

Título del estudio: Utilice un título efectivo que transmita los principales temas del estudio, resalte la importancia de la investigación y atraiga a los lectores. Sea conciso. Procure utilizar el menor número de palabras posible.

Autores: Sanchez, J (1), Perez JP (2)

(1) Nombre de institución, Provincia, País.

(2) Nombre de institución, Provincia, País.

Introducción: En una o dos oraciones, resuma el cuerpo científico de conocimiento que rodea su estudio y cómo esto llevó a su investigación.

Objetivos: Indique la(s) teoría(s) que está intentando probar o refutar según su estudio o el propósito si no existe una hipótesis.

Métodos: Resuma sucintamente los métodos generales que utilizó en su investigación. Incluya la población del estudio, el tipo de intervención, el método de recolección de datos y la duración del estudio.

Resultados: Informe los resultados más importantes de su estudio. Solo incluya resultados positivos que sean estadísticamente significativos, o resultados negativos importantes que estén respaldados por un poder estadístico adecuado. Reporte datos reales, no solo valores de p.

Conclusión: Exponga la respuesta a su pregunta o hipótesis original. Resuma las conclusiones más importantes que pueden extraerse directamente de su estudio.

Nivel de Evidencia: Colocar el tipo de estudio (terapéutico, pronóstico, diagnóstico o económico) y el nivel de evidencia (I al V). Ver tabla adjunta.

Levels of Evidence for Primary Research Question¹

| Types of Studies | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Therapeutic Studies <i>Investigating the Results of Treatment</i> | Prognostic Studies <i>Investigating the Effect of a Patient Characteristic on the Outcome of Disease</i> | Diagnostic Studies <i>Investigating a Diagnostic Test</i> | Economic and Decision Analysis <i>Developing an Economic or Decision Model</i> |
| Level I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality randomized controlled trial with statistically significant difference or no statistically significant difference but narrow confidence intervals Systematic review² of Level-I randomized controlled trials (and study results were homogeneous³) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality prospective study⁴(all patients were enrolled at the same point in their disease with ≥80% follow-up of enrolled patients) Systematic review² of Level-I studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing of previously developed diagnostic criteria in series of consecutive patients (with universally applied reference "gold" standard) Systematic review² of Level-I studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible costs and alternatives; value obtained from many studies; multiway sensitivity analyses Systematic review² of Level-I studies |
| Level II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesser-quality randomized controlled trial (e.g., <80% follow-up, no blinding, or improper randomization) Prospective⁴ comparative study⁵ Systematic review² of Level-II studies or Level-I studies with inconsistent results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective⁶ study Untreated controls from a randomized controlled trial Lesser-quality prospective study (e.g., patients enrolled at different points in their disease or <80% follow-up) Systematic review² of Level-II studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of diagnostic criteria on basis of consecutive patients (with universally applied reference "gold" standard) Systematic review² of Level-II studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensible costs and alternatives; value obtained from limited studies; multiway sensitivity analyses Systematic review² of Level-II studies |
| Level III | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case-control study⁷ Retrospective⁶ comparative study⁵ Systematic review² of Level-III studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case-control study⁷ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study of nonconsecutive patients (without consistently applied reference "gold" standard) Systematic review² of Level-III studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses based on limited alternatives and costs; poor estimates Systematic review² of Level-III studies |
| Level IV | Case series ⁸ | Case series | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case-control study Poor reference standard | No sensitivity analyses |
| Level V | Expert opinion | Expert opinion | Expert opinion | Expert opinion |

- (1) A complete assessment of the quality of individual studies requires critical appraisal of all aspects of the study design.
- (2) A combination of results from two or more prior studies.
- (3) Studies provided consistent results.
- (4) Study was started before the first patient enrolled.
- (5) Patients treated one way (e.g., with cemented hip arthroplasty) compared with patients treated another way (e.g., with cementless hip arthroplasty) at the same institution.
- (6) Study was started after the first patient enrolled.
- (7) Patients identified for the study on the basis of their outcome (e.g., failed total hip arthroplasty), called "cases," are compared with those who did not have the outcome (e.g., had a successful total hip arthroplasty), called "controls."
- (8) Patients treated one way with no comparison group of patients treated another way.

This chart is reprinted from The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery.