

CRITICAL REVIEW FORM: DIFFERENTIAL DIAGNOSIS

Citation:

1. Abdulmalak C et al. Hemoptysis in adults: a 5-year study using the French nationwide hospital administrative database. *Eur Respir J.* 2015; 46: 503-511.
2. Mondoni et al. Observational, multicentre study on the epidemiology of haemoptysis. *Eur Respir J.* 2018; 51: 1701813 (epub).

*answers listed as “1” and “2”, below correspond to the two citations, above,

How serious is the risk of bias?	
Did the study patients represent the full spectrum of those with this clinical problem?	
Was the diagnostic evaluation definitive?	
What are the Results?	
What were the diagnoses and their probabilities?	
How precise are the estimates of disease probability?	
How can I apply the results to patient care?	
Are the study patients and clinical setting similar to mine?	
Is it unlikely that the disease possibilities or probabilities have changed since this evidence was gathered?	

Adapted from Duke and McMaster Evidence-based Practice Workshops and Users' Guide to the Medical Literature 3rd Ed.