

Supplementary material

Table S3: Frameworks and questions used in the literature review quality assessment process

Reviewers were asked to complete a proforma for each included publication. This required reviewers to identify the 'research type' and to answer evaluation questions and comment on aspects of the publication specific to that research type.

The details of frameworks and evaluation questions used for literature included in this review are provided below.

Once the relevant framework questions had been answered and comments recorded, the evaluation process for all research types asked reviewers to do the following:

'Overall grading of quality of the item that you are reviewing

Please choose one of the following three levels of overall quality for the item that you are reviewing, based on your answers using the quality assessment framework above. Please note: this is an assessment of the study as reported in the item that you are reviewing.

- This publication is of LOW quality. The study as reported has major limitations
- This is a publication of MEDIUM quality. The study as reported has important limitations
- This is a publication of HIGH quality. The study as reported has only minor limitations'

Framework and evaluation questions for Qualitative studies

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record
Adapted from Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) (2010)	Is the described study qualitative research? Are the research questions clearly stated?	Comments on the appropriateness of qualitative research methods to this topic

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record
<p>'Making sense of evidence about clinical effectiveness: 10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research', the checklist for Qualitative Studies dated 14/10/10</p>	<p>Is the qualitative approach clearly justified?</p> <p>Is the approach appropriate for the research question(s)?</p> <p>Is the study context clearly described?</p> <p>Is the role of the researcher clearly described?</p> <p>Is the sampling method clearly described?</p> <p>Is the sampling strategy appropriate for the research question(s)?</p> <p>Is the method of data collection clearly described?</p> <p>Is the data collection method appropriate to the research question(s)?</p> <p>Is the method of analysis clearly described?</p> <p>Is the analysis appropriate for the research question(s)?</p> <p>Are the claims made / conclusions supported by sufficient evidence?</p>	<p>Comments on the level of detail about the qualitative study described in the item that you are reviewing</p> <p>Comments on the appropriateness of data collection or data analysis methods used</p>

Framework and evaluation questions for Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs)

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record
<p>Derived from guidance provided in CRD (2001) 'Undertaking Systematic Reviews of Research on Effectiveness (2nd Edition)' Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) Report Number 4, dated March 2001, and in particular Box 5.8, a checklist of criteria titled 'Quality criteria for assessment of experimental studies'</p>	<p>Was the assignment to the treatment groups really random?</p> <p>Was the treatment allocation concealed?</p> <p>Were the groups similar at baseline in terms of prognostic factors?</p> <p>Were the eligibility criteria specified?</p> <p>Were outcome assessors blinded to the treatment allocation?</p> <p>Was the care provider blinded?</p> <p>Was the patient blinded?</p> <p>Were the point estimates and measure of variability presented for the primary outcome measure?</p> <p>Did the analyses include an intention to treat analysis?</p>	<p>Comments on patient recruitment and the adequacy of assignment to treatment groups</p> <p>Comments on the adequacy of blinding of outcome assessors, care providers, and/or patients</p> <p>Comments on the presentation and adequacy of analyses</p>

Framework and evaluation questions for Controlled before/after studies

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record
<p>Based on the 'Quality criteria for controlled before and after (CBA) designs' as described in Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group (EPOC) (2002) 'Data Abstraction Form, Section 6.4.2', part of the EPOC data collection template, dated July 2002.</p>	<p>Have appropriate baseline measures been recorded?</p> <p>Were the groups similar at baseline in terms of prognostic factors?</p> <p>Where a second site is used as a control, are the site characteristics sufficiently similar?</p> <p>Has there been blinded assessment of primary outcome(s)? (protection against detection bias)</p> <p>Has there been appropriate protection against contamination? (e.g. using a second site as a control)</p> <p>Are the primary outcome measures used reliable?</p> <p>Has there been appropriate and equal follow-up of control and intervention groups by professionals? (protection against exclusion bias)</p> <p>Has there been appropriate follow-up of patients? (has loss to follow-up been addressed)</p>	<p>Comments on patient recruitment and the adequacy of treatment and control groups</p> <p>Comments on the adequacy of primary outcome measurement</p> <p>Comments on the adequacy of protection against sources of exclusion bias</p>

Framework and evaluation questions for Literature reviews (including systematic literature reviews)

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record
<p>Based on Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) (2006) '10 questions to help you make sense of reviews'.</p>	<p>Did the review ask a clearly-focused question (in terms of population studied, intervention, outcomes considered)?</p> <p>Did the review include the right type of study (i.e. ones that address the review's question and have appropriate study design)?</p> <p>Did the reviewers try to identify all relevant studies (bibliographic sources used; follow-up from reference lists; personal contact with experts; search for unpublished materials; non-English language inclusion)?</p> <p>Did the reviewers assess the quality of included studies (was there a strategy/protocol for this, was there a scoring system, more than one assessor)?</p> <p>Where the results of studies have been combined, was it reasonable to do so (results of individual studies displayed; heterogeneity of studies; discussion of reasons for variation)?</p> <p>Are results appropriately presented, and is there a summarised main result?</p> <p>Are you happy with the precision of the results (size of confidence intervals if reported, and comfort with using; presence of a p-value if not)?</p> <p>Can the results be applied to other populations or contexts (specificity of subjects or setting of reviewed studies)?</p>	<p>Comments on the adequacy of the research type, study design and methods</p> <p>Comments on the review results and findings</p>

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record
	<p>Were all important outcomes considered (e.g. for individuals; for policy makers and professionals; for families/carers; for wider community)?</p> <p>Should policy or practice change as a result of the evidence contained in the review (does review provide cost/benefit analysis/can this been determined from elsewhere)?</p>	

Framework and evaluation questions for 'Other' publications

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record (guidance text also provided)
No general framework available	None	<p>Comments on the adequacy of the publication in terms of information sources used:</p> <p>Please detail any concerns or comments that you have in relation to aspects of the publication's production - e.g. use of sources, apparent depth of reporting, impartiality of authors.</p> <p>Comments on the publication results and findings:</p> <p>Please detail any concerns or comments that you have in relation to aspects of the publication's reported results and findings (e.g. in relation</p>

Source of evaluation framework	Evaluation questions used (response categories: Adequate/Yes, Inadequate/No or Not Known)	Comment boxes to record (guidance text also