

Quality assessment and study selection checklist for qualitative studies

This procedure is for use by evidence reviewers considering **qualitative research papers**. It is intended to provide a transparent format for the development of **evidence summaries** for inclusion in IFARG 2020. Evidence reviewers should use this form to record their perspectives on individual papers sourced from the literature search which are deemed to contribute insight to a particular, relevant topic. Papers are qualitative if they use interviews, focus groups, observations etc which provide opinions or ask participants to recall information in their own words. Some papers may use mixed methods research (qualitative and quantitative), in which case this form should be used, as well as the one provided for quantitative studies.

Reviewer name	
Title of paper	
Date of publication	
Author	
Citation or DOI (if possible)	
Date reviewed	
Topic	

Part 1: Information about the approach	Met		Partially met		Not met		Notes
There is a clear statement of the aims of the study	Yes		Can't tell		No		
There is an evidence base to support approach described (this is usually found in the introduction. e.g. educational theory or literature)	Relevant literature is cited and referred to appropriately		Literature is cited but not clear about relevance, or is not thorough		No evidence base is provided		
The research methodology is described (e.g interviews, focus groups, observations)?	Yes, clear and appropriately defended		Implied but not well described, or information is missing		Not described		
The subject population is described (e.g. are demographics of the group reported)?	Yes, clear information is		Population is described but		No description of the population		

	provided about the population		specific info is not provided			
The sampling strategy is well described (who or what is selected, how and why), or not applicable (please note this and provide further detail in the final column)	Yes, it is clear who/what was selected, how and why		There is a description, but explanation is inadequate		Sampling strategy is not described	Not applicable
Ethical approval is explicit (if needed), or explained why not needed (please note this in last column)	Yes, there is a statement of ethical approval or clear explanation if not needed		Not clear		Ethical approval is not mentioned	Not needed
Participant consent has been acquired (if applicable)	Yes, and it is clear how.		Implied but not clear how it was acquired		No acquired or reported on	Not applicable
The methods for processing and analysing data are transparent	Clear explanations of analysis and reasons, including who was involved in analysis		Touched on but not thorough		Not clear or transparent	
Based on the above answers, should review of this paper continue? (If the paper is thought to be of sufficient quality it should be referred to in an evidence summary created for this topic. If it is of poor quality, it can be excluded at this stage)	Yes, above criteria mostly met		Yes, because not enough information to exclude		No, because most of the criteria above are not met and the paper is therefore too weak to include.	

For Educational papers (where learning is implicit to the study): this section allows the reviewer to determine the strength of the approach from an education perspective. This section is relevant to both qualitative and quantitative papers.

Part 2: Information about the education	High quality		Medium quality		Low quality		Notes
Educational materials used for the learning are well described	It is clear what materials /props were used and why		Materials are mentioned but		No materials are mentioned, or		

			not fully explained		they are not described		
Incentives	Any incentives provided for participants are explicit and are clearly unconnected to the learning outcomes		Incentives are explicit, but there is lack of clarity over any influence they might have on learner outcomes		There is an implication that incentives affect the study outcomes, e.g. by encouraging a bias response.		
Instructor/facilitator information	Information about selection of instructors for the study demonstrates lack of bias		Instructors are chosen for convenience, but there is some level of randomisation or blinding		Instructors have specific skills which might limit generalizability the study outcomes		
Schedule and attendance	Schedule and attendance is consistent and clear		Schedule and attendance is inconsistent, but reported		Schedule and attendance are inconsistent and unclear, thus introducing potential bias		

Outcomes and findings, is relevant to all qualitative studies both educational and non-educational

Part 3: Outcomes and findings	High quality		Medium quality		Low quality		Notes
Outcomes and findings (planned or unplanned) are recorded objectively and accurately	All results are reported upon completely and accurately		Some results are emphasised for effect but all are reported		Some results are excluded or presentation is incomplete		
The data analysis is sufficiently rigorous and clearly follows the methodology described	Analysis follows methodology closely		Analysis can be broadly seen to follow		Analysis does not follow methodology		

	and includes all results		methodology but not always clear and/or some information is missing		and aspects of results are omitted.		
The analysis outcomes are clearly presented	It is clear what the analysis supports		Data is presented but not always easy to navigate		Data presentation is confusing		
Weaknesses in study design or limitations are acknowledged	Researchers show good understanding of weaknesses and limitations and offer reasons and suggestions for future research		Weaknesses and limitations are acknowledged and discussed		Weaknesses and limitations are not acknowledged, or researchers do not demonstrate importance of them.		

Part 4: Other information	Yes	No	Don't know	Other info
Is any conflict of interest acknowledged?				
Are funding sources acknowledged?				
Does the work show promise for further exploration?				
Should this paper contribute to the summary of evidence for this topic?				
Quality of evidence overall (high, medium or low)				

Factors affecting implementation of the study findings in developing first aid education	High quality		Medium quality		Low quality		
The paper is explicit about cost or potential cost of implementation, either to the learner or the provider	Costs are explicit and discussed in a transparent way		Costs are explicit but not discussed		Costs are not included in data provided or it is not clear what costs would be incurred		
The paper discusses scalability of the approach and/or extrapolation to other contexts	Options and issues for evolution are discussed and further research needed		Some discussion of next steps to evolve the work already done		Little or no indication of next steps		
The paper gives indications of cultural, environmental, behavioural or legal considerations	Cultural, environmental, behavioural or legal aspects are discussed and contextualised		Cultural, environmental, behavioural or legal aspects are mentioned		Cultural, environmental, behavioural or legal aspects are ignored		
Please indicate here any specific cultural, environmental, behavioural or legal aspects which could be explored further for the implementation recommendations for the Guidelines							

Summary of article

Brief summary of what the article adds to this review	
Methodology: what was the educational approach, what materials were used, who were the learners and instructors, how was the education delivered?	
What are the results – what was found, and how strong was the finding?	
What are the implications of this work – can the findings be extrapolated to other populations? Are the costs or scalability feasible for rolling out this approach?	
What are the limitations of this study, including weaknesses in design and trustworthiness?	
Are the findings consistent with other evidence from similar studies?	