

Supplementary Materials

Appraisal Tools

Realist Appraisal

Document title:				
Author:		Year:	Project title if different:	
Companion papers:				
Usefulness and relevance score:	High	Moderate	Low	None/exclude
Summary of paper: <i>About? Data? Methods?</i>				
What is interesting about this paper? <i>Relevance to PTs? Refer to page no etc, Strength and weaknesses</i>				
Connection between outcomes and process (C+M=O)				
Link to MRTs:				
Stage/aspect of review appraised in:				
Additional appraisal conducted? <i>Which?</i>				
<p>HIGH: High relevance to the realist synthesis. The framing of the research and, the research questions are highly matched to the review questions, the empirical findings are clearly described and there is a rich description of the process and context that can greatly advance the theoretical output of the review. The paper is a 'key informant'</p> <p>MODERATE: 'Moderately' relevant framing of the primary research to the review theories. e.g the article reports on a different (but related) intervention working toward similar outcomes, describes middle range theories, or has a few areas that are of interest.</p> <p>LOW: Has met the selection criteria in terms of relevance to the review questions and the initial programme theories (or MRT) but is thin on context and mechanism. Contains at least one idea or statement about the context, about the mechanisms or about conceptualizing outcomes that can be used.</p> <p>EXCLUDE: The full-text paper does not correspond to the review questions, does not have any content that corresponds to the initial programme theories (or MRT), or does not describe at all the context, or the mechanisms (or process).</p>				

Mixed Method Appraisal Tool (MMAT) V.2018

Document ID:					
Category of Study designs	Methodological quality criteria	Responses			
		Yes	No	Can't tell	Comments
Screening (all study types)	Are there clear research questions?				
	Do the collected data address the research questions?				
	<i>Further appraisal may not be feasible or appropriate when the answer is 'no' or 'can't tell' to one or both screening questions.</i>				
1. Qualitative	1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?				
	1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?				
	1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?				
	1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?				
	1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation?				
2. Quantitative randomized controlled trials	2.1 Is randomization appropriately performed?				
	2.2 Are the groups comparable at baseline?				
	2.3 Are there complete outcome data?				
	2.4 Are outcome assessors blinded to the intervention provided?				
	2.5 Did the participants adhere to the assigned intervention?				
3. Quantitative non-randomized	3.1 Are the participants representative of the target population?				
	3.2 Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?				
	3.3 Are there complete outcome data?				
	3.4 Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?				
	3.5 During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?				
4. Quantitative descriptive	4.1 Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?				
	4.2 Is the sample representative of the target population?				
	4.3 Are the measurements appropriate?				
	4.4 Is the risk of nonresponse bias low?				
	4.5 Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question?				
5. Mixed methods	5.1 Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?				
	5.2 Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?				
	5.3 Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?				
	5.4 Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?				
	5.5 Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?				