| | Chart review Checklist | YES | NO | NA |
|-----|--|-----|----|----|
| 1 | Training (typically by PI) | | | |
| | Have identified all parts of the record for review (e.g. Progress notes, labs) | | | |
| | Medical synonyms and colloquialisms have been discussed and defined | | | |
| | Interpretation will not be done when reviewing. A strategy for copying the statement and reviewing with PI has been determined | | | |
| | A table for documenting interpretations has been prepared | | | |
| | Practice charts have been used and reviewed by the trainer to check proficiency. | | | |
| | Determined whether paper extraction the data entry is better than entry into electronic database | | | |
| 1a. | If chart to be extracted into electronic data base, practice is done with electronic database and checked | | | |
| 2 | Case Selection | | | |
| | Inclusion/exclusion criteria have been specified | | | |
| | Checklist for inclusion criteria is prepared | | | |
| | Table or checklist to record exclusions- who, what , where , why- has been prepared | | | |
| 3 | Definition of variables | | | |
| | A dictionary of variables to be collected has been prepared | | П | |
| | A precise definition of each variable is given(e.g Referred means Ever referred not at a | | | |
| | specific visit) | | | |
| | Definitions consistent with general usage | | | |
| | Values for variables have been specified A procedure manual contains variable information in easily obtainable form | H | | |
| 4 | Abstraction Form | Ш | | |
| | | | | |
| | Sufficient space is allowed on form for ambiguities to be documented Space exists to document why data are missing | H | | |
| | Data on form mirrors the order in the chart (as much as possible) | | | |
| , | Electronic data base is defined which mirrors form (minus comments) | | | |
| 4a | If chart to be extracted to electronic data base comment fields are kept. | | | П |
| 5 | Regular meetings | | | |
| | Routine review meetings with PI and chart reviewer(s) are scheduled. | | | |
| | Plan for review of problems early is in place. | | | |
| | Strategy for documenting decisions exists. | H | H | |
| 6 | Monitoring | | | |
| | At beginning, plan is to independently review 10 charts | | |] |
| | Check for reviewer taking shortcut in place | | | |
| | Check for missing data in place | | | |
| | Check for wrong information in place | | | |
| | Plan is to periodically (especially after 50% reviews) independently review another 10 charts | | | |
| 7 | Blinding | | | |
| | Was it possible to blind the chart reviewer to the outcome? | | | |
| 7a | If it is possible, is there a plan to do this? | | | |
| 8 | Testing inter rater agreement | | | |
| 8a | If only one rater is used, then the rater will have the PI extract 10-20 charts and the interrater agreement will be checked | | | |
| 8b | If more than one chart extractor is used, then 10-20 charts will be reviewed independently by all pairs of raters to establish that agreement can be reached | | | |

If any NO are checked, RECONSIDER!