APPENDIX 15B: METHODOLOGY CHECKLIST: QUALITATIVE STUDIES

Study reference	ASKEY2009	
Bibliographic reference: 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. Journal of Family Therapy. 2009;31:310-31		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.1 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.2 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments: Notes and statements from focus groups were used to generate themes for thematic analysis (not recorded and transcribed verbatim)
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments: Not described in enough detail. Data was collected from carers , service users amd professionals but data were not

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?	Poor Not sure/not reported	compared.
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments: More than 1 researcher however there is no mention about differences were resolved
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	BARNABLE2006	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.3 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.4 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		
2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data	Defensible	Comments:

collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?		
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	BERGNER2008	
Bibliographic reference: 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. Comprehensive Psychiatry. 2008;49:530-6.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.5 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.6 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments: All carers were African Americans and high school graduates
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments: Thematic analysis and content analysis used to generate categories
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	CHIU2006	
Bibliographic reference: 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. International Journal of Social Psychiatry. 2006;52:413-23.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.7 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.8 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear Unclear Not sure	Comments: Sample not varied
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	GOODWIN2006	
Bibliographic reference: Goodwin V, Happell B. Conflicting agendas between consumers and carers: The perspectives of carers and nurses. International Journal of Mental Health Nursing. 2006;15:135-43.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.9 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.10 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments: Weak rationale for using focus groups (i.e. a way to collect information faster than interviews) Study aimed to examine issues of consumer and carer participation in mental health care- but only carers and healthcare professionals were recruited
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research	Clear	Comments:

was explained and presented to the participants?		
4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Unclear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments: See comment above about focus groups- only 2 focus groups with carers
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts	Not sure/not reported	Comments: Content analysis. Not enough detail provided.

were derived from the data?		
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?	Poor	Comments:
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing Not convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?	Adequate	Comments:
Section 6: ethics		

6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	HUGHES2011	
Bibliographic reference: Hughes H, Meddings S, Vandrevala T, Holmes S, Hayward M. Carers' experiences of assertive outreach services: An exploratory study. Journal of Mental Health. 2011;20:70-78.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.11 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.12 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research	Clear	Comments:

was explained and presented to the participants?		
4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts	Rigorous	Comments:

were derived from the data?		
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?	Rich	Comments:
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:

5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?	Adequate	Comments:
Section 6: ethics		

6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	JANKOVIC2011	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.13 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.14 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	KNUDSON2002	
Bibliographic reference: Knudson B, Coyle A. Parents' experiences of caring for sons and daughters with schizophrenia: A qualitative analysis of coping. European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling and Health. 2002;5:169-83.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.15 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.16 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Unclear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Unclear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	LAIRD2010	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.17 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.18 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments: Not enough information
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Not sure	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments: Not enough information about what they did or the rationale
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments: Not reported in enough detail
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Inadequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	LEVINE2002	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.19 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.20 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Not sure	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?		Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?	Inadequate	
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	LOBBAN2012	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.21 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.22 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	LUMSDEN2011	
Bibliographic reference: Lumsden V, Rajan L. Carer satisfaction with an Assertive Outreach Service. Clinical Psychology Forum. 2011:11-15.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.23 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.24 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Not sure	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Poor	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Not sure	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Not sure	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	MCAULIFFE2009	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.25 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.26 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	MCCANN2011	
Bibliographic reference: McCann TV, Lubman DI, Clark E. First-time primary caregivers' experience accessing first-episode psychosis services. Early Intervention in Psychiatry. 2011;5:156-62.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.27 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.28 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	MCCANN2012	
Bibliographic reference: 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. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2012;21:224-31.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.29 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.30 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	NICHOLLS2009	
Bibliographic reference: Nicholls E, Pernice R. Perceptions of the relationship between mental health professionals and family caregivers: Has there been any change? Issues in Mental Health Nursing. 2009;30:474-81.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.31 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.32 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	NORDBY2010	
Bibliographic reference: Nordby K, Kjonsberg 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.33 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.34 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Not sure	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	REID2006	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.35 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.36 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	RILEY2011	
Bibliographic reference: 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. Early Intervention in Psychiatry. 2011;5:57-63.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.37 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.38 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Not sure	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	ROONEY2006	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.39 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.40 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	SAUNDERS2002	
Bibliographic reference: Saunders JC, Byrne MM. A thematic analysis of families living with schizophrenia. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing. 2002;16:217-23.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.41 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.42 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Not sure	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	SMALL2010	
Bibliographic reference: Small N, Harrison J, Newell R. Carer burden in schizophrenia: considerations for nursing practice. Mental Health Practice. 2010;14:22-25.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.43 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.44 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Unclear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Not sure	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Not sure	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	TANSKANEN2011	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.45 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.46 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	TRANVAG2008	
Bibliographic reference: 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.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.47 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.48 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:

Study reference	Wainwright (pre publication	
Bibliographic reference: Wainwright L, Glentworth D, Haddock G, Bentley R, Lobban F. What do relatives experience when supporting someone in early psychosis. In press.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.49 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.50 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Defensible	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Appropriate	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Clear	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Clear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Reliable	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Rigorous	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Reliable	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions?	Adequate	Comments:

• Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behaviour? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments:

Study reference	WEIMAND2011	
Bibliographic reference: Weimand BM, Hedelin B, Hall-Lord M-L, Sallstrom C. "Left alone with straining but inescapable responsibilities": Relatives' experiences with mental health services. Issues in Mental Health Nursing. 2011;32:703-10.		
Section 1: theoretical approach		
1.51 Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example:* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Appropriate	Comments:
1.52 Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example:* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question(s)? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Clear	Comments:
Section 2: study design		

2.1 How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example:* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 3: data collection		
3.1 How well was the data collection carried out? *For example:* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Not sure/ inadequately reported	Comments:
Section 4: validity		
4.1 Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example:* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Not described	Comments:

4.2 Is the context clearly described? *For example:* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Unclear	Comments:
4.3 Were the methods reliable? *For example:* • Were data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Not sure	Comments:
Section 5: analysis		
5.1 Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example:* • Is the procedure explicit – is it clear how the data were analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis – is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.2 Are the data 'rich'? *For example:* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and	Rich	Comments:

content been explored? • How well have the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?		
5.3 Is the analysis reliable? *For example:* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data? (if possible and relevant) • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Not sure/not reported	Comments:
5.4 Are the findings convincing? *For example:* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Convincing	Comments:
5.5 Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Comments:
5.6 Are the conclusions adequate? *For example:* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and	Adequate	Comments:

coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this study enhance understanding of the research subject? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?		
Section 6: ethics		
6.1 How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethical considerations? *For example:* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are ethical issues discussed adequately – do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered; for example, raising expectations, changing behavior? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Clear	Comments: