# **Appendix 4**

# The quality assessment tool for before-after (pre-post) studies with no control group: scores of included studies.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Scale Itemsa | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Score |
| Holm et al. (2015) | | Y | NR | N | CD | CD | N | Y | N | N | Y | N | NA | M |

a Refer to table below for criteria

The quality assessment tool for before-after (pre-post) studies with no control group: criteria.

| Criteria | Scale Items |
| --- | --- |
| Was the study question or objective clearly stated? | 1 |
| Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population pre-specified and clearly described? | 2 |
| Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest? | 3 |
| Were all eligible participants that met the pre-specified entry criteria enrolled? | 4 |
| Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings? | 5 |
| Was the test/service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population? | 6 |
| Were the outcome measures pre-specified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants? | 7 |
| Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions? | 8 |
| Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis? | 9 |
| Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes? | 10 |
| Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)? | 11 |
| If the intervention was conducted at a group level (e.g., a whole hospital, a community, etc.) did the statistical analysis take into account the use of individual-level data to determine effects at the group level?  \*If this question is not applicable, total score is out of 11, not 12. | 12 |
| Add scores for each criterion together and divide by 12.  *Risk of bias rating (Low (75-100%), Moderate (25-75%), or High (0-25%))\**  OVERALL SCORE: |  |

# \*This section includes altered wording from original tool for consistency purposes

# **Appendix 4 key**: The quality assessment tool for before-after (pre-post) studies with no control group: scores of included studies

Key: Y = Yes, N = No, NR = Not reported, CD = Cannot determine, NA = Not applicable, M = Moderate

**This tool was adapted from the original tool found at:**

National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies With No Control Group [National Heart Lung and Blood Institute web site]. 2014. http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-pro/guidelines/in-develop/cardiovascular-risk-reduction/tools/before-after. Accessed September 13, 2015.