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Table 1: Summary of findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bibliography: (review name)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>No of Participants (studies) Follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1 - Most critical outcome (i.e. Mortality) Measurement (i.e. all-cause mortality)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>i.e. 247 (4 studies) 4-16 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).*

**CI:** Confidence interval; **RR:** Risk ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

- **High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
- **Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
- **Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
- **Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

Example footnotes:

1. No studies assessed mortality
2. Change score in the control (continuous) group
3. Methodological limitations across studies, particularly in terms of blinding.
4. Statistical heterogeneity

OR

Table 1 ConQual summary of findings example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synthesised finding</th>
<th>Type of research</th>
<th>Dependability</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>ConQual score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People undergoing imaging often expect a health issue to be found during their scan, which can then</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Downgrade 1 level*</td>
<td>Downgrade 1 level**</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Downgraded one level due to common dependability issues across the included primary studies (the majority of studies had no statement locating the researcher and no acknowledgement of their influence on the research).
** Downgraded one level due to a mix of unequivocal and equivocal findings.
Introduction

Background

#Insert text#

This review was conducted according to an a priori published protocol. #Insert reference for protocol#

Subheading (if required)

Objectives

The quantitative objective/s is/are to identify the effectiveness of #state intervention# on #state outcome#

More specifically, the objectives are to identify the effectiveness of #insert text# on #insert text# in #insert text#

The qualitative objective/s is/are to identify the meaningfulness/appropriateness of #modify text as appropriate# of #phenomena of interest#.

The textual objective/s is/are to identify the findings of #describe#

The economic objective/s of this review is/are to identify the cost effectiveness, cost benefit, cost minimization, cost utility #modify text as appropriate# of #state intervention# on #state outcome#

More specifically, the objectives are to identify the evidence on:

The cost effectiveness, cost benefit, cost minimization, cost utility #modify text as appropriate# of #insert text# compared to #insert text# on #insert text# in #insert text#

Inclusion criteria

Types of participants

This review considered studies that included #describe participants#

Types of intervention(s)/phenomena of interest

This review considered studies that evaluated #insert text#

Types of studies

The quantitative component of the review considered both experimental and epidemiological study designs including randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental studies, before and after studies, prospective and retrospective cohort studies, case control studies and analytical cross sectional studies #modify text as appropriate# for inclusion. The quantitative component of the review also considered descriptive epidemiological study designs including case series, individual case reports and descriptive cross sectional studies #modify text as appropriate# for inclusion.

The qualitative component of the review considered studies that focused on qualitative data including, designs such as phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, action research and feminist research #modify text as appropriate#.

In the absence of research studies, other text such as opinion papers and reports were considered. The
textual component of the review considered expert opinion, discussion papers, position papers and other text #modify text as appropriate#

The economic component of the review will consider cost effectiveness, cost benefit, cost minimization, cost utility #modify text as appropriate# studies.

**Types of outcomes**

This review considered studies that included the following outcomes: #insert text#

**Search strategy**

The search strategy aimed to find both published and unpublished studies. A three-step search strategy was utilised in this review. An initial limited search of MEDLINE and CINAHL #change as appropriate# was undertaken followed by analysis of the text words contained in the title and abstract, and of the index terms used to describe article. A second search using all identified keywords and index terms was undertaken across all included databases. Thirdly, the reference list of all identified reports and articles was searched for additional studies. Studies published in #insert language(s)# were considered for inclusion in this review. Studies published #insert dates# were considered for inclusion in this review.

The databases searched included:

#insert text#

The search for unpublished studies included:

#insert text#

Initial keywords to be used were:

#insert text#

The full search strategy is provided in Appendix #modify number as appropriate#.

**Method of the review**

Quantitative papers selected for retrieval were assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from the Joanna Briggs Institute Meta Analysis of Statistics Assessment and Review Instrument (JBI-MAStARI) (Appendix #number as appropriate#). Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

Qualitative papers selected for retrieval were assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from the Joanna Briggs Institute Qualitative Assessment and Review Instrument (JBI-QARI) (Appendix #number as appropriate#). Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

Textual papers selected for retrieval were assessed by two independent reviewers for authenticity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from the Joanna Briggs Institute Narrative, Opinion and Text Assessment and Review Instrument (JBI-NOTARI) (Appendix #number as appropriate#). Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved
through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

Economic papers selected for retrieval were assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from the Joanna Briggs Institute Analysis of Cost, Technology and Utilisation Assessment and Review Instrument (JBI-ACTUARI) (Appendix #number as appropriate#). Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

Data collection

Quantitative data were extracted from papers included in the review using the standardized data extraction tool from JBI-MAStARI (Appendix #number as appropriate#). The data extracted included specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives #modify text as appropriate#.

Qualitative data were extracted from papers included in the review using the standardized data extraction tool from JBI-QARI (Appendix #number as appropriate#). The data extracted included specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives #modify text as appropriate#.

Textual data were extracted from papers included in the review using the standardized data extraction tool from JBI-NOTARI (Appendix #number as appropriate#). The data extracted included specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives #modify text as appropriate#.

Economic data were extracted from papers included in the review using the standardized data extraction tool from JBI-ACTUARI (Appendix #number as appropriate#). The data extracted included specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives #modify text as appropriate#.

Data synthesis

Quantitative data were, where possible, pooled in statistical meta-analysis using JBI-MAStARI. All results will be subject to double data entry. Effect sizes expressed as odds ratio (for categorical data) and weighted mean differences (for continuous data) and their 95% confidence intervals were calculated for analysis #modify text as appropriate#. Heterogeneity was assessed statistically using the standard Chi-square and also explored using subgroup analyses based on the different quantitative study designs included in this review. Where statistical pooling was not possible the findings were presented in narrative form including tables and figures to aid in data presentation where appropriate.

Qualitative research findings were, where possible, pooled using JBI-QARI. This involved the aggregation or synthesis of findings to generate a set of statements that represent that aggregation, through assembling the findings rated according to their quality, and categorizing these findings on the basis of similarity in meaning. These categories were then subjected to a meta-synthesis in order to produce a single comprehensive set of synthesized findings that could be used as a basis for evidence-based practice. Where textual pooling was not possible the findings were presented in narrative form.

Textual papers were, where possible, pooled using JBI-NOTARI. This involved the aggregation or
synthesis of conclusions to generate a set of statements that represent that aggregation, through assembling and categorizing these conclusions on the basis of similarity in meaning. These categories were then subjected to a meta-synthesis in order to produce a single comprehensive set of synthesized findings that could be used as a basis for evidence-based practice. Where textual pooling was not possible the conclusions will be presented in narrative form.

Economic findings were, where possible pooled using JBI-ACTUARI and presented in a tabular summary. Where this was not possible, findings were presented in narrative form.

Results

Description of studies

#Insert text pertaining to searching and study selection here. Consider alternative heading of “Study Selection”. Refer to Study selection flow chart in the text#.

**Figure #**: Titles and captions should be concise but comprehensive. The figure must be understandable without reference to the text. PRISMA flow diagram of search and study selection process (please use editable text NOT an image)

#Insert text describing characteristics of included studies. Refer to table of characteristics of included studies (Appendix #) here#.

**Methodological quality**

#Insert text#

**Table #**: Assessment of methodological quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chen YC, Chou SS, Lin LH, Wu LF, 2006</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiebert JM, Brown A, Anderson RG, Halffacre S, Rodeheaver GT, Edlich PF, 1981</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocan MJ, Hickisch SM, 1986</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLeod JB, Lefton J, Houghton D, Roland C, Doherty J, Cohn SM et al., 2007</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpa LF, Kimura M, Faintuch J, Ceconello I, 2003</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor TT, 1982</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings of the review**

#Insert text#
Figure #: Titles and captions should be concise but comprehensive. The figure must be understandable without reference to the text. For example: The effect of the intervention compared with the comparator on the outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Synthesized findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Synthesized finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure #**: Results of metasynthesis of qualitative research findings (Please use editable text not an image)
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## Appendix I: Search strategy

PubMed (pubmed.gov)

Search on #Insert date#

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search</th>
<th>Query</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#1 AND #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limit to #insert date, language, species etc limits#
## Appendix II: Appraisal instruments

### QARI appraisal instrument

### JBI QARI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall appraisal: 

Comments (including reason for exclusion):

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
MAStARI appraisal instrument

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomised Control / Pseudo-randomised Trial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the assignment to treatment groups truly random?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were participants blinded to treatment allocation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was allocation to treatment groups concealed from the allocator?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were the outcomes of people who withdrew described and included in the analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Were those assessing outcomes blind to the treatment allocation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the control and treatment groups comparable at entry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were groups treated identically other than for the named interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were outcomes measured in the same way for all groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall appraisal: Include □ Exclude □ Seek further info. □

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
## JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Descriptive / Case Series

**Reviewer**  
**Date**  
**Author**  
**Year**  
**Record Number**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall appraisal:**  
**Include**  
**Exclude**  
**Seek further info**  

**Comments (Including reason for exclusion)**

---

Created by XMLmind XSL-FO Converter.
JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Comparable Cohort/ Case Control

Reviewer ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Author ______________________________ Year ______________ Record Number _______

1. Is sample representative of patients in the population as a whole?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

2. Are the patients at a similar point in the course of their condition/illness?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

3. Has bias been minimised in relation to selection of cases and of controls?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

4. Are confounding factors identified and strategies to deal with them stated?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

5. Are outcomes assessed using objective criteria?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

6. Was follow up carried out over a sufficient time period?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

7. Were the outcomes of people who withdrew described and included in the analysis?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] Unclear  [ ] Not Applicable

Overall appraisal:  Include  [ ]  Exclude  [ ]  Seek further info.  [ ]

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
ACTUARI appraisal instrument

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Economic Evaluations

Reviewer ____________________________ Date ____________________________

Author ____________________________ Year _______ Record Number ________

1. Is there a well defined question? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

2. Is there comprehensive description of alternatives? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

3. Are all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative identified? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

4. Has clinical effectiveness been established? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

5. Are costs and outcomes measured accurately? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

6. Are costs and outcomes valued credibly? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

7. Are costs and outcomes adjusted for differential timing? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

8. Is there an incremental analysis of costs and consequences? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

9. Were sensitivity analyses conducted to investigate uncertainty in estimates of costs or consequences? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

10. Do study results include all issues of concern to users? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

11. Are the results generalisable to the setting of interest in the review? □ Yes □ No □ Unclear □ Not Applicable

Overall appraisal: Include □ Exclude □ Seek further info. □

Comments (including reasons for exclusion) ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________
**NOTARI appraisal instrument**

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Narrative, Expert opinion & text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the source of the opinion clearly identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the source of the opinion have standing in the field of expertise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the interests of patients/clients the central focus of the opinion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the opinion's basis in logic/experience clearly argued?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the argument developed analytical?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there reference to the extant literature/evidence and any incongruency with it logically defended?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the opinion supported by peers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall appraisal:** Include □ Exclude □ Seek further info □

**Comments (including reason for exclusion):**

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
# Appendix III: Data extraction instruments

**QARI data extraction instrument**

![JBI QARI Data Extraction Form for Interpretive & Critical Research](image)

- **Reviewer**: 
- **Date**: 
- **Author**: 
- **Year**: 
- **Journal**: 
- **Record Number**: 

**Study Description**

- **Methodology**
- **Method**
- **Phenomena of interest**
- **Setting**
- **Geographical**
- **Cultural**
- **Participants**
- **Data analysis**
- **Authors Conclusions**

**Comments**

- **Complete**: Yes [ ] No [ ]

---

Created by XMind XSL-FO Converter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Illustration from Publication (page number)</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unequivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction of findings complete  Yes ☐  No ☐
MAStARI data extraction instrument

JBI Data Extraction Form for Experimental / Observational Studies

Reviewer ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Author ___________________________ Year ___________________________

Journal, ___________________________ Record Number ______________________

Study Method

RCT □ Quasi-RCT □ Longitudinal □
Retrospective □ Observational □ Other □

Participants

Setting

Population

Sample size

Group A ___________________________ Group B ___________________________

Interventions

Intervention A

Intervention B

Authors Conclusions:

Reviewers Conclusions:
### Study results

#### Dichotomous data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention ( ) number / total number</th>
<th>Intervention ( ) number / total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Continuous data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention ( ) number / total number</th>
<th>Intervention ( ) number / total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTUARI data extraction instrument

JBI Data Extraction Form for Economic Evaluations

Reviewer _______________________________ Date ____________

Author _______________________________ Year ____________

Journal _______________________________ Record Number ______

Method of Evaluation

Cost Minimisation [ ] Cost Effectiveness [ ]

Cost Utility [ ] Cost Benefit [ ]

Interventions

_________________________________________________________________

Comparator

_________________________________________________________________

Setting

_________________________________________________________________

Geographical

_________________________________________________________________

Participants

_________________________________________________________________

Source of effectiveness data

_________________________________________________________________

Authors Conclusions

_________________________________________________________________

Reviewers Comments

_________________________________________________________________

Extraction Complete Yes [ ] No [ ]
Clinical Effectiveness Results

Study design

Year range of primary studies

Analysis used

Clinical outcome results

Economic Effectiveness results

Data/s of economic data

Modeling used

Measure of benefits used in economic evaluation

Direct costs

Indirect costs

Currency

Statistical analysis

Estimated benefits used in EE

Cost results

Synthesis of costs and results

Outcome category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- Effectiveness
- Cost

+ Better Lower
0 Equal Equal
- Poorer Higher
NOTARI data extraction instrument

JBI Data Extraction for Narrative, Expert opinion & text

Reviewer _______________________________ Date _______________________________

Author _______________________________ Year __________ Record Number ________

Study Description
Type of Text:

Those Represented:

Stated Allegiance/ Position:

Setting

Geographical

Cultural

Logic of Argument

Data analysis

Authors Conclusions

Reviewers Comments

Data Extraction Complete Yes ☐ No ☐
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Illustration from Publication (page number)</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unequivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include

Yes □
No □
Appendix IV: Excluded studies

#Insert text of excluded studies. Where studies have been excluded based on not meeting inclusion criteria or being of insufficient quality, these need to be listed separately#.

Boxer LK and Buchman SR. An alternative method of closure of fasciotomy wounds: healing by secondary intention

**Reason for exclusion:** Methodology lacked rigor including criteria for inclusion in study not defined and no length of stay recorded.

Harrah J, Gates R, Carl J, Harrah JD. A simpler, less expensive technique for delayed primary closure of fasciotomies

**Reason for exclusion:** Paper described a wound management technique but data about the patients the method was used on was not described clearly enough in the paper.

Heemskerk J and Kitslaar P. Acute compartment syndrome of the lower leg: retrospective study on prevalence, technique, and outcome of fasciotomies

**Reason for exclusion:** Outcomes of interest not clearly defined.


**Reason for exclusion:** This study reviewed patients who developed thigh compartment syndrome overall, therefore wound treatment was not the main focus of the paper and most outcomes of interest were not documented.
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