

## APPENDIX 15B: METHODOLOGY CHECKLIST: QUALITATIVE STUDIES

Study reference	ASKEY2009	
<p><b>Bibliographic reference:</b></p> <p>Askey R, Holmshaw J, Gamble C, Gray R. What do carers of people with psychosis need from mental health services? Exploring the views of carers, service users and professionals. <i>Journal of Family Therapy</i>. 2009;31:310-31</p>		
<p><b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b></p>		
<p><b>1.1 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<p><b>1.2 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Notes and statements from focus groups were used to generate themes for thematic analysis (not recorded and transcribed verbatim)</p>

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Not described in enough detail. Data was collected from carers , service users amd professionals but data were not compared.</p>
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	<p>Comments:</p> <p>More than 1 researcher however there is no mention about differences were resolved</p>

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	BARNABLE2006	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Barnable A, Gaudine A, Bennett L, Meadus R. Having a sibling with schizophrenia: a phenomenological study. Research and theory for nursing practice. 2006;20:247-64.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.3 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.4 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:



Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	BERGNER2008	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Bergner E, Leiner AS, Carter T, Franz L, Thompson NJ, Compton MT. The period of untreated psychosis before treatment initiation: a qualitative study of family members' perspectives. <i>Comprehensive Psychiatry</i> . 2008;49:530-6.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.5 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.6 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:  All carers were African Americans and high school graduates
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Thematic analysis and content analysis used to generate categories</p>
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feedback on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:



<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	CHIU2006	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Chiu MYL, Wei GFW, Lee S. Personal tragedy or system failure: A qualitative analysis of narratives of caregivers of people with severe mental illness in Hong Kong and Taiwan. <i>International Journal of Social Psychiatry</i> . 2006;52:413-23.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.7 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.8 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:  Sample not varied
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:



<b>Study reference</b>	GOODWIN2006	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Goodwin V, Happell B. Conflicting agendas between consumers and carers: The perspectives of carers and nurses. <i>International Journal of Mental Health Nursing</i> . 2006;15:135-43.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.9 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.10 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Weak rationale for using focus groups (i.e. a way to collect information faster than interviews)</p> <p>Study aimed to examine issues of consumer and carer participation in mental health care- but only carers and healthcare professionals were recruited</p>
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Unclear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See comment above about focus groups- only 2 focus groups with carers</p>

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Content analysis. Not enough detail provided.</p>
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Poor	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:



Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	HUGHES2011	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Hughes H, Meddings S, Vandrevalla T, Holmes S, Hayward M. Carers' experiences of assertive outreach services: An exploratory study. Journal of Mental Health. 2011;20:70-78.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.11 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.12 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Section 2: study design</b>		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
<b>Section 3: data collection</b>		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:



Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	JANKOVIC2011	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Jankovic J, Yeeles K, Katsakou C, Amos T, Morriss R, Rose D, et al. Family caregivers' experiences of involuntary psychiatric hospital admissions of their relatives--a qualitative study. PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource]. 2011;6:e25425.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.13 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.14 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:



<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	KNUDSON2002	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Knudson B, Coyle A. Parents' experiences of caring for sons and daughters with schizophrenia: A qualitative analysis of coping. <i>European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling and Health</i> . 2002;5:169-83.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.15 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.16 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Unclear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:

research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Unclear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Partially relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:



<b>Study reference</b>	LAIRD2010	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Laird B, Smith B, Dutu G, Mellsop G. Views and experiences of family/whanau carers of psychiatric service users on diagnosis and classification. The International journal of social psychiatry. 2010;56:270-79.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.17 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.18 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Section 2: study design</b>		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Not enough information</p>
<b>Section 3: data collection</b>		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	<p>Comments:</p>
<b>Section 4: validity</b>		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Not described	<p>Comments:</p>

research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:  Not enough information about what they did or the rationale
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:  Not reported in enough detail

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Inadequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	LEVINE2002	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Levine IS, Ligenza LR. In their own voices: Families in crisis. A focus group study families of persons with serious mental illness. Journal of Psychiatric Practice. 2002;8:344-53.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.19 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.20 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:



research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Inadequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	LOBBAN2012	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Lobban F, Glentworth D, Haddock G, Wainwright L, Clancy A, R B. The views of relatives of young people with psychosis on how to design a Relatives Education And Coping Toolkit (REACT). Journal of Mental Health. 2011;20:567-79.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.21 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.22 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:



<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	LUMSDEN2011	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Lumsden V, Rajan L. Carer satisfaction with an Assertive Outreach Service. Clinical Psychology Forum. 2011:11-15.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.23 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.24 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:

research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Poor	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Partially relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:



<b>Study reference</b>	MCAULIFFE2009	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> McAuliffe D, Andriske L, Moller E, O'Brien M, Breslin P, Hickey P. 'Who cares?' An exploratory study of carer needs in adult mental health. AeJAMH (Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health). 2009;8:1-12.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.25 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.26 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	MCCANN2011	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> McCann TV, Lubman DI, Clark E. First-time primary caregivers' experience accessing first-episode psychosis services. <i>Early Intervention in Psychiatry</i> . 2011;5:156-62.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.27 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.28 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:



research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	MCCANN2012	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> McCann TV, Lubman DI, Clark E. Primary caregivers' satisfaction with clinicians' response to them as informal carers of young people with first-episode psychosis: A qualitative study. <i>Journal of Clinical Nursing</i> . 2012;21:224-31.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.29 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.30 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

research was explained and presented to the participants?		
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:
<b>Section 5: analysis</b>		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.2 Are the data 'rich'?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:



