

Table 6

Quality appraisal table

Walsh and Downe's (2006) critical appraisal framework was completed using a broad judgement of high, medium and low quality.

Authors	Scope and purpose - Clear statement of, and rationale for, research question/ aims/ purposes - Study thoroughly contextualised by existing literature	Design - Method/ design apparent, and consistent with research intent - Data collection strategy apparent and appropriate	Sampling strategy - Sample and sampling method appropriate	Analysis - Analytic approach appropriate	Interpretation - Context described and taken account of in interpretation - Clear audit trail given - Data used to support interpretation	Reflexivity - Researcher reflexivity demonstrated	Ethical dimensions - Demonstration of sensitivity to ethical concerns	Relevance and transferability - Relevance and transferability evident	Broad judgement of quality High, medium or low
Aiyegbusi and Kelly	Clear aims, well evidenced	Mixed methods including phenomenology which has complexity, data collection stated	Staff and SUs, Delph, interviews and focus groups, further clarity needed	Thematic, Husserl and psychoanalytic mentioned, further detail warranted	Focused on nurses minimal on service users' experiences	Psychoanalytic approach discussed	Ethical approval granted	One theme discussed, relevance discussed	Medium

Bacha, Hanley and Winter	Clear aims, in-depth background with vast supporting evidence	Discussed method and methodology choice, good consideration of data collection given	Clear recruitment, appropriate sample	Data analysis discussed	Clear table of themes, supporting extracts included, interpretation lead to conclusion	Discussed in analysis	Ethical approval granted	Abstract seems to focus away from the findings, limitations discussed	Medium
Borg and Kristiansen	Brief background, clear aims (slight differences to open questions used)	Clear qualitative design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Group level analysis discussed	Interpretation lead to conclusion	Group level analysis stated, from a larger study	Not referred to specifically	Good discussion, limitations not discussed	Medium
Bowen and Mason	Clear focus, use of evidence	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Quantitative analysis discussed	Statistics interpreted	None-quantitative	Ethical approval granted	Relevance to practice discussed	High
Bressington, Stewart, Beer and MacInnes	Clear background and evidence, clear aims	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Clear analysis discussed	Statistics interpreted	None-quantitative	Section on ethics	Limitations discussed, new insights, aims achieved, practical relevance	High
Cleary and Edwards	Clear focus, use of evidence	Clear design, data collection clear	Clear sample explained	Clear analysis discussed, joint analysis	Clear interpretations lead to discussion	Joint analysis reflections	Not referred to specifically	Limitations discussed in relation to generalisability	Medium
Eldal Natvik, Veseth, Davidson, Skjolberg, Gytri and Moltu	Clear aim identified, good introduction and evidenced background	Broad mention of methodology further depth needed, very good overview of	Clear sample discussed	Analysis discussed in-depth	Clear themes identified, interpretation lead to conclusion	Discussed implications well	Section on ethical approval	Very good, clear discussion and conclusion, limitations highlighted	High

		data collection						Validity and reliability discussed	
Evans, Murray, Jellicoe-Jones and Smith	Clear aims and purpose, good background	Clear design, data collection clear	Clear and in table	IPA clearly discussed	Results and discussion clear	Good section discussed in relation to analysis	Section on ethical approval	Originality and value discussed, limitations discussed	Medium
Horberg, Sjogren and Dahlberg	Clear aims and good background	Clear design, data collection clear	Clear sampling	Discussed very well	Very good	Detailed reflection section	Section on ethical approval	Implications for practice section supported with evidence	High
Jenkins and Coffey	Clear focus, use of evidence	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Comprehensive diagrams completed, appraisal conducted	Interpretation lead to conclusion	Diary extracts included, joint analysis	Section on ethical approval	Limitations insightfully acknowledged, practical and educational implications discussed	High
Johansson and Martensson	Clear aims, good background	Methods clear, data collection clear	Sampling identified	Many themes identified in a table, analysis discussed	Good thematic analysis laid out in discussion	Rigour considered, both authors involved	Section on ethical approval and considerations	Good discussion and clear conclusion, reviews paper strengths	High
Jones and Wright	Good background Clear aims	Clear design Data collection clear	Sample identified	Clear analysis discussed	Themes discussed	Discussed	Discussed	Limitations and relevance acknowledged	High
Ketola and Stein	Good background, clear aims	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Clear analysis discussed, both authors involved in analysis	Findings discussed clearly	Author discussion during analysis	Review board application approved	Recommendations made, limitations discussed	Medium

