JHNEBP EVIDENCE RATING SCALES

STRENGTH of the Evidence	
Level I	Experimental study/randomized controlled trial (RCT) or meta analysis of RCT
Level II	Quasi-experimental study
Level III	Non-experimental study, qualitative study, or meta-synthesis.
Level IV	Opinion of nationally recognized experts based on research evidence or expert consensus panel (systematic review, clinical practice guidelines)
Level V	Opinion of individual expert based on non-research evidence. (Includes case studies; literature review; organizational experience e.g., quality improvement and financial data; clinical expertise, or personal experience)

QUALITY of the Evidence			
A	High	Research	consistent results with sufficient sample size, adequate control, and definitive conclusions; consistent recommendations based on extensive literature review that includes thoughtful reference to scientific evidence.
		Summative reviews	well-defined, reproducible search strategies; consistent results with sufficient numbers of well defined studies; criteria-based evaluation of overall scientific strength and quality of included studies; definitive conclusions.
		Organizational	well-defined methods using a rigorous approach; consistent results with sufficient sample size; use of reliable **and** valid measures
		Expert Opinion	expertise is clearly evident
B	Good	Research	reasonably consistent results, sufficient sample size, some control, with fairly definitive conclusions; reasonably consistent recommendations based on fairly comprehensive literature review that includes some reference to scientific evidence
		Summative reviews	reasonably thorough and appropriate search; reasonably consistent results with sufficient numbers of well defined studies; evaluation of strengths and limitations of included studies; fairly definitive conclusions.
		Organizational	Well-defined methods; reasonably consistent results with sufficient numbers; use of **reliable and valid** measures; reasonably consistent recommendations
		Expert Opinion	expertise appears to be credible.
C	Low quality or major flaws	Research	little evidence with inconsistent results, insufficient sample size, conclusions cannot be drawn
		Summative reviews	undefined, poorly defined, or limited search strategies; insufficient evidence with inconsistent results; conclusions cannot be drawn
		Organizational	Undefined, **or** poorly defined methods; insufficient sample size; inconsistent results; undefined, poorly defined or measures that lack adequate reliability or validity
		Expert Opinion	expertise is not discernable or is dubious.

**A study rated an A would be of high quality, whereas, a study rated a C would have major flaws that raise serious questions about the believability of the findings and should be automatically eliminated from consideration.*

Newhouse R, Dearholt S, Poe S, Pugh LC, White K. The Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-based Practice Rating Scale. 2005. Baltimore, MD, The Johns Hopkins Hospital; Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing.