



THE REAL LIFE EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT TOOL (RELEVANT)

REG - EAACI TASK FORCE ON QUALITY STANDARDS IN REAL-LIFE ASTHMA RESEARCH

USER'S GUIDE

PUBLICATIONS

N ROCHE, ET AL. QUALITY STANDARDS IN RESPIRATORY REAL-LIFE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH: THE REAL LIFE EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT TOOL (RELEVANT): REPORT FROM THE RESPIRATORY EFFECTIVENESS GROUP-EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF ALLERGY AND CLINICAL IMMUNOLOGY TASK FORCE. CLINICAL AND TRANSLATIONAL ALLERGY, 2019:

<https://ctajournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13601-019-0255-x>

J. D. CAMPBELL ET AL. THE REAL LIFE EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT TOOL (RELEVANT): DEVELOPMENT OF A NOVEL QUALITY ASSURANCE ASSET TO RATE OBSERVATIONAL COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH STUDIES. CLINICAL AND TRANSLATIONAL ALLERGY, 2019: <https://ctajournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13601-019-0256-9>

PURPOSE OF THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT TOOL

THE TOOL CAN BE USED WITH TWO TYPES OF GOALS:

1. TO INFORM GUIDELINES OR ANY DECISION-MAKING PROCESS (CLINICAL DECISION, POLICY-MAKING...)
2. TO ASSESS PUBLICATIONS OR PROTOCOLS FOR REVIEWING (FOR JOURNALS OR FUNDERS), TEACHING OR ANY OTHER PURPOSE...

PRIMARY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA ARE DESIGNED TO ASSESS WHETHER OR NOT PUBLISHED OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF SUFFICIENTLY HIGH QUALITY (I.E. ALL ITEMS SCORED "YES") TO INFORM FUTURE GUIDELINES AND CLINICAL OR HEALTHCARE POLICY DECISION-MAKING

SECONDARY AIM (SECONDARY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA) ARE DESIGNED TO ASSESS QUALITY FURTHER AND DESCRIBE ANY PARTICULAR STRENGTHS OR LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY. THEY DON'T NEED TO BE CONSIDERED IF THE GOAL IS TO INFORM GUIDELINES AND ONE PRIMARY ITEM HAS BEEN RATED "NO" (IN THAT CASE THE STUDY CAN BE DISCARDED)

USER'S GUIDE STEPS:

1. USE EITHER THE PDF OR EXCEL OR WEBSITE VERSION OF RELEVANT TO ASSESS PUBLISHED STUDIES
 - a. RELEVANT IS BEST USED FOR INDIVIDUAL PUBLISHED MANUSCRIPTS OR STUDIES. MULTIPLE STUDIES MAY BE ASSESSED USING RELEVANT THROUGH MAKING MULTIPLE STUDY-LEVEL ASSESSMENTS.
2. IF THE GOAL IS TO INFORM GUIDELINES OR OTHER CLINICAL OR HEALTHCARE POLICY DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES:
 - a. ASSIGN VALUE OF "YES" OR "NO" TO EACH OF THE 11 PRIMARY ITEMS
 - i. FOR PRIMARY ITEM 3.1, IF NOT APPLICABLE, THEN ASSIGN A "YES" VALUE
 - b. IF ALL ITEMS ARE RATED "YES":
 - i. THE STUDY MAY BE SUITABLE TO INFORM GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT OR SIMILAR PROCESSES
 - ii. AND SECONDARY SUB-ITEMS NEED TO BE ASSESSED TO ENABLE FURTHER DESCRIPTIVE APPRAISAL OF THE RELATIVE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.
 - c. IF ONE ITEM OR MORE IS RATED "NO":
 - i. THE STUDY IS NOT OF SUFFICIENT QUALITY TO INFORM GUIDELINES,
 - ii. THE ASSESSMENT CAN BE STOPPED THERE.
3. IF THE GOAL IS TO USE THE TOOL FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT OR CLINICAL OR HEALTHCARE POLICY DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES
 - a. RATE ALL ITEMS (BOTH PRIMARY AND SECONDARY)
 - b. KEEP IN MIND THAT A "NO" ANSWER TO ANY PRIMARY ITEM IMPLIES SUBOPTIMAL STUDY QUALITY THE USER EVALUATES
4. COMMENTS CAN COMPLEMENT RATINGS AND EXPLAIN THEIR RATIONALE.