

FOAM Content: How to find and appraise it!

✓ How do I navigate FOAM resources?

- Really Simple Syndication (RSS) Feeds
 - Feedly, NewsBlur, Inoreader
- Search Engines:
 - [Google FOAM](#)
 - [Numose](#)
 - [#FOAMFinder](#)
- Twitter □ [#FOAMed](#), [#FOAMus](#), [#MedEd](#), [#FOAMtox](#), [#FOAMPed](#), [#emconf](#)
- ALiEM [Approved Instructional Resources \(AIR\) Series](#)
- [Social Media Index \(SMi\)](#) □ SMI-50

✓ Where are FOAM resources curated?

- [ALiEM AIR Series](#)
- [LITFL Review](#)
- [FOAM SOAR](#)
- [SAEM SOAR](#)
- [SonoMojo.org](#) – FOAMus
- [emDOCs.net EM Educator Series](#) – MedEd
- [PEM geek](#)

✓ How do I appraise FOAM resources?

- Gestalt - What are good markers of quality?
- [rMETRIC Scoring Tool](#)
 - METRIQ 5 and METRIQ 8 scoring tools
- [ALiEM AIR Tool](#) (revised air took)
- Peer reviewed FOAM - Transparency
 - Pre publication peer review
 - [Conflict of Interest](#)
 - Post publication peer review (comments)

FOAM Content: How to find and appraise it!

Revised METRIC Scoring Tool

Questions	Options
Q1: Does the resource provide enough background information to situate the user?	3 - Yes, the resource provides sufficient background information to situate the user and also directs users to other valuable resources related to the topic. 2 - Yes, the resource provides sufficient background information to situate the user 1 - No, the information presented within the resource cannot be situated within its broader context, but users are directed to resources with this information. 0 - No, the information presented within the resource cannot be situated within its broader context without looking up information independently.
Q2: Does the resource contain an appropriate amount of information for its length?	3 - No unnecessary, redundant or missing content, all content was essential 2 - Some unnecessary, redundant or missing content, but most content was essential 1 - Lots of unnecessary redundant, or missing content 0 - Insufficient content
Q3: Is the resource well written and formatted?	3 - The resource is very well written and formatted in a way that optimized and benefits learning. 2 - The resource is reasonably well written and formatted, but aspects of the organization or presentation are distracting or otherwise detrimental to learning. 1 - The resource is somewhat well written and formatted, but could benefit from substantive editing (e.g. grammatical errors are seen, or better organized). 0 - The resource is poorly written and/or formatted and should not be a resource for learning.
Q4: Does the resource cite its references?	3 - Yes, the references are cited, clearly map to specific statements within the resource, and all statements of fact that are not common knowledge are supported with a reference 2 - Yes, the references are cited and clearly map to specific statements within the resource, but statements of fact that are not common knowledge are made without the support of a reference 1 - Yes, there are references listed but they do not map to specific statements within the resource 0 - No, no references are cited
Q5: Is it clear who created the resource and do they have any conflicts of interest?	3 - Yes, the identity and qualifications of the author are clear and they specify that they have no relevant conflicts of interest 2 - Yes, the identity and qualifications of the author are clear, but they do not disclose whether they have any conflicts of interest 1 - Yes, the identity of the author is clear, but they do not list their qualifications or disclose whether they have any conflicts of interest 0 - No, the author of the resource has significant conflicts of interest or is not clearly identified (e.g. no name or a pseudonym is used)
Q6: Are the editorial and pre-publication peer review processes that were used to create the resource clearly outlined?	3 - Yes, a clear review process is described on the website and it was clearly applied to the resource 2 - Yes, a clear review process is described on the website, but it was not clear whether it was applied to the resource 1 - Yes, a review process is mentioned on the website, but it was not clearly described 0 - No, it is unclear whether or not the website has a review process; or, there is no process
Q7: Is there evidence of post-publication commentary on the resource's content by its users?	3 - Yes, a robust discussion of the resource's content has occurred that expands upon the content of the resource. 2 - Yes, some comments have been made on the resource, but a robust discussion about the resource's content has not occurred. 1 - There was a mechanism to leave comments but none had been made. 0 - No, there was no mechanism to leave comments or comments that were present were either unrelated to the post or unprofessional.

Revised Approved Instructional Resources (rAIR) Score

FOAM Content: How to find and appraise it!

<i>An evaluation tool for FOAM resources designed for medical educators</i>						
Score	BEEM Rater Scale	Content accuracy	Educational Utility	Evidence-based medicine	References	Authorship
	How much does this article impact clinical practice?	How concerned are you about the accuracy of this article?	What is the educational value of this article for residents?	Does this article reflect the practice of evidence-based medicine?	Is the literature cited?	Are the authors clearly listed?
0	Would not change clinical practice	Extremely concerned about inaccuracies	Not at all valuable for residents	Not at all evidenced based	None	The author is named without credentials* OR no author is named OR a pseudonym is used
1	Would change clinical practice for most clinicians	Somewhat concerned about inaccuracies	Somewhat valuable for residents	Somewhat evidenced based	References are cited	The author is named and credentials* are listed
2	Would change practice for most clinicians	Not at all concerned about inaccuracies	Extremely valuable for residents	Extremely evidenced based	References are cited inline with the text	The author is named, credentials* are listed, and conflicts of interest are declared
<p>BEEM = Best Evidence in Emergency Medicine</p> <p>EBM = Evidence Based Medicine</p> <p>*Listed credentials may include a certification (e.g. MD, ABEM, FRCPC), level of training (e.g. Registrar, Postgraduate Year), or relevant position (e.g. Assistant Professor, Director)</p>						<p>TOTAL SCORE</p> <p>(out of 12):</p>

Original AIR Scoring Tool

FOAM Content: How to find and appraise it!

Tier 1: BEEM Rater Scale	Score-choose only 1	Tier 2: Content accuracy	Score-choose only 1	Tier 3: Educational Utility	Score-choose only 1	Tier 4: EBM	Score-choose only 1	Tier 5: Referenced	Score-choose only 1
Assuming that the results of this article are valid, how much does this article impact on EM clinical practice?		Do you have any concerns about the accuracy of the data presented or conclusions of this article?		Are there useful educational pearls in this article for residents?		Is this article reflect evidence based medicine (EBM) and thus lack bias?		Are the authors and literature clearly cited?	
Useless information	1	Yes, many concerns from many inaccuracies	1	Low value: No valuable pearls	1	Not EBM based, only expert opinion (and thus more biased)	1	No	1
Not really interesting, not really new, changes nothing	2		2		2		2		2
Interesting and new, but doesn't change practice	3	Yes, a major concern about few inaccuracies	3	Yes, but there are only a few (1-2) valuable or multiple (>=3) less-valuable educational pearls	3	Minimally EBM based	3		3
Interesting and new, has the potential to change practice	4		4		4		4		4
New and important: this would probably change practice for some EPs	5	Minimal concerns over minor inaccuracies	5	Yes, there are several (>=3) valuable educational pearls, or a few (1-2) KEY educational pearls that every resident should know before graduating	5	Mostly EBM based	5		5
New and Important: this would change practice for most EPs	6		6		6		6		6
This is a "must know" for EPs	7	No concerns over inaccuracies	7	Yes, there are multiple KEY educational pearls that residents should know before graduating	7	Yes exclusively EBM based (unbiased)	7	Yes	7
Your Score									

METRIQ 8 and METRIQ 5

Score Model 1: METRIQ-8 Score (Maximum 56 points)	Score Model 2: METRIQ-5 Score (Maximum 35 points)
Q3 Concise content - Does the resource contain an appropriate amount of information for its length?	Q3 Concise content - Does the resource contain an appropriate amount of information for its length?
Q6 Content Construction - Are the processes (e.g. editorial, peer review, evaluation, etc) that were used to create the resource outlined?	Q7 References - Does the resource cite its references?
Q7 References - Does the resource cite its references?	Q10 Background - Does the resource provide enough background information to situate the learner in the context of prior knowledge?
Q8 Editorial Process - Is there an editorial process?	Q11 Moderation - Are interactions between learners moderated effectively to ensure professional conduct?
Q9 Consistency with citations - Are the resource's statements consistent with its references?	Q12 Publisher - Is it clear who published the resource?
Q10 Background - Does the resource provide enough background information to situate the learner in the context of prior knowledge?	
Q11 Moderation - Are interactions between learners moderated effectively to ensure professional conduct?	
Q12 Publisher - Is it clear who published the resource?	