

Appendix 17

Quality assessment of included systematic reviews of adapted interventions (Critical Appraisal Skills Programme)

Study	Clearly focused question?	Right type of study?	Tried to identify all relevant studies?	Assessed quality of studies?	Are results combined and, if so, was it reasonable?	How are the results presented (OR/RR, etc.) and what is the main result?	How precise are the results? (CIs, <i>p</i> -values)	Can the results be applied to the local population?	Were all important outcomes considered?	Should policy change as a result of the evidence?
Whitt-Glover and Kumanyika 2009 ²⁷⁶	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Not combined	Narrative (see <i>Table 11</i>)	N/R	Results are relevant to our study populations	Yes	Not enough evidence
Hawthorne <i>et al.</i> 2008 ²⁷⁸	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Weighted mean difference (see <i>Table 11</i>)	95% CIs and <i>p</i> -values reported and some significant results	Yes, UK-relevant ethnic minority groups and others relevant to study	Yes	Yes – recommends cultural adaptation as a good standard for ethnic minority groups
Hudson 2008 ²⁷⁷	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Not combined	Narrative (see <i>Table 11</i>)	N/R	Results are relevant to our study populations	Yes	Not enough evidence
Webb 2008 ²⁴⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	OR (see <i>Table 11</i>)	95% CIs reported and some significant results	Results are relevant to our study populations	Yes	Not enough evidence
Chen and Tang 2007 ²⁷⁵	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Not combined	Narrative (see <i>Table 11</i>)	N/R	Results are relevant to our study populations	Yes	Not enough evidence
Shaya <i>et al.</i> 2006 ²⁷⁹	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Not combined	Narrative (see <i>Table 11</i>)	N/R	Results are relevant to our study populations	Yes	Not enough evidence
Banks-Wallace and Conn 2002 ²⁴⁵	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Not combined	Narrative (see <i>Table 11</i>)	N/R	Results are relevant to our study populations	Yes	Not enough evidence

CI, confidence interval; N/R, not reported; OR, odds ratio; RR, risk ratio.