

Ministry of Health

PAP Device Evaluation Form

Assistive Devices Program (ADP) 5700 Yonge Street, 7th Floor Toronto ON M2M 4K5

Section 1 – ADP Registered Sleep Clinic Information							
Clinic Name			С	linic Number			
Contact Person			1				
Business Telephone Number ext.	Email Ad	dress					
Section 2 – Evaluator Information	·						
Start Date of Product Evaluation (yyyy/mm/dd)	End Date	of Product Ev	/aluation (yyyy/	/mm/dd)			
Evaluator Name	Profession	nal Title					
Evaluator Name	Profession	nal Title					
Section 3 – Positive Airway Pressure Device Information	on						
Manufacturer	Description	Description of Device (Make and Model)					
Manufacturer Contact Person	Business	Telephone Nu	umber		ext.		
Section 4 – Evaluation: Clinical Assessment							
Please answer the following questions Describe the protocol used to clinically evaluate the equipment							
Identify the conditions which would require the use of this device							
Describe the effectiveness of this device in treating the conditions	s listed above						
Rate the client response to this device using the following scale: 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent)	_	_		_	_		
1 2 3 4 5	<u> </u>	7	8	9	<u> </u>		
Comments or recommendations to the manufacturer							

Section 5 – Evaluation: Performance/Safety
Is the on/off selection switch easily accessible to the user?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, please explain
Is the pressure selection switch (if applicable) easily accessible to the user?
Yes No
If yes, how does the manufacturer address this issue?
Are there any sharp edges/protrusions?
Yes No
If yes, please explain
Are valves (if applicable) designed to be assembled in one manner only?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, please explain
Is the pressure range acceptable?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, please explain
Does the device deliver the specified pressure and flow?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, please explain
Comments and recommendations to the Manufacturer

4598-67E (2022/11) Page 2 of 4

Section 6 – Evaluation: Durability/Reliability											
CPAP/APAP/BPAP Pressure Blower											
			using the follo	wing scale:							
1 (poor) to 10	•										
1	2	3	4	5	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	9	10		
If any response was scored below 5, please explain											
Nasal Mask											
Rate the client response to this device using the following scale: 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent)											
1 (poor) to 10	2	□3	□ 4	<u> </u>	☐ 6		□8	9	□ 10		
					ш.				Ш.		
if any respon	se was scored	d below 5, p	lease explain								
Headgear Data the alies	at raananaa ta	this dayies	using the falls	wing cools.							
1 (poor) to 10		this device	using the follo	owing scale:							
1	2	<u> </u>	4	5	<u> </u>	7	<u> </u>	9	10		
If any respon	se was scored	d below 5, p	lease explain								
Corrugated ¹	Tubina										
		this device	using the follo	wing scale:							
1 (poor) to 10											
1	2	3	4	5	<u> </u>	<u></u> 7	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	10		
If any respon	se was scored	d below 5, p	lease explain								
Pressure/No	n-rebreathin	g									
Rate the clier 1 (poor) to 10		this device	using the follo	wing scale:							
1 (poor) to 10	2	□3	1 4	5	□ 6	7	□8	9	□ 10		
If any respon											
If any response was scored below 5, please explain											
Pressure Adapters/Oxygen Entrainment Rate the client response to this device using the following scale:											
1 (poor) to 10	nt response to	uns device	using the 10110	wing scale:							
1 (pool) to 10	(excellent)										
1 (poor) to 10	(excellent)	3	4	5	<u> </u>	7	8	9	<u> </u>		
1				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	7	8	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
1	2			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	9	10		

4598-67E (2022/11) Page 3 of 4

Other									
Rate the clien 1 (poor) to 10		this device	using the follo	owing scale:					
1	2	3	4	5	<u> </u>	7	8	9	10
If any respons	e was scored	d below 5, p	lease explain						
D: 1 41-: 1		4:	41 1 4	i:i:10					
Did anything b		unction durir	ng the evaluat	ion period?					
Yes	☐ No								
If yes, please	specify what	failed and th	ne circumstan	ces in which th	e failure occur	red			
Comments an	d recommen	dations to th	ne Manufactur	er					
Section 7 -	Conclusion	1							
The device we	ould meet the	needs of yo	our patients.						
Yes	☐ No								
Does this unit	compare in o	cost to existi	ng technology	/?					
Yes	No								
Comments									
Identify advan	ces in techno	ology preser	it in this devic	e					
Describe the	advantages a	s they relate	e to the patien	t/client					
Equivalent P	urpose Devi	ces							
Name of equiv	/alent				Price of e	equivalent (if a	vailable)		
Evaluator Inf					1				
Name of evalu	uator				Title				
Signature							Da	te (yyyy/mm/d	4)
Gigilatule							Da	ic (yyyy/iiiii/di	4)

This form is intended to identify potential products for ADP funding. It does not constitute an endorsement of the product. Please return the completed form to: Assistive Devices Program, 5700 Yonge St., 7th Floor, Toronto ON M2M 4K5. Attention: Program Coordinator, Respiratory Devices.

4598-67E (2022/11) Page 4 of 4