

First Author: _____

Year: _____

Journal: _____

Reviewer: _____

Instructions for completion: Please refer to the attached dictionary for definition of terms and instructions for completing each section. For each criteria, score by placing a check mark in the appropriate box.

CRITERION		YES	NO										
1. Did the authors have a clearly focused question [population, intervention (strategy), and outcome(s)]?													
2. Were appropriate inclusion criteria used to select primary studies?													
3. Did the authors describe a search strategy that was comprehensive? (Circle all strategies used)													
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">health databases</td> <td style="width: 50%;">handsearching</td> </tr> <tr> <td>psychological databases</td> <td>key informants</td> </tr> <tr> <td>social science databases</td> <td>reference lists</td> </tr> <tr> <td>educational databases</td> <td>unpublished</td> </tr> <tr> <td>other _____</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		health databases	handsearching	psychological databases	key informants	social science databases	reference lists	educational databases	unpublished	other _____			
health databases	handsearching												
psychological databases	key informants												
social science databases	reference lists												
educational databases	unpublished												
other _____													
4. Did search strategy cover an adequate number of years?													
<p>For questions 5, 6, and 8, please choose the column relating to the appropriate methodology. Strike a line through the column that does not apply.</p>													
5. <i>Quantitative reviews:</i> Did the authors describe the level of evidence in the primary studies included in the review? Level I (RCTs only) Level II (non-randomized, cohort, case-control studies) Level III (uncontrolled studies)		5. <i>Qualitative reviews:</i> Do the authors provide a clear description of the range of methods in each of the primary studies included in the review?											
6. <i>Quantitative reviews</i> Did the review assess the methodological quality of the primary studies, including: (minimum requirement: 4/7 of the following)		6. <i>Qualitative reviews</i> Did the review assess the methodological quality of the primary studies, including: (minimum requirement: 4/7 of the following)											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ research design ▪ study sample ▪ participation rates ▪ sources of bias (confounders, respondent bias) ▪ data collection (measurement of independent/dependent variables) ▪ follow-up/attrition rates ▪ data analysis 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ suitability of methodology/paradigm to the research question ▪ sampling (selection of participants/settings /documentation) ▪ clear description of context, data collection and data analysis ▪ rigor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) audit trail ii) some coding by 2 or more coders, if appropriate iii) deviant case analysis (negative cases) iv) respondent validation (member checking) ▪ triangulation ▪ reflexivity (researcher and research process) ▪ relevance (credibility, consistency, applicability, transferability) 											
7. Are the results of the review transparent?													
8. Quantitative review: Was it appropriate to combine the findings of results across studies?	8. Qualitative review: Is there a description of how reviewers determined results were similar enough across studies to compare or combine them?												
9. Were appropriate methods used for combining or comparing results across studies?													
10. Do the data support the author's interpretation?													

TOTAL SCORE: _____

QUALITY ASSESSMENT RATING (circle one)

(total score 7-10)
STRONG

(total score 5-6)
MODERATE

(total score 4 or less)
WEAK