

Primary Care Evidence Review Toolkit

The MacColl Center for Healthcare Innovation at Group Health Research Institute supports the transformation of health care delivery through evidence-based research, model development, training and technical assistance. As part of our work, we regularly identify evidence that has potential for scale-up and adaptation in primary care.

The purpose of this toolkit is to share our methods for evidence screening, drawing on implementation science theory and methods. We also include links to several additional resources that can be used as companion materials to our tools by other evidence review and translation efforts.

This work is supported by the National Center For Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number UL1TR000423. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Resource	Description
Implementation science presentation https://vimeo.com/129920328	This narrated webinar provides an introduction to implementation science.
Evidence pre-screening tool – Page 2	Procedures to identify evidence that may be appropriate for implementation in primary care.
Research synopsis template – Page 4	A template to summarize key points from an evidence-based intervention described in a research publication to guide discussion about suitability for implementation in primary care settings.
Decision-to-Implement Worksheet – Page 5	A worksheet that primary care practice-based clinicians and leaders can use to evaluate if an intervention suitable to adopt in their setting.
<i>Recommended Companion tools</i>	
Will it Work Here? A Decisionmaker’s Guide to Adopting Innovations (AHRQ) https://innovations.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/guides/InnovationAdoptionGuide.pdf	The Guide helps users determine if an innovation would be a good fit—or an appropriate stretch—for their health care organization by asking a series of questions. It links users to actionable Web-based tools and presents case studies that illustrate how other organizations have addressed these questions.
The Informed Decisions Toolbox http://www.ache.org/pubs/JHM/Rundall%20Appendix--to%20post.pdf	Steps to guide a decision-maker through finding sources of research evidence and assessing its accuracy, applicability, and actionability.
Registry of Methods and Tools (National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools) www.nccmt.ca/registry/index-eng.html	A searchable, online collection of evidence-informed methods (processes) and tools (instruments) for knowledge translation in public health.

Evidence pre-screening tool

Instructions

The purpose of this form is to assess if research findings have sufficient strength of evidence and relevance to primary care practices. You can use this with study abstracts or a full text description if the abstract is missing or does not contain enough information to answer the questions below. We recommend review by a staff person trained in reading clinical research articles in consultation with a primary care clinician who can provide input on whether a study's topic and setting are relevant to primary care practice.

Study type (level of evidence). <i>Note, additional assessment of study quality is recommended.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Randomized Controlled Trial <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic review <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure	<input type="checkbox"/> Longitudinal cohort study <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Significance: Are the patient or operational outcomes (positive or negative) statistically significant?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure (either you can't tell at all or mixed results)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Relevance: Are the outcomes a common or serious problem in primary care (illness burden)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Full-text review?	SELECT IF <u>ALL ROWS ABOVE ARE CHECKED</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	SELECT IF <u>ANY ROWS ABOVE ARE CHECKED</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No
Additional tracking information for reference		
Setting: Was the study/innovation conducted in a primary care setting?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Condition: What underlying condition was addressed? Select from the list below. If there is a condition that you think is relevant but is not on the list, note it here.	Condition 1: Condition 2: Condition free text:	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

*List of common conditions included the following, based on National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey 2010: Twenty leading principal reasons for office visits; [Pace et al 2004](#) 23 diagnostic clusters accounting for >1% total diagnoses; and clinical input from Laura-Mae Baldwin, MD, MPH and Michael Parchman, MD.

Anxiety	Diabetes
Arthritis	Gynecological exam
Asthma	Headache
Attention deficit disorder	Health care maintenance (e.g., prevention, non-cancer screening, tobacco, substance use, exercise, diet, immunizations)
Back pain	Medication (including management, adverse events)
Bronchitis	Menopause
Cancer (e.g., prevention, screening, surveillance, survivorship)	Musculoskeletal disorders
Cardiovascular disease (including coronary artery disease, coronary heart disease, peripheral vascular disease, peripheral artery disease, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, stroke, venous thrombosis)	Neck pain
Chronic/outpatient infectious diseases (e.g., upper respiratory infection, pneumonia, strep, pelvic inflammatory disease, pharyngitis, HIV, Hepatitis C, urinary tract infection)	Obesity
Contraception	Osteoporosis/fractures
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	Otitis, ear infection
Degenerative joint disease	Pain management
Dementia (including Alzheimer's)	Pregnancy
Depression	Prenatal exam, routine
Dermatitis, skin rash	Shoulder symptoms
	Sinusitis
	Stomach and abdominal pain, cramps, spasms
	Thyroid disease
	Vision dysfunctions
	Well baby exam

Research synopsis template

Headline (example: “Directly connecting patients To quitlines encourages smoking cessation treatment”)

Prepared by MacColl Center for Health Care Innovation – Group Health Research Institute

What does the research tell us?

[Describe the bottom line. 50-75 words]

How was the research done?

[Summarize the methods, e.g., study setting, study type, eligibility criteria, number of patients, and randomization]

What was the intervention?

[Provide details of the intervention including training requirements and what patients received]

What were the findings?

[Describe the findings. Describe how the study findings fit with previous research.]

What would be needed to implement this in your practice?

[Describe what implementation would involve based on what the article or other resources describe. Include aspects such as:

- Use of personnel (e.g., how providers, practice, staff would be affected)
- Use of EHR
- Cost
- Upkeep.]

For more information:

[include references to article, links to websites with training materials, etc.]

