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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Is this a newly derived instrument? (LEVEL IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Were all important predictors included in the derivation process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Were all important predictors present in significant proportion of the study population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the rule make clinical sense?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Has the instrument been validated? (LEVEL II or III) If so, consider the following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Did validation include prospective studies on several different populations from that used to derive it (II), or was it restricted to a single population (III)? How well did the validation exercise meet the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Were the patients chosen in an unbiased fashion and do they represent a wide spectrum of severity of disease?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Was there a blinded assessment of the criterion standard or outcome event (or was the outcome all-cause mortality) for all patients?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Was there an explicit and accurate interpretation of the predictor variables and the actual rule without knowledge of the outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Was there 100% follow-up of those enrolled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>How powerful is the rule (in terms of sensitivity and specificity; likelihood ratios; proportions with alternative outcomes; or relative risks or absolute outcome rates)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Has an impact analysis demonstrated change in clinical behaviour or patient outcomes as a result of using the instrument? (LEVEL I) If so, consider the following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How well did the study guard against bias in terms of differences at the start (concealed randomization, adjustment in analysis) or as the study proceeded (blinding, co-intervention, loss to follow-up)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What was the impact on clinician behaviour and patient-important outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>