case control)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Was the ascertainment clearly stated?

Methodological quality criteria for COMPARATIVE STUDIES ONLY (eg cross sectional, case control)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Was the comparison group appropriately chosen?

Methodological quality criteria for COMPARATIVE STUDIES ONLY (eg cross sectional, case control)

- ☐ Yes

- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Was the comparison group enrolled in the same time period and assessed in the same way as the abused group?

Methodological quality criteria for COMPARATIVE STUDIES ONLY (eg cross sectional, case control)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Were the statistical methods used appropriately?

Methodological quality criteria for COMPARATIVE STUDIES ONLY (eg cross sectional, case control)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear
- ☐ N/A or I don't know

Extra questions

Does the study answer one of our questions? Ie patterns, ageing, child factors etc.*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear

Which information from this study can be used in our guideline?

Key points meriting inclusion (list strengths)

Reviewer's conclusion and comments

Weakness, potential confounders and study limitations

Reviewer's conclusion and comments

Decision before CASP - Is the study included?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

☐ Unclear

CASP Case Control Study Checklist

Did the study address a clearly focused issue?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Can't tell

Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Can't tell

Were the cases recruited in an acceptable way?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Can't tell

Were the controls selected in an acceptable way?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Can't tell

Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Can't tell

What confounding factors have the authors confounded for?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

Have the authors taken account of the potential confounding factors?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes

- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

What are the results of this study?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

How precise are the results? How precise is the estimate of risk?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

Do you believe the results?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Can the results be applied to the local population?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Do the results of this study fit with other available evidence?

CASP - Case Control Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

CASP Case Cohort Study Checklist

Did the study address a clearly focused issue?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Was the cohort recruited in an acceptable way?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Have the authors identified all important cofounding factors? List the ones you think might be important that the author missed by 'other'.

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ Other: _____

Have they taken account of the confounding factors in the design and/or analysis? List by 'other'.

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell
- ☐ Other: _____

Was the follow up of subjects complete enough?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Was the follow up of subjects long enough?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

☐ Can't tell

What are the results of this study?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

How precise are the results?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

Do you believe the results?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Can the results be applied to the local population?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

Do the results of this study fit with other available evidence?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Can't tell

What are the implications of this study for practice?

CASP - Case Cohort Study Checklist

Final

Should we include this study for our guideline? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unclear

Extra comments?

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

Powered by

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

[Report Abuse](#)-[Terms of Service](#)-[Additional Terms](#)