Kurtz and Turner	Research questions stated, use of evidence	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Grounded theory discussed	Discussion of findings compared with previous studies	Rigour considered	Not referred to specifically	Discussion and summary joined, evidence used, recommendations for discussed	Medium
Langley and Klopfer	Research question stated, use of evidence	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Thematic analysis discussed	Findings discussed alongside other literature	Field notes taken	Ethical approval granted considerations discussed	One theme discussed, wider implications of findings discussed	High
Long, Knight, Bradley and Thomas	Clear aims given, background with evidence supported	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Thematic analysis discussed	Themes identified, interpretation lead to conclusion	Joint discussions in analysis	Ethical approval granted considerations discussed	Limitations and strengths discussed, conclusion joined with discussion	Medium
Looi, Savenstedt and Engstrom	Clear focus, background given	Journal analysis discussed more detail would have been useful	Sample stated clear	Journal analysis-theme table included	Clear result and discussion	Brief reference to reflection	Ethical approval granted	Implications for practice and research discussed	Medium
Lord, Priest and McGowan	Aim stated, good background	Clear design, data collection clear	Interviews, sample clearly stated	IPA discussed	Themes clearly stated in relation to each case. In discussion	Discussed, section on diary completed	Ethical approval granted and considerations discussed well	Strengths and limitations noted, clinical implications discussed	High

					compared with other studies				
MacInnes, Courtney, Flanagan, Bressington and Beer	Clear aims stated, good background given	Clear design, data collection clear	Clear participant data shared and data collection	Scoring discussed	States SPSS, interpretation of others studies	Quantitative	Ethical approval granted and considerations discussed well	Concluding statements given, limitations discussed	High
McAllister and McCrae	Clear aim and focus, good background and evidence	Clear data collection and appropriate, rationale, triangulation	Sampling clear	Clear analysis presented, thematic analysis approach clear	Interpretation lead to conclusion	Reflexive journals kept, section on rigour, table of trustworthines s	Ethical approval granted and considerations discussed	Good discussion of findings, limitations and relevance statement	High
Mollerhoj and Os Stolan	Clear aim, background and evidence provided	Clear design and collection	Clear sample, good detail	Questions given and discussed, analysis briefly referred to	Good interpretation, quotes used	Briefly mentioned in relation to analysis, discussion between researchers	Approval at unit, ethical approval not specifically referred to	Good discussion and conclusion	Medium
Mukumbang and Adejumo	Clear focus, use of evidence	Clear phenomenology	Appropriate sampling	Thematic analysis-table included, second opinion on coding	Discussed in themes and discussion	Trustworthines s discussed, second opinion on coding	Ethical approval granted and considerations discussed well	Recommendat ions for practice, limitations discussed	High
Muller and Poggenpoel	Could be clearer	Clear design, data collection clear	Numbers could be clearer	Table included, content analysis	Discussion and results are together	Section included, consideration of interviewer	Ethical considerations section	Discussion of reliability/ validity in qualitative studies, brief conclusion, limitations discussed	Medium

