




CASP Checklist: 11 questions to help you make sense of **descriptive/cross-sectional studies**

How to use this appraisal tool: Three broad issues need to be considered when appraising the report of a descriptive/ **cross-sectional study** (e.g., a study that collects data on individuals at one time point using a survey or review of medical charts):

-  Are the results of the study valid? (Section A)
-  What are the results? (Section B)
-  Will the results help locally? (Section C)

The 11 questions on the following pages are designed to help you think about these issues systematically. The first two questions are screening questions and can be answered quickly. If the answer to both is “yes”, it is worth proceeding with the remaining questions. You are asked to record a “yes”, “no” or “can’t tell” to most of the questions. A number of italicized prompts are given after each question. The 12 questions on the following pages are designed to help you think about these issues systematically. The first two questions are screening questions and can be answered quickly. If the answer to both is “yes”, it is worth proceeding with the remaining questions. There is some degree of overlap between the questions, you are asked to record a “yes”, “no” or “can’t tell” to most of the questions. These are designed to remind you why the question is important. Record your reasons for your answers in the spaces provided.

About: These questions are adapted from Guyatt GH, Sackett DL, and Cook DJ, Users’ guides to the medical literature. II. How to use an article about therapy or prevention. JAMA 1993; 270 (21): 2598-2601 and JAMA 1994; 271(1): 59-63 © Milton Keynes Primary Care Trust 2002. All rights reserved.

Referencing: we recommend using the Harvard style citation, i.e.: *Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (2018). CASP (insert name of checklist i.e. Cohort Study) Checklist. [online] Available at: URL. Accessed: Date Accessed.*

©CASP this work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial-Share A like. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/> www.casp-uk.net

Section A: Are the results of the study valid?

1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue?

Yes

Can't Tell

No

HINT: A question can be 'focused' in terms of

- the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome)

Comments:	<p>Se evaluó la disciplina/adherencia a las medidas de prevención y control de enfermedades en el personal de salud de múltiples centros de salud, hospitales y dispensarios médicos de Tanzania.</p> <p>Población: Médicos, asistentes médicos, enfermeras, parteras y laboratoristas de dispensarios médicos, centros de salud y hospitales basados en la fe y privados con fines de lucro.</p> <p>Medidas estudiadas: medidas de prevención y control de enfermedades: higiene de manos, uso de guantes, manejo de desechos y desinfección de equipos reutilizables.</p> <p>Comparación: se comparó las características del personal sanitario y de las instalaciones estudiadas.</p>
-----------	--

2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?

Yes

Can't Tell

No

HINT: Consider

- Is a descriptive/cross-sectional study an appropriate way of answering the question?

- Did it address the study question?

Comments:	<p>En este caso se quería estudiar las características de una población determinada en momento dado (2018) para determinar si la adherencia a las medidas de prevención y control de infecciones eran adecuadas.</p>
-----------	--

Is it worth continuing?

3. Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?

Yes

Can't Tell

No

HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:

- Was the sample representative of a defined population?
- Was everybody included who should have been included?

Comments:	La población fue tomada de la muestra final de un estudio clínico aleatorio previo destinado a un programa de mejora de calidad. Se incluye a 223 instituciones sanitarias, y una amplia gama de profesionales de la salud de las regiones norte, sur, este, centro de Tanzania, y sus respectivas interacciones con pacientes.
-----------	---

4. Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?

Yes

Can't Tell

No

HINT: Look for measurement or classification bias:

- did they use subjective or objective measurement
- do the measurements truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)

Comments:	Se usan variables principalmente subjetivas, ya que son los trabajadores de campo que determinan si una medida fue correctamente realizada o no. Las mediciones se realizaron basadas en herramientas de un estudio previo de Bedoya and colleagues. que a su vez se basó en las guías de la OMS.
-----------	---

5. Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?

Yes

Can't Tell

No

Consider:

- if the setting for data collection was justified
- if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)
- if the researcher has justified the methods chosen
- if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)

Comments:	Una parte del estudio se realiza a través de una encuesta a los profesionales de salud y la otra parte se realiza observando la interacción médico-paciente para identificar la correcta higiene de manos (definida por la OMS), el correcto uso de guantes, la limpieza de materiales reusables y el desecho de residuos, cada dominio con sus items específicos. Para definir la adherencia se utilizó una variable dicotómica, 1 para cuando si se realizaba correctamente el proceso y 0 cuando no.
-----------	--

6. Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?

Yes

Can't Tell

No

Consider:

- If the result is precise enough to make a decision
- if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.

Comments:	El estudio presenta 18 710 observaciones relevantes al control y prevención de infecciones, con 5425 interacciones medico-pacientes. Lamentablemente no hay un cálculo de la potencia del estudio, sin embargo la muestra es manifiestamente grande.
-----------	---

7. How are the results presented and what is the main result?

Yes

Consider:

- if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome, such as risks, or as a measurement,

such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards

- how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is

- how you would sum up the bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence

Can't Tell

No

La evidencia del estudio sugiere que las medidas de control y prevención de infección fueron inadecuadas. Se utiliza porcentaje de personas que cumplen con la normativa y Odd Ratio para asociar variables.

8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?

Yes

Consider:

- if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process
- if sufficient data are presented to support the findings

Can't Tell

No

Comments:	Se presenta cuadros comparativos con todos los datos necesarios para que el lector realice sus propios cálculos, con los intervalos de confianza indicados. El proceso se encuentra descrito rigurosamente con el tipo de test utilizado para cada etapa del estudio y los ajustes necesarios de variables.
-----------	---

9. Is there a clear statement of findings?

Consider:

- if the findings are explicit
- if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments
- if the researcher have discussed the **credibility** of their findings

- if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions

Comments:	<p>Se enlistan las falencias que pudo haber tenido el estudio tanto en la discusión como en los métodos, argumentando que a pesar de ciertas deficiencias como el efecto Hawthorn, la inadecuada practica de prevención debe ser tomada al máximo.</p> <p>Se evidencian ciertas falencias respecto a otras variables que deben ser estudiadas en relación al coronavirus (material personal de protección) pero que no fueron posibles por la temporalidad del estudio.</p> <p>Se describe claramente los resultados más relevantes del estudio y su importancia en la práctica clínica.</p>
-----------	--

10. Can the results be applied to the local population?

HINT:

- The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern.
- Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study

Comments:	<p>Al ser un estudio realizado en personal sanitario con formación en una población de bajos y medianos ingresos (PIB 1051 per cápita) podría causar interés revisar si las medidas de control y prevención de COVID se llevan adecuadamente en nuestro personal sanitario. Se puede Sin embargo este PIB per cápita se encuentra debajo del ecuatoriano (PIB: 6368 en 2018).</p> <p>Por otro lado, los centros de salud estudiados son en su mayoría privados y basados en creencias, lo cual no es la mayoría de instituciones en Ecuador ni en Tanzania. Sin embargo, hay un aumento en los dos países de este tipo de establecimiento.</p>
-----------	--

11. How valuable is the research?

HINT: Consider

- if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research-based literature?)
- if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations

Comments:	Se compara en un inicio la extrapolabilidad con la misma población de Tanzania, posteriormente se hace referencia a similitudes con la población estudiada en Kenia. Se hace un llamado de atención importante a la mejora en las medidas de prevención y transmisión de enfermedades en pacientes ambulatorios y no ambulatorios en todo el mundo.
-----------	---