

Research Evidence Appraisal Tool

Appendix E

Does this evidence answer the EBP question?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Continue appraisal
		<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> STOP, do not continue evidence appraisal
Article Summary Information		
Article Title: Investigating the effect of multimedia education in combination with teach-back method on quality of life and cardiac anxiety in patients with heart failure: a randomized clinical trial.		
Author(s): Mohammadi, F., Jahromi, M.S., Bijani,		Number: 1
Population, size, and setting: 120 patients, Heart hospital in South Iran		Publication date: ██████████
Complete after appraisal		
Evidence level and quality rating: Level 1, quality rating of A		
Study findings that help answer the EBP question:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant difference in demographic variable among intervention (A/B) and the control group. • No significant difference in mean scores of the quality of life and cardiac anxiety in intervention and control groups prior to performing educational interventions. • There was a significant difference in mean score for quality of life and cardiac anxiety in the intervention and control groups immediately after, 1 month, and 3 months after educational interventions. • The difference in mean scores for quality of life and cardiac anxiety in multimedia education together with teach-back method was more than the control group and intervention group A (multimedia education only). <p>Intervention group A (multimedia education only), Intervention group B (multimedia education with teach-back method), Control group (education per nurses and packages at the hospital daily)</p> <p>Patient education is the key to having effective management and control over heart failure. Timely diagnosis and patient education helps prevent or delay complications of heart failure.</p>		

Article Appraisal Workflow

Is this study:

QuaNtitative (collection, analysis, and reporting of numerical data)

Numerical data (how many, how much, or how often) are used to formulate facts, uncover patterns, and generalize to a larger population; provides observed effects of a program, problem, or condition. Common methods are polls, surveys, observations, and reviews of records or documents. Data are analyzed using statistical tests.

→ **Go to Section I for QuaNtitative leveling**

QuaLitative (collection, analysis, and reporting of narrative data)

Rich narrative data to gain a deep understanding of phenomena, meanings, perceptions, concepts, and experiences from those experiencing it. Sample sizes are relatively small and determined by the point of redundancy when no new information is gleaned, and key themes are reiterated (data saturation). Data are analyzed using thematic analysis. Often a starting point for studies when little research exists; may use results to design empirical studies. Common methods are focus groups, individual interviews (unstructured or semi-structured), and participation/observations.

→ **Go to Section II for QuaLitative leveling**

Mixed methods (results reported both numerically and narratively)

A study design (a single study or series of studies) that uses rigorous procedures in collecting and analyzing both quaNtitative and quaLitative data. *Note:* QuaNtitative survey designs with open-ended questions do not meet criteria