



iCAHE Critical Appraisal Summary

Article/Paper

Baker PRA, Francis DP, Soares J, Weightman AL, Foster C. Community wide interventions for increasing physical activity. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2011, Issue 4.

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review address a clearly focused question?</p> <p>There are several community wide interventions for physical activity but their ability to achieve population level improvements is unknown. The authors set out to assess the effects of community wide, multi-strategic interventions upon population levels of physical activity.</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the authors look for the appropriate sort of papers?</p> <p>The authors searched all the relevant databases, scanned national websites and guideline houses such as NICE and SIGN. Reference lists of all relevant systematic reviews, guidelines and primary studies were followed up and experts in the field were spoken to as well.</p> <p>The searches were last updated to the end of November 2009 and were not restricted by language or publication status.</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES</p>
3	✓			<p>Do you think the important, relevant studies were included?</p> <p>Cluster randomised controlled trials, randomised controlled trials (RCT), quasi-experimental designs which used a control population for comparison, interrupted time-series (ITS) studies, and prospective controlled cohort studies (PCCS) were included. Only studies with a minimum six-month follow up from the start of the intervention to measurement of outcomes were included. Community wide interventions had to comprise at least two broad strategies aimed at physical activity for the whole population.</p>

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
 Telephone: +61 8 830 22099
 Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 00121B



University of
 South Australia

International Centre for
 Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

4	✓		<p>Did the review’s authors do enough to assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>Quality criteria questions for randomised controlled trials (RCTs), controlled clinical trials (CCTs), controlled before and after (CBA) studies and ITS study designs were incorporated into the data extraction form.</p> <p>However the authors do not report on the quality of the studies or mention any appraisal tool on which the above mentioned questions were modelled.</p>
5	✓		<p>If the results of the review have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>Very few studies had reliable measures of physical activity and sedentary behaviour, and much of the data were incomplete, this was not done. Hence the results of the studies were combined narratively. Meta- analysis could not be performed due to heterogeneity between the studies.</p>
6			<p>What are the overall results of the reviews?</p> <p>The authors report a noticeable inconsistency of the findings of the available studies and this is confounded by serious methodological issues within the included studies. The body of evidence in this review does not support the hypothesis that multi-component community wide interventions effectively increase population levels of physical activity.</p> <p>There is a clear need for well-designed intervention studies and such studies should focus on the quality of the measurement of physical activity, the frequency of measurement and the allocation to intervention and control communities.</p>
7			<p>How precise are the results?</p> <p>N/A. results are presented narratively; hence precision doesn’t apply in this aspect.</p>
8			<p>Can the results be applied to the local population?</p> <p>Consumer to answer based on the relevance to their population and clinical setting.</p>
9			<p>Were all important outcomes considered?</p> <p>Consumer to answer based on their interpretation of the paper.</p>
10			<p>Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?</p> <p>Consumer to answer based on their interpretation of the paper.</p>