

Evaluative And Explanatory Reasoning

Trials



Review

Open Access

Making trials matter: pragmatic and explanatory trials and the problem of applicability

Shaun Treweek^{1,2} and Merrick Zwarenstein^{3,4,5}

Address: ¹Division of Clinical and Population Sciences and Education, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK; ²Norwegian Knowledge Centre for the Health Services, Oslo, Norway; ³Centre for Health Services Sciences, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Sunnybrook Health Services Centre, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; ⁴Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Toronto, Ontario, Canada and ⁵Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Email: Shaun Treweek^{*} - stweek@mac.com; Merrick Zwarenstein - merrick.zwarenstein@ices.on.ca

^{*} Corresponding author

Published: 3 June 2009

Received: 9 January 2009

Accepted: 3 June 2009

Trials 2009, 10:37 doi:10.1186/1745-6215-10-37

This article is available from: <http://www.trialsjournal.com/content/10/1/37>

© 2009 Treweek and Zwarenstein; licensee BioMed Central Ltd.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Randomised controlled trials are the best research design for decisions about the effect of different interventions but randomisation does not, of itself, promote the applicability of a trial's results to situations other than the precise one in which the trial was done. While methodologists and trialists have rightly paid great attention to internal validity, much less has been given to applicability.

This narrative review is aimed at those planning to conduct trials, and those aiming to use the information in them. It is intended to help the former group make their trials more widely useful and to help the latter group make more informed decisions about the wider use of existing trials. We review the differences between the design of most randomised trials (which have an explanatory attitude) and the design of trials more able to inform decision making (which have a pragmatic attitude) and discuss approaches used to assert applicability of trial results.

If we want evidence from trials to be used in clinical practice and policy, trialists should make every effort to make their trial widely applicable, which means that more trials should be pragmatic in attitude.

Introduction

The statistical experiment, or, as we know it in medicine, the randomised controlled trial (RCT) is among the more beautiful intersections between man and mathematics. RCTs minimise the risk of bias (threats to internal validity), particularly selection bias [1,2] and are thus the best research design for decisions about the effect of different interventions, be they treatments, therapies or delivery methods and policies. But, as Cochrane noted, there is a snag: randomisation does not, of itself, promote external validity; that is, the applicability of a trial's results to

situations other than the precise one in which the trial was done [3]. It is thus possible for a trial to be free of bias but be of no relevance beyond the immediate setting, patients, and practitioners among whom it was conducted. This question of applicability is central to those who have to choose between therapies for groups of patients (policymakers), for their own patients (clinicians) or for themselves (patients and families). How likely is it, these decision makers may ask, that this treatment (apparently successful in this trial or review) will achieve important benefits in my context, administered to

Page 1 of 9

(page number not for citation purposes)

Read the full-text online edition of Evaluative and Explanatory Reasoning ().Evaluative and Explanatory Reasoning. by Stuart S. Nagel. Nagel's new book will help academic and practicing attorneys in two important ways.Download & Read Online with Best Experience File Name: Evaluative And Explanatory Legal Reasoning PDF. EVALUATIVE AND EXPLANATORY LEGAL .Boris Kment, Modality and Explanatory Reasoning, forthcoming with Oxford. University documented influence on our evaluative judgments and emotions. (FREE) Evaluative And Explanatory Reasoning Download [PDF] [EPUB]. 1. (FREE) Evaluative And Explanatory Reasoning. Evaluative And Explanatory.'A reason' has two meanings: explanatory reasons are facts that contribute to an explanation (of anything explained); normative reasons are facts that favour and .Explanatory reasoning is not only central to ordinary reasoning, but also a cornerstone of When are explanatory inferences, such as an Inference to the Best with conditionals and probabilities - Logical foundations and empirical evaluation.Explanatory theories in psychology are usually evaluated by employing the come together and explanatory reasoning becomes the basis for evaluating theories. Also, in contrast with the Bayesian approach to theory evaluation, advocates of.Causal reasoning is a ubiquitous feature of human cognition. behavior involving both the generation and evaluation of explanatory inferences (for a review.understand how evaluative reasoning is being practised in Aotearoa. New Zealand. . types of questions, such as descriptive or explanatory questions). An.We describe a critical realist Explanatory Theory Building Method comprising of Abductive and retroductive reasoning will be applied to: categorical .. a number of evaluative principles and criteria in a way that has been.Keywords: explanation, motivation, abductive reasoning, causal explanatory reasoning by influencing the generation and evaluation of.C. Explanatory research Errors in everyday observations and reasoning include all of the following EXCEPT: What is the cause behind evaluation research.(modes of reasoning about evidence conceptualising our study). Choice of Evaluation. History The main aim of explanatory research is to identify any.Modality & Explanatory Reasoning by Boris Kment. Richard Baron explains modal reasoning. Your football team only drew a game yesterday. But things could.or explanatory, reasoning, their development through analogical modeling, and their fuller .. generation and evaluation of explanatory hypotheses and theories .distinctive pattern of reasoning wherein explanatory hypotheses are formed and accepted evaluation in the decision-making processes of juries in law courts .Record - We show the applicability of explanatory coherence to mental Eighty Phenomena About the Self: Representation, Evaluation, Regulation, and Change Model-based reasoning requires not only inferences about what.The short answer here is that such evaluation has an explanatory quest programme Such questions drive the evaluator to inspect the reasoning of legions of.

[\[PDF\] The Case Against Professor Briggs](#)

[\[PDF\] Stratigraphy Of The Ovamboland Basin, South West Africa](#)

[\[PDF\] Guido Reni: A Complete Catalogue Of His Works With An Introductory Text](#)

[\[PDF\] The Lean Certification Handbook](#)

[\[PDF\] Being A Snowboarder](#)

[\[PDF\] Writing Early Modern History](#)

[\[PDF\] The Very Dead Of Winter](#)