

1. Study information

1a Study type (Rheumatoid arthritis = 1, medicine taking = 2)

1b Date of paper's entry into system (DD/MM/YYYY)

2. Reference information

2a Reference type (1 = Journal article, 2 = Book Chapter, 3 = Book, 4 = Report, 5 = Serial, 6 = Thesis, 7 = Unpublished work, 8 = Conference proceeding, 99 = Other)

2c Title of article

2d Authors in the form Surname, Initials; Surname, Initials; etc.

2e Year of Publication

2f Web address

2g Notes

2h Keywords

2i If we have a copy of reprint, who is keeping it – 1 = Pandora, 2 = Gavin, 3 = Clerical Assistant

2j Journal name

2k Volume number

2l Issue no.

2m Start page

2n End page

2o Editors

2p City of publication

2q Publisher

2r Original language of publication (1 = English, 2 = Other)

2s Disciplinary background of majority of authors (1 = medicine, 2 = social sciences, 3 = nursing, 4 = multidisciplinary, 5 = unclear)

2t Geographical location of study (1 = UK, 2 = other Europe, 3 = North America, 4 = Australia and New Zealand, 5 = Other)

2u Corresponding or first author's address

2v Was paper identified using an electronic database? (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

IF YES, please answer the following questions (2w–2bb):

2w Was it on MEDLINE (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

2x Was it on EMBASE (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

2y Was it on CINAHL (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

2z Was it on WoS (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

2aa Was it on PsychInfo (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

2bb Was it on Zetoc (1 = Yes, 2 = No)

2cc If paper not identified using electronic database, then how? (Give one option only)

1 = handsearch (hard copy or online), 2 = checking reference lists, 3 = serendipity/browsing, 4 = checking with experts, 5 = Concordance website, 6 = Reference manager

3. Appraiser information

3a Name of first appraiser (1 = Pandora, 2 = Gavin)

3b Date first appraisal done in the format DD/MM/YYYY

3c Name of second appraiser (1 = Rona, 2 = Jenny, 3 = Roisin, 4 = Nicky, 5 = Lucy, 6 = Myfanwy)

3d Date paper sent to 2nd appraiser in the format DD/MM/YYYY

3e Date paper returned from 2nd appraiser in the format DD/MM/YYYY

3f Date of 2nd appraisal in the format DD/MM/YYYY

3g Name of 3rd appraiser (1 = Rona, 2 = Jenny, 3 = Roisin, 4 = Nicky, 5 = Lucy, 6 = Myfanwy, 7 = Gavin, 8 = Pandora)

3h Date paper sent to 3rd appraiser in the format DD/MM/YYYY

3i Date paper returned from 3rd appraiser in the format DD/MM/YYYY

3j Date of 3rd appraisal in the format DD/MM/YYYY

APPRAISAL

AW = author's words, i.e. respond in author's words *if appropriate* (it's OK to paraphrase)

RW = reviewer's words, i.e. comment in your own words *if appropriate*

4. Initial screening questions

Please read whole paper through once before attempting to answer the questions in this section.

4a Does the paper report on findings from qualitative research and did that work involve both qualitative methods of data collection and data analysis?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

4b Comment using authors' words if appropriate (AW comment)

4c Comment using reviewers' words if appropriate (RW comment)

4d Is the research relevant to the synthesis topic?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

4e Comment

INSTRUCTION: If the answers to both the preceding questions were 'YES', continue with the appraisal. If one or both of the answers were 'NO', exclude the paper and elaborate on the reasons for this in the following questions:

4f Is the paper excluded?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

4g Reasons for exclusion

5. Aims

5a Is there a clear statement of the aims of the research?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

5b AW comment

5c RW comment

6. Methodology

6a Is a qualitative methodology appropriate for authors' stated aims?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

6b AW comment

6c RW comment

7. Theoretical perspective

7a Is a theoretical perspective identified?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

7b AW comment

7c RW comment

7d If yes, which theoretical perspective is identified by the authors?

7e How would *you* categorise the theoretical perspective?

