# Appendix 48: Quality Assessment Instrument — Qualitative Studies

**Reviewer Name:**

| **STUDY CHARACTERISTICS** | |
|---|---|
| **Ref ID** | |
| **First author** | |
| **Publication year** | |
| 1. Was ethics approval obtained? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **STUDY DESIGN** | |
| 2. Was the study design clearly stated and justified? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES** | |
| 3. Are the research questions and/or objectives clearly stated? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 4. Are the research questions suited to qualitative inquiry? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLING** | |
| 5. Is the sampling strategy clearly described? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 6. Is the sampling strategy congruent with the research questions and/or objectives? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7. Did sampling continue until data saturation was reached? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **DATA COLLECTION** | |
| 8. Are the data collection strategies described with sufficient detail? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 9. Are the data collection strategies congruent with the research questions and/or objectives? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **DATA ANALYSIS** | |
| 10. Are the data analysis strategies described with sufficient detail? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 11. Are the data analysis strategies congruent with the research questions and/or objectives? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **RESULTS** | |
| 12. Are the results supported by and consistent with the data? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 13. Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 14. Are results rooted in participants' own perspectives? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 15. Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **CONFIRMABILITY** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 16. Is the role of the researcher clearly described? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 17. Have the assumptions and biases of the researcher been clearly described? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 18. Have the effects of the researcher throughout the study process been clearly described? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **TRANSFERABILITY** | |
| 19. Is the study setting described with sufficient detail? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| 20. Are study participants described with sufficient detail? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **CREDIBILITY** | |
| 21. Which of the following techniques were used to enhance credibility of results? | □ Member checking<br>□ Peer debriefing<br>□ Attention to negative cases<br>□ Independent analysis by more than one researcher<br>□ Reporting of verbatim data<br>□ Other (specify): |
| 22. Were the applied techniques to enhance credibility sufficient and appropriate? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |
| **DEPENDABILITY** | |
| 23. Which of the following techniques were used to enhance dependability of results? | □ Peer review<br>□ Debriefing<br>□ Audit trail<br>□ Triangulation<br>□ Other (specify): |

| | |
|---|---|
| 24. Were the applied techniques to enhance dependability sufficient and appropriate? | □ Yes □ No □ Unclear<br><br>Comments: |