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 | Seguridad y efectividad del soporte circulatorio percutáneo Impella® CP (4.0) en el shock cardiogénico. Santiago de Compostela: Agencia Gallega para la Gestión del Conocimiento en Salud (ACIS). Unidad de Asesoramiento Científico-técnico, avalia-t; 2017. | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Organization (acronym) | Avalia-t | | | | |
| Name of person completing the checklist | Janet Puñal Riobóo | | | | |
| Email | Avalia-t@sergas.es | | | | |

| Item | | | | | | | Yes | Partly | No | |
|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|--------|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| Preliminary | | | | | | | | • | • | |
| Appropriate contact details for further information? | | | | | | | Х | | | |
| 2. Authors identified? | | | | | | | Х | | | |
| 3. Statement regarding conflict of interest? | | | | | | | Х | | | |
| 4. Statement on whether report externally reviewed? | | | | | | Х | | | | |
| 5. Short summary in non-technical language? | | | | | | | | | Х | |
| Why? | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Reference to the policy question that is addressed? | | | | | | | | | Х | |
| 7. Reference to the research question that is addressed? | | | | | | | Х | | | |
| 8. Scope of the assessment specified? | | | | | | Х | | | | |
| 9. Description of the assessed health technology? | | | | | | Х | | | | |
| How? | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Details on so | ources of | informat | ion and literatu | ure sear | ch strategies p | orovid | ed? | | | |
| Search | Data | oases | Year | - 3 - 3 | | | Primary | | Other kind of | |
| strategy | | | range | | restriction | | data | | information resources | |
| YES | Y | ES | Until 2017 | , | YES | | YES | 163 | NO | |
| Complete refere | nce list | <u> </u> | List of | | Inclusion |)) | | Exclusion | | |
| of included studies exclu- | | uded studies | | criteria | | | criteria | | | |
| . = 0 | | | NO | | YES | | | YES | | |
| 11. Information of | | | | | | | lata and | | | |
| extraction described? metal asset | | Critical appraisal | | | Method of data | | Results of the | | | |
| | | method (for quality assessment of the | | Syl | synthesis described | | assessment clearly presented, eg, in the form | | | |
| | | | re) described | ? | | | of evidence tables? | | | |
| YES | YES Y | | YES | | YES | | YES | | | |
| Context? | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Information of | on contex | kt (mayor | may not apply to | o each H | TA). | | | | | |
| (Medico-) legal | | Economic | | Ethical | | Social | | Other perspectives | | |
| implications considered? | | analysis provided? | | implications implication considered? considered | | | | (stakeholders, patients, consumers) considered? | | |
| YES | ρ, | NO NO | | YES | | | 00110 | NO | | |
| What then? | | | | | | | Yes | Partly | No | |
| 13. Findings of the assessment discussed? | | | | | | | | Х | | |
| 14. Conclusions from assessment clearly stated? | | | | | | | Х | | | |
| 15. Suggestions for further action? | | | | | | | | Х | | |