(See notes at end to aid with categorizing into one of four following options: 1 = Phenomenology, 2 = Grounded theory, 3 = Ethnography, 4 = Action research, 5 = not classifiable according to grid)

7f Comment

8. Sampling

8a Is it clear which setting(s) the sample was selected from? (e.g. hospital/community)

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8b AW comment

8c RW comment

8d Is it clear why this setting was chosen?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8e AW comment

8f RW comment

8g Is clear and adequate information given on who was selected?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8h AW comment

8i RW comment

8j Is it clear why these samples were selected?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8k AW comment

8l RW comment

8m Is it clear how the sample was recruited?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8n AW comment

8o RW comment

8p Is the sample size justified by the authors?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8q AW comment

8r RW comment

8s Is it clear how many people accepted or refused to take part in the research?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8t AW comment

8u RW comment

8v Is it clear why some participants chose not to take part?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8w AW comment

8x RW comment

8y Overall, do you consider the sampling strategy appropriate to address the aims?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

8z AW comment

8aa RW comment

9. Data collection

9a Is it clear where the setting of the data collection was?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9b AW comment

9c RW comment

9d Is it clear why that setting was chosen?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9e AW comment

9f RW comment

9g Is it clear how the purpose of the research was explained and presented to the participants?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9h AW comment

9i RW comment

9j Is it clear how the data were collected and why? (e.g. interviews/focus groups, etc.)

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9k AW comment

9l RW comment

9m Is it clear how the data were recorded? (e.g. audio/video/notes, etc.)

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9n AW comment

9o RW comment

9p Is there evidence of flexibility or an iterative process in the way the research was conducted?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9q AW comment

9r RW comment

9s Is it clear who collected the data?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9t AW comment

9u RW comment

9v Overall, do you consider that the data were collected in a way that addresses the research aims?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

9w AW comment

9x RW comment

10. Data analysis

10a Is it clear how the analysis was done?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10b AW comment

10c RW comment

10d Is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10e AW comment

10f RW comment

10g Is there adequate description of the analysis?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10h AW comment

10i RW comment

10j Have attempts been made to feed results back to respondents?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10k AW comment

10l RW comment

10m Have different sources of data about the same issue been compared where appropriate (triangulation)?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10n AW comment

10o RW comment

10p Was the analysis repeated by more than one researcher to ensure reliability?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10q AW comment

10r RW comment

10s Overall, do you consider that the data analysis was sufficiently rigorous to address the aims?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

10t AW comment

10u RW comment

11. Research partnership relations

11a Is it clear whether the researchers critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

11b AW comment

11c RW comment

11d Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

11e AW comment

11f RW comment

12. Findings

12a Please outline the findings here *in as much detail as possible*

12b Were the findings explicit and easy to understand?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

12c AW comment

12d RW comment

12e What are the key concepts and interpretations? *Please outline in as much detail as possible*

13. Justification of data interpretation

13a Are sufficient data presented to support the descriptive findings?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

13b AW comment

13c RW comment

13d Are quotes numbered/identified?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

13e AW comment

13f RW comment

13g Do the researchers explain how the data presented in the paper were selected from the original sample?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

13h AW comment

13i RW comment

13j Do the researchers indicate how they developed their conceptual interpretations of what the data contain?

1 = Yes, 2 = No, 3 = not applicable (i.e. no conceptual development)

13k AW comment

13l RW comment

13m Are negative, unusual or contradictory cases presented?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

13n AW comment

13o RW comment

13p Is there adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' interpretations?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

13q AW comment

13r RW comment

13s Overall, are you confident that all the data were taken into account?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

13t AW comment

13u RW comment

14. Transferability

14a Is there descriptive, conceptual or theoretical congruence between this and other work?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

14b AW comment

14c RW comment

14d Are the findings of this study transferable to a wider population?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

14e AW comment

14f RW comment

15. Relevance and Usefulness

15a Does the study add to knowledge or theory in the field?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

15b AW comment

15c RW comment

15d How important are these findings to practice?

1 = Very important, 2 = quite important, 3 = not very important, 4 = not at all important

15e AW comment

15f RW comment

16. Overall assessment of study

16a What is your overall view of this study?

1 = Excellent, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = not very good, 5 = poor, 6 = very poor

16b Comment

16c Would you include this study in the synthesis?

1 = Yes, 2 = No

16d Comment

17. Time taken to conduct appraisal

17a How long did you take to conduct the appraisal of this paper? Please give time in minutes