

**TABLE 2**

**EVALUATION GUIDE FOR INTERVENTION TRIALS**

**Step 1: Evidence level**

• Meta-analysis (statistical combination of the results of several studies)	5 points
• Clinical trial	3 points
• Case report	2 points
• Expert opinion or experience	1 point

**Step 2: Additional quality criteria (regarding corresponding evidence level)**

Meta-analysis	• Literature search is exhaustive and reproducible	2 points
	• Included trials are clinically comparable	4 points
	• Included trials are of high quality (ie, randomized, controlled, blinded)	2 points
	• Results are discussed objectively and critically, including questions regarding comparability and bias	2 points
Clinical trial	• Trial comprises a sufficient number of participants or samples, including a sample size calculation to identify the appropriate number of participants or samples	2 points
	• Essential information (eg, number included, breed, age, sex, inclusion criteria, housing) is given regarding participants	1 point
	• Trial is composed of an adequate control group	3 points
	• Trial is randomized	1 point
	• Trial is blinded	1 point
	• Examinations and interventions are described in detail, and results are presented completely	1 point
	• Adequate statistical procedures are used, and any data that are incomplete or missing are documented	1 point
	• Results are discussed critically	1 point
	• References are extensive and current	1 point
Case report	• Essential information (eg, number included, breed, age, sex, inclusion criteria, housing) is given regarding participants	2 points
	• Examinations and interventions are described in detail	2 points
	• Results are discussed critically	2 points
	• References are extensive and current	1 point
Expert opinion or experience	• Results are discussed critically	1 point
	• References are extensive and current	1 point

**Step 3: Summation of points for an overall score**

15-13 = very good; 12-10 = good; 9-7 = satisfactory; 6-4 = adequate; 3-2 = inadequate; 1 = fail

**TABLE 3****EVALUATION GUIDE FOR RESEARCH ON DIAGNOSTIC TESTS**

---

Study design	• Disease/condition to be tested is clearly defined	1 point
	• Clear, defined test results indicating physiologic/not physiologic conditions	2 points
	• Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants or samples are reported	1 point
	• Appropriate number of participants or samples are included	1 point
	• Procedures are described in detail	1 point
	• Study is blinded	2 points
Test characteristics	• Test is compared with an acknowledged gold standard	1 point
	• Sensitivity and specificity of the test are given	2 points
	• Repeatability (same result obtained when test is repeated) is good	1 point
	• Possible biases or other problems of the test (preanalytic/analytic) are discussed	1 point
Practical relevance	• Quality of the test results are discussed in context with other diagnostic tools for the given disease or condition	1 point
	• Applicability and reliability of the test are discussed objectively	1 point

---

**Summation of points for an overall score**

15-13 = very good; 12-10 = good; 9-7 = satisfactory; 6-4 = adequate; 3-2 = inadequate; 1 = fail

---

**TABLE 4****EVALUATION GUIDE FOR LITERATURE REVIEWS**

---

Literature search and inclusion	• Literature search was conducted systematically via databases and is well documented	4 points
	• Search terms used are documented	2 points
	• More literature was searched in reference lists of acquired articles (eg, hand searching*)	1 point
	• Inclusion and exclusion criteria for papers are well-documented	2 points
Assessment	• Quality of each paper is assessed systematically	4 points
	• Findings and conclusions are discussed objectively	2 points

---

**Summation of points for an overall score**

15-13 = very good; 12-10 = good; 9-7 = satisfactory; 6-4 = adequate; 3-2 = inadequate; 1 = fail

---

\*Hand searching is the examination of reference lists of included studies in order to identify other relevant citations.