

**Therapies for Children with ASD Systematic Evidence Review
Quality Review Form for Previous Systematic Reviews (2008-09)**

First Author, Year: _____ Reference ID #: _____ Abstractor Initials: ____

| | | | |
|--|-----|----|----------------------|
| 1. Was the search strategy appropriate (relevant terminology, comprehensive approach, etc.)? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 2. Were the databases searched appropriate? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 3. Were other search measures (circle applicable: handsearch, reference list search, contacting experts) specified? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 4. Was grey literature included (dissertations, unpublished reports, etc.)? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 5. Does the review provide an a priori design (e.g. procedures established in advance)? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 6. Was there dual review study selection and data abstraction (e.g., 2 reviewers assessed each study for inclusion/exclusion and data extraction)? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 7. Was a list of included and excluded articles provided? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 8. Were characteristics of included studies provided? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 9. Was the scientific quality of included studies rated and documented? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 10. Was the scientific quality of included studies used appropriately to formulate conclusions? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 11. Were methods used to combine findings of studies appropriate? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 12. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |
| 13. Was authors' conflict of interest stated? | Yes | No | N/A or Not Specified |

Comments: