*i*CAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Journal Club location   Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre

JC Facilitator   Cea Georgeson

JC Discipline   Speech Pathology

Clinical Scenario

Is Semantic Feature Analysis the most effective therapy for improving "high level" word finding difficulties in adults with acquired brain injury?

Review Question/PICO/PACO

P: Adults with acquired brain injury with "high level" word finding deficits

I: Semantic Feature Analysis

C: Other word finding therapies

O: Improved word finding skills

Article/Paper

Sophia van Hees , Anthony Angwin , Katie McMahon & David Copland (2013). A comparison of semantic feature analysis and phonological components analysis for the treatment of naming impairments in aphasia, Neuropsychological Rehabilitation: An International Journal, 23:1, 102-132, DOI: 10.1080/09602011.2012.726201

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the DOHSA librarian.

Article Methodology: Pre-post study

Click here to access critical appraisal tool

The International Centre for Allied Health Evidence (*i*CAHE)
For more information on CAHE Journal Clubs email iCAHEjournalclub@unisa.edu.au
To receive CAHE updates register online at www.unisa.edu.au/cahe

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			**Was the purpose stated clearly?** The aim of the current study was to investigate the relative effects of SFA and PCA therapy for naming in a group of people with aphasia. Population: People with aphasia Intervention: Semantic feature analysis and Phonological Components Analysis Comparator: Compared to each other Outcome (s): naming accuracy
2	✓			**Was relevant background literature reviewed?** Appropriate background literature was reviewed; authors provide an in-depth summary of relevant background information and previous research. Authors also discuss the gap in the literature, highlighting the limitations of the current body of evidence.
3	✓			**Describe the study design. Was the design appropriate for the study question?** A within subject alternating treatment design was chosen to allow for comparisons between the different treatments in the same individual.
4		✓		**Was the sample described in detail?** The author summarised participant information in text and provides demographic information for each participant in table 1. **Describe ethics procedures. Was informed consent obtained?** Authors do not report ethics procedures (e.g. if ethics approval was sought and approved), however all subjects gave their informed consent prior to participation in the study.
5		✓ ✓		**Specify the frequency of outcome measurement (i.e., pre, post, follow-up)** Pre and Post intervention, follow up (2-3 weeks) **Were the outcome measures reliable?** Not reported **Were the outcome measures valid?** Not reported
6	✓			**Intervention was described in detail?** The interventions were described in detail on pages 110 and 113.

The International Centre for Allied Health Evidence (*i*CAHE)
For more information on CAHE Journal Clubs email iCAHEjournalclub@unisa.edu.au
To receive CAHE updates register online at www.unisa.edu.au/cahe

7	✓ ✓			**Results were reported in terms of statistical significance?** Results are presented in terms of statistical significance (p values and effect sizes), however statistical analysis is not described until the results section and no sample size/power calculations are reported.With a small sample and lack of justification of power calculations reported it is likely that the study is underpowered. **Were the analysis method(s) appropriate?** Due to the small sample size and the cross over design non parametric statistical tests are appropriate. **What was the clinical importance of the results? Were differences between groups clinically meaningful?** Journal Club to Answer.
8		✓		**Did any participants drop out from the study?** Not reported
9	✓			**What did the study conclude? Conclusions were appropriate given study methods and results?** The current study found that both participants with semantic impairments only showed significant improvements for items treated with the phonologically-based task, whereas participants with primarily post-semantic impairments benefited from both treatments, with greater maintenance of items treated with the semantically-based task. Conclusions should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size.
10	**Journal club to discuss**			**What do the study findings mean to practice (i.e. clinical practice, systems or processes)?**
11				**What are your next steps? (e.g. evaluate clinical practice against evidence-based recommendations; organise the next four journal club meetings around this topic to build the evidence base; organize training for staff, etc.)**
12				**What is required to implement these next steps?**

The International Centre for Allied Health Evidence (*i*CAHE)
For more information on CAHE Journal Clubs email iCAHEjournalclub@unisa.edu.au
To receive CAHE updates register online at www.unisa.edu.au/cahe