

Evidence Sheet: *Child protection Bruises aspects Study (COBS update 2013)*Critical appraisal form for **case series and case studies; case-control, cross-sectional, uncontrolled before & after, prospective cohort / longitudinal, retrospective cohort study, (interrupted time series)**

Reviewers name:

Date:

Citation including IDENTIFIER (number):

Section A.

	Study Type: please tick study type			Study Type: please tick study type	
O ₁	case-control		O ₃	prospective cohort/ longitudinal	
O ₂	cross-sectional		O ₄	retrospective cohort study	
O ₂	interrupted time series		O ₅	case-series	
O ₃	uncontrolled before and after study		O ₆	case study	

Section B.

Does this study address either of the following key questions: (include studies of < 18 years)		Yes
1	Can you age bruises in live children?	
2	Are there diagnostic or suggestive patterns of bruising in abused children? Include:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparative papers that describe abusive/accidental bruising Abusive bruising patterns only Accidental bruising patterns only 	

Exclusion Criteria (please tick any of the following criteria which apply)

- Does not address key questions []
- Formal consensus / expert opinion / personal practice / review article []
- Rank of abuse is 4 OR 5 OR mixed rank, where relevant cases cannot be extracted nor part of original exclusion criteria (Q2 Only) []
- Adult only data OR mixed adult & child data, where child data cannot be isolated []
- Methodologically flawed papers []

Section C.**Additional Study Quality Criteria Required**

1.	How have the authors defined abuse? (Please state criteria used)			
2.	ONLY RELATES TO COBS RESEARCH Q2 – ABUSE CASES What ranking of abuse criteria would you apply? 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 ranks – please specify		
		Not applicable (if study does not relate to Q”, abuse cases)		
		If study has a level 4 or 5 ranking, or is mixed (with level 4/5 and another, but the relevant higher ranked cases cannot be extracted), it should be EXCLUDED (If study is excluded go to the end of critical appraisal form)		
Have the authors actively excluded abuse from any NON-ABUSED group? (accidental and / or organic cause) <i>If your study does not contain any comparative data, (concerns NAI only) please tick here :</i>		Yes	No	N/A
N/A []				
A ¹ .	Independently witnessed accidental cause or forensic recreation of scene			
A ² .	By confirmation of organic disease (diagnostic test and / or diagnosis from clinical profile)			
B ¹ .	By multi-disciplinary assessment and child protection clinical investigation			
B ² .	Consistent account of accident by the same individual over time			
B ³ .	By checking either the child abuse register or records of previous abuse			
C ¹ .	Accidental cause / organic diagnosis stated but no detail given			
C ² .	No attempt made to exclude abuse / no detail given			

Section D.

Methodological Quality Criteria.¹ Please tick the appropriate column.	Yes	No	Unclear	N/A or I do not know
1. Were the aims of the study clearly stated?				
2. Was the study clearly focused in terms of population selected, the comparative features assessed (where appropriate ie comparative studies) and outcomes considered?				
3. Do the authors appear to have conducted a preparatory unbiased literature review to identify current state of knowledge?				
4. Was the choice of study method appropriate?				
5. Are the inclusion criteria explicit?				
6. Have the results of the study been clearly presented?				
7. Are the data in the tables or graphs and the text consistent?				
8. Were all important outcomes/ results considered?				
for Comparative Studies only (eg cross sectional, case control)				
9. Was study size considered and is it likely to have affected the results?				
10. Was the ascertainment clearly stated?				
11. Was the comparison group appropriately chosen?				
12. Was the comparison group enrolled in the same time period and assessed in the same way as the abused group?				
13. Were the statistical methods used appropriately?				

¹ Adapted from the following sources:

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme: <http://www.phru.nhs.uk/Pages/PHD/CASP.htm>

Undertaking systematic reviews of research on effectiveness. University of York: NHS Centre for Reviews & Dissemination, 2001;

Polgar A, Thomas SA. Chapter 22. Critical evaluation of published research in Introduction to research in the health sciences. 3rd edition. Melbourne: Churchill Livingstone, 1995;

Weightman AL, Mann MK, Sander L and Turley RL Health Evidence Bulletins Wales, A systematic approach to identifying the evidence, Project Methodology 5. Cardiff:

Information Services UWCM, January 2004

Rychetnik L, Frommer M A schema for evaluating evidence on public health interventions version 4, National Public Health Partnership, Melbourne 2002

Section E.

Reviewer's Conclusion and Comments	
Key points meriting inclusion (list strengths)	
Weaknesses, potential confounders and study limitations	

Section E.

Final Decision	Yes	No	Comment
Is the study included? <i>If you have suggested contacting the authors for further information (e.g. regarding confirmation of abuse) please select INCLUDE if you feel the study meets all other requisite inclusion criteria</i>			
If the study is excluded, should it be kept for background information, introduction or discussion?			

Section G.

Additional comments (e.g. write to authors)