

## 2010 DGAC Conclusion Statement Evaluation Criteria

### Criteria for judging the strength of the body of evidence supporting the Conclusion Statement

Elements	Strong	Moderate	Limited	Expert Opinion Only	No Evidence Available
<b>Quality</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scientific rigor and validity</li> <li>• Consider study design and execution</li> </ul>	Studies of strong design  Free from design flaws, bias, and execution problems	Studies of strong design with minor methodological concerns OR only studies of weaker study design for question	Studies of weak design for answering the question OR inconclusive findings due to design flaws, bias, or execution problems	No studies available  Conclusion based on usual practice, expert consensus, clinical experience, opinion, or extrapolation from basic research	No evidence that pertains to question being addressed
<b>Consistency</b>  Of findings across studies	Findings generally consistent in direction and size of effect or degree of association, and statistical significance with minor very exceptions	Inconsistency among results of studies with strong design, OR consistency with minor exceptions across studies of weaker design	Unexplained inconsistency among results from different studies, OR single study unconfirmed by other studies	Conclusion supported solely by statements of informed nutrition or medical commentators	NA
<b>Quantity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of studies</li> <li>• Number of subjects in studies</li> </ul>	One large study with a diverse population or several good quality studies  Large number of subjects studied Studies with negative results have sufficiently large sample size for adequate statistical power	Several studies by independent investigators Doubts about adequacy of sample size to avoid Type I and Type II error	Limited number of studies Low number of subjects studied and/or inadequate sample size within studies	Unsubstantiated by published research studies	Relevant studies have not been done
<b>Impact</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of studied outcomes</li> <li>• Magnitude of effect</li> </ul>	Studied outcome relates directly to the question Size of effect is clinically meaningful Significant (statistical) difference is large	Some doubt about the statistical or clinical significance of the effect	Studied outcome is an intermediate outcome or surrogate for the true outcome of interest OR size of effect is small or lacks statistical and/or clinical significance	Objective data unavailable	Indicates area for future research
<b>Generalizability</b>  To population of interest	Studied population, intervention and outcomes are free from serious doubts about generalizability	Minor doubts about generalizability	Serious doubts about generalizability due to narrow or different study population, intervention or outcomes studied	Generalizability limited to scope of experience	NA