<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

Section 6: ethics		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	NICHOLLS2009	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Nicholls E, Pernice R. Perceptions of the relationship between mental health professionals and family caregivers: Has there been any change? <i>Issues in Mental Health Nursing</i> . 2009;30:474-81.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.31 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.32 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:



<b>Study reference</b>	NORDBY2010	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Nordby K, Kjongsberg K, Hummelvoll JK. Relatives of persons with recently discovered serious mental illness: In need of support to become resource persons in treatment and recovery. Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing. 2010;17:304-11.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.33 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.34 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	REID2006	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Reid J, Lloyd C, de Groot L. The psychoeducation needs of parents who have an adult son or daughter with a mental illness. AeJAMH (Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health). 2005;4:No Pagination Specified.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.35 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.36 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:



Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	RILEY2011	
<p><b>Bibliographic reference:</b></p> <p>Riley G, Gregory N, Bellinger J, Davies N, Mabbott G, Sabourin R. Carer's education groups for relatives with a first episode of psychosis: An evaluation of an eight-week education group. <i>Early Intervention in Psychiatry</i>. 2011;5:57-63.</p>		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<p><b>1.37 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<p><b>1.38 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:



addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	ROONEY2006	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Rooney R, Wright B, O'Neil K. Issues faced by carers of people with a mental illness from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds: carers' and practitioners' perceptions. Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health. 2006;5:1-13.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.39 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.40 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:



<b>Study reference</b>	SAUNDERS2002	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Saunders JC, Byrne MM. A thematic analysis of families living with schizophrenia. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing. 2002;16:217-23.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.41 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.42 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	SMALL2010	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Small N, Harrison J, Newell R. Carer burden in schizophrenia: considerations for nursing practice. <i>Mental Health Practice</i> . 2010;14:22-25.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.43 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.44 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Unclear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:



Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Partially relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	TANSKANEN2011	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Tanskanen S, Morant N, Hinton M, Lloyd-Evans B, Crosby M, Killaspy H, et al. Service user and carer experiences of seeking help for a first episode of psychosis: A UK qualitative study. BMC Psychiatry. 2011;11.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.45 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.46 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:



addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	TRANVAG2008	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Tranvag O, Kristoffersen K. Experience of being the spouse/cohabitant of a person with bipolar affective disorder: A cumulative process over time. Scandinavian journal of caring sciences. 2008;22:5-18.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.47 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.48 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Partially relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:



<b>Study reference</b>	Wainwright	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Wainwright L, Glentworth D, Haddock G, Bentley R, Lobban F. What do relatives experience when supporting someone in early psychosis. In press.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.49 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.50 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:

Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Rigorous	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/discrepant results</li> </ul>	Reliable	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</li> </ul>		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

<b>Study reference</b>	WEIMAND2011	
<b>Bibliographic reference:</b> Weimand BM, Hedelin B, Hall-Lord M-L, Sallstrom C. "Left alone with straining but inescapable responsibilities": Relatives' experiences with mental health services. <i>Issues in Mental Health Nursing</i> . 2011;32:703-10.		
<b>Section 1: theoretical approach</b>		
<b>1.51 Is a qualitative approach appropriate?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings?</li> <li>• Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?</li> </ul>	Appropriate	Comments:
<b>1.52 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?</b>  <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)?</li> <li>• Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature?</li> <li>• Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments:

Section 2: study design		
<p><b>2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the design appropriate to the research question?</li> <li>• Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach?</li> <li>• Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</li> <li>• Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
<p><b>3.1 How well was the data collection carried out?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the data collection methods clearly described?</li> <li>• Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</li> <li>• Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:



Section 4: validity		
<p><b>4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</li> <li>• Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?</li> </ul>	Not described	Comments:
<p><b>4.2 Is the context clearly described?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</li> <li>• Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</li> <li>• Was context bias considered?</li> </ul>	Unclear	Comments:
<p><b>4.3 Were the methods reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were data collected by more than one method?</li> <li>• Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</li> <li>• Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</li> </ul>	Not sure	Comments:

Section 5: analysis		
<p><b>5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results?</li> <li>• How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:
<p><b>5.2 Are the data ‘rich’?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well are the contexts of the data described?</li> <li>• Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored?</li> <li>• How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated?</li> <li>• Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?</li> </ul>	Rich	Comments:
<p><b>5.3 Is the analysis reliable?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data?</li> <li>• If so, how were differences resolved?</li> <li>• Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant)</li> <li>• Were negative/ discrepant results</li> </ul>	Not sure/ not reported	Comments:

addressed or ignored?		
<p><b>5.4 Are the findings convincing?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are the findings internally coherent?</li> <li>• Are extracts from the original data included?</li> <li>• Are the data appropriately referenced?</li> <li>• Is the reporting clear and coherent?</li> </ul>	Convincing	Comments:
<p><b>5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</b></p>	Relevant	Comments:
<p><b>5.6 Are the conclusions adequate?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted?</li> <li>• Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject?</li> <li>• Are the implications of the research clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is there adequate discussion of any</li> </ul>	Adequate	Comments:

limitations encountered?		
<b>Section 6: ethics</b>		
<p><b>6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations?</b></p> <p><i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</li> <li>• Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity?</li> <li>• Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behavior?</li> <li>• Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</li> </ul>	Clear	Comments: