MODE ARTS: Quality Assessment Tool

Paper ID:

	Criteria	Yes (2/good)	Partial (1/fair)	No (0/poor)	N/A
1	Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly & sufficiently described?	Easily identified in introduction/method. Specifies: purpose, subjects/target population, and specific associations under investigation. ☐	Vague/incomplete reporting *or* some info has to be gathered from parts of the paper other than intro/background/objective section. ☐	Question or objective not reported/incomprehensible. ☐	
2	Are the measures clearly described?	Full description of measures including either a full appended version or a detailed description and examples of questions used ☐	Some description of measure with no appended version or example of questions ☐	Badly defined description of the measure (if no example please note source article if available) ☐	
3	Are the modes clearly described?	Full description of modes including the description of the way in which the measure is implemented in each mode ☐	Some description of modes with no explicit description of implementation of measure. ☐	Badly or no description of mode comparison ☐	
4	Is the main question(s) linked to a strong theoretical framework ?	Hypothesis and objectives fully described within the context of a rigorous theoretical framework ☐	Hypotheses derived loosely from theory with no explicit references to actual, only generalised theories or established concepts ☐	Hypothesis mentioned with no reference to theory ☐	
5	Is the study design well described & appropriate? *(If study question not given, infer from conclusions).*	Design easily identified and well described. ☐	Design and/or study question not clearly described, *or* design only partially addresses study question. ☐	Design does not answer study question *or* design is poorly described. ☐	
6	Are the characteristics of participants clearly described (e.g. age, SES ethnicity)?	Sufficient relevant demographic information. Reproducible criteria used to categorise participants clearly defined. ☐	Poorly defined criteria *or* incomplete demographic information. ☐	No baseline/demographic info provided. ☐	
7	Are the differences in selection across groups or conditions clearly described?	Described and appropriate. Inclusion/exclusion criteria described and defined. ☐	Selection methods not completely described, but no obvious inappropriateness. *Or selection* strategy likely to introduce bias but not enough to seriously distort results. ☐	No information/ inappropriate information provided *or* selection bias which likely distorts results. ☐	
8	Are the study sample representative of the intended population	A full description of the target population is given with the sample selected in a non-biased manner. ☐	Sample selected from a known population however, selection strategy likely introduces bias but not enough to seriously distort results ☐	Sample recruited from an unknown population in an opportunistic fashion ☐	

9	How were participants allocated to conditions?	*If randomisation appropriate:* Evidence of well randomised design with a description of the method used (e.g. random number tables, block design). ☐	No randomisation mentioned but a stratified sampling method is utilised (i.e. may be that full randomisation may not be possible). ☐	Random allocation not mentioned although it would have been feasible and appropriate (and possible done). ☐	Study has no control group i.e. observation-al /surveys/ case-control. *Or* adequate justification for non-randomisation given. ☐
10	Are population characteristics (if measured & described) controlled for and adequately described?	Appropriate control at design/analysis stage *or* randomised study with comparable baseline characteristics. ☐	Incomplete control/ description. *Or* not considered but unlikely to seriously influence results. ☐	Not controlled for and likely to seriously influence results. ☐	
11	Was consideration given for data collected at different times (within groups)	A well described hypothetical reason why data was collected from participants at different time points or comparison with matched historical data set ☐	Data was collected at different times due to specific opportunity ☐	No explanation for data collection at different time points, either by chance ☐	Studies which data was collected at the same time point or between groups ☐
12	Are the groups adequately compared across	The same measure or mode adapted measures are applied to both groups with full description of procedure ☐	No clear description of comparison across responder groups only that the same measure was utilised ☐	No description of methods of comparison between groups or measure application ☐	Studies that compare different modes within the same group ☐
13	Have the characteristics of non-responders or participants lost to follow-up been described?	Losses adequately reported & not likely to affect results, *Or* no responders or participants lost to follow up ☐	Losses not well reported, but small & not likely to affect results. ☐	No information *or* large losses of responders and likely to affect results. ☐	
14	Are the main findings clearly described?	Simple outcome data (e.g. mean/proportions) reported for all major findings. ☐	Incomplete or inappropriate descriptive statistics. ☐	No/inadequate descriptive statistics ☐.	
15	Are methods of analysis adequately described and appropriate?	Described and appropriate. ☐	Not reported but probably appropriate *or* some tests appropriate, some not. ☐	Methods not described and cannot be determined. ☐	
16	Are estimates of variance reported for the main results?	Appropriate estimates provided (SD/SE, confidence intervals). ☐	Undefined *or* estimates provided for some but not all outcomes. ☐	No information. ☐	
17	Does the explanation of the results lie within the theoretical framework identified in the introduction	Clear and coherent description of results discussed in relation to previous established theoretical framework ☐	Findings related to generalised theory with no specific relation to specific theory ☐	Findings discussed with no consideration to previously mentioned theory ☐	
18	Are the conclusions supported by the results?	All conclusions supported by data. ☐	Some of the major conclusions are supported by the data; some are not. *Or* speculative interpretations are not indicated as such. ☐	None/few of major conclusions supported by the data. ☐	