| Study Citation (Authors & Date) | Study Aim/Purpose/ Clinical Question | Sample Characteristics, Size & Setting/ Method of Sample Selection) | Design Level of Evidence (LOE) and Intervention or Program | Tools Used to Measure Outcome Variables (include validity and reliability) | Findings (include descriptive or analytical statistics used) | Reviewer's Comments (Major Strengths & Limitations) |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Giordano, A., Scalvini, S., Zanelli, E., Corra, U., Longobardi, G., Ricci, V., Baiardi, P., & Glisenti, F. (2009) | | Non-probability purposive sample of 460 heart failure patients | RCT; LOE II Portable device that transmits data to remote nurse available for live consultation | | Significant decrease in heart-failure related hospital readmissions for intervention group (95% confidence interval 0.31, 0.76; p = 0.0001) | Strength: Appropriate sample size supported by power analysis Weakness: Selection bias due to predominantly male sample |
| Woodend, K., Sherrard, H., Fraser, M., Stuewe, L., Cheung, T., & Struthers, C. (2008) | | Non-probability purposive sample of 121 heart failure patients | RCT; LOE II Three months of video conferencing with nurse, daily phone report, and periodic electrocardiogram to healthcare providers | | No significant difference in hospital readmissions between intervention and control groups ($p > 0.05$) | Strength: Homogeneity of sample characteristics between intervention and control groups Weakness: Recorded data relied on patient recall |
| Wakefield, B., Ward, M., Holman, J., Ray, A., Scherubel, M., Burns, T., Kienzle, M., & Rosenthal, G. (2008) | | Non-probability purposive sample of 148 patients admitted to hospital for heart failure exacerbation | RCT; LOE II Weekly telephone or video conferences with nurse and transmission of symptoms to healthcare providers for 3 months | | Combined intervention groups had significantly lower risk of readmission compared to control (p=0.02) | Strength: Utilized appropriate sample size based on power analysis Weakness: Participants and researchers were not blinded |
| Klersy, C., De Silvestri, A., Gabutti, G., Regoli, F., & Auricchio, A. (2009) | | 20 RCTs (n=6,258 heart failure patients) and 12 Cohort Studies (n=2,354 heart failure patients) | Meta-Analysis: LOE I Remote patient monitoring via structured telephone contact or through various electronic devices | | Remote patient monitoring as compared to usual care showed significant benefits in patients with chronic heart failure | Strength: Heterogeneity testing and random effects models were completed to account for study variations Weakness: Comparison of usual care was not defined in all studies |
| Clark, R., Inglis, S., McAlister, F., Cleland, J., & Stewart, S. (2007) | | 14 RCTs (n=4,264 chronic heart failure patients) | Meta-Analysis: LOE I Remote monitoring via structured telephone support or tele- monitoring | | Remote monitoring reduced hospital readmission in patients with chronic heart failure | Strength: Every effort was made to identify all relevant studies Weakness: Small number of participants as well as short length of trials in studies utilized |

Example of a Table of Evidence (TOE) Enhanced*

Cherofsky, N., Onua, E., Sawo, D., Slavin, E., & Levin, R. (2011). Telehealth in patients with congestive heart failure in long term home health care. *Joanna Briggs Library of Systemic Reviews*, 9(30), 1271-1296.