Oostvogels, Bongers and Willems	Clear aims, abstract not as clear as in discussion	Quantitative approach in keeping with aims, appropriate methodology	Clear sample	Statistical analysis discussed	Interpretation lead to conclusion	Quantitative study	Ethical approval granted	Good discussion and conclusion, aims achieved, limitations discussed	Medium
Rask and Brunt	Clear aims, good background well referenced	Survey research in line with aims	Very detailed overview of participants	Statistical analysis, good consideration of methodology	Tables of results included	Quantitative study	Ethical approval granted	Limitations discussed, study meets aims of study, conclusion given	High
Reavey, Brown, Kanyeredzi, McGrath and Tucker	Clear aim, very comprehensive background	Very detailed overview of design	Detailed	Group analysis conducted	Participant quotes used in interpretation	Reflection on interviewers' observations	Ethical approval granted	Good discussion and conclusion, brief mention of limitations, part of bigger study	Medium
Salzmann-Erikson, Rydlo and Wiklund Gustin	Clear focus, use of evidence	Clear and section on methodological considerations	Appropriate sampling	Broad descriptive approach	Discussion comparing other studies, rationale given for their minimal interpretative approach, minimal discussion on findings, in-depth discussion	Minimal reference	Ethical approval granted	Section on contribution, also methodological considerations	Medium
Schafer and Peternelj-Taylor	Aims could be clearer, background included	Clear design, data collection clear	Appropriate sampling	Discuss Glaser and Strauss but not grounded theory study, triangulated	Sound interpretation in discussion section	Field notes taken, reflective journal	Ethical approval granted	Recommendations made, limitations discussed in data collection, discussion,	Medium

				hypothesis testing				recommendations and conclusion discussed together	
Scheick	Could be clearer	Could be clearer	Appropriate sampling	Complex use of model, statistical analysis	Group development of template	Quantitative and qualitative, reflexivity not specifically referred to for qualitative approach	Institutional review board approval	Limitation referred to in abstract, new model, conclusions based on evidence	Medium
Shattell, Andes and Thomas	Questions posed, good background	Clear design, data collection clear	Setting outlined and sample clear	Thematic, unclear specific approach, group analysis used	Discussion of other evidence, group interpretation	Group interpretation of findings	Approved by institutional review boards	Limitations referred to, new insights	Medium
Shattell, Starr and Thomas	Comprehensive background, clear aims	Another study, clear data collection	Secondary results, clear sample	Secondary analysis	Interpretation in discussion	Joint analysis, presented to participant	Approved by institutional review board	Some links to practical implications	Medium
Walsh	Case study approach, no literature review in keeping with article aim	Methodology discussed, further detail in other article	Case study approach	Phenomenological analysis discussed	Clear discussions of interpretation	Aligned to methodology although not specifically referred to	Not specifically referred to in this paper	In keeping with methodology	Medium
Yildiz	Clear aims, good background, specific background of study area given to	Design discussed, conflict between phenomenology and saturation	Sampling is clear	Topic guide presented, themes presented	Sound interpretation	Rigour section included and detailed	Ethics section included	Good discussion and conclusion based on evidence, strengths and limitations discussed	Medium

	provide context								
--	--------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Quality appraisal table of discussion and literature review papers

Authors	Scope and purpose - Clear statement of, and rationale for, research question/ aims/ purposes - Study thoroughly contextualised by existing literature	Design - Method/ design apparent, and consistent with research intent - Data collection strategy apparent and appropriate	Sampling strategy - Sample and sampling method appropriate	Analysis - Analytic approach appropriate	Interpretation - Context described and taken account of in interpretation - Clear audit trail given - Data used to support interpretation	Reflexivity - Researcher reflexivity demonstrated	Ethical dimensions - Demonstration of sensitivity to ethical concerns	Relevance and transferability - Relevance and transferability evident	Broad judgement of quality High, medium or low
Cameron, Kapur and Campbell	Clear, good background and evidence throughout	Discussion paper	Discussion paper	Themes of discussion	Discussions and interpretations based on evidence	None as discussion paper	None as discussion paper	Relevance discussed, conclusions based on evidence	Low as discussion paper
Chandley	Clear, good background and evidence throughout	Discussion paper	Discussion paper	Themes of discussion	Discussion	None as discussion paper	None as discussion paper	Relevant, interesting piece	Low, however very relevant
Cleary, Hunt, Horsfall and Deacon	Very clear aims stated, thorough background	Clear searching strategy stated	Searching strategy and tables included and discussed	Analysis discussed; their interpretation considered	Considered, clear data trail	Their interpretation of findings considered well	None as literature review	Very interesting and relevant piece	Medium as secondary evidence (High quality)
Gildberg, Elverdam and Hounsgaard	Clear aim, background given	Literature review design	Databases	Content analysis	Themes discussed	None as literature review	Considered in review of literature	Summary given and limitations discussed in-depth	Low as literature review

