A checklist for HTA reports

It is NOT intended as a scorecard to rate the standard of HTA reports — reports may be valid and useful without meeting all the criteria that have been listed. An introduction, background, objective, context of material in the HTA checklist, etc is available at www.inahta.org/HTA/Checklist.

Reference of report	Maceira Rozas MC, Cantero Munoz P. [Intravitreal Inyections. Effectiveness and safety based on the place of procedure] Santiago de Compostela: Agencia Gallega para la Gestión del Conocimiento en Salud, Unidad de Asesoramiento Científico-técnico, avalia-t; Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad; 2016. Available from: http://https://avalia-t.sergas.gal/DXerais/697/avalia-t201604-InyeccionesIntravitreas-DEF-NIPO.pdf
Organization (acronym)	Avalia-t
Name of person completing the checklist	Maria del Carmen Maceira Rozas
Email	Avalia-t@sergas.es

Email		Į F	Avalia-t@sergas.	.es						
Item							Yes	Partly	No	
Preliminary										
1. Appropriate contact details for further information?							Χ			
2. Authors identified?							Χ			
3. Statement regarding conflict of interest?							Χ			
4. Statement on whether report externally reviewed?							Χ			
5. Short summar	y in non	-technica	l language?						X	
Why?										
6. Reference to the policy question that is addressed?							Χ			
7. Reference to the research question that is addressed?							Χ			
8. Scope of the assessment specified?							Χ			
9. Description of the assessed health technology?							Χ			
How?										
10. Details on so	urces of	informati	on and literature	search	n strategies p	rovide	ed?			
Search	Datal	oases	Year		Language		rimary		Other kind of	
strategy			range	re	restriction		data		information resources	
YES	YES		2016		NO		YES		NO	
Complete referen			List of		Inclusion			Exclusion		
of included studies		excluded studies			criteria		criteria			
YES YES YES YES 11. Information on basis for the assessment and interpretation of selected to the selected to					-41-1	YES				
Method of da					ation of selection of da			Results of		
extraction described?		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			esis described?			assessment clearly		
		assessment of the literature) described?				presented, eg, in the fo				
YES			YES YES			of evidence tables? YES		abies?		
Context?			. = 0							
12. Information o	n conte	(† (mayor)	may not apply to ea	ach HT.	A).					
(Medico-) legal						I	Other perspectives			
implications	analysis			implications		implications		(stakeholders, patients,		
considered? NO	provided? NO			considered? considered YES NO		ed?			rs) considered? NO	
What then?							Yes	Partly	No	
13. Findings of the assessment discussed?							X	,		
14. Conclusions from assessment clearly stated?							X	 		
15. Suggestions for further action?							X	 		
	.56.	J. 450011					<i>,</i> ,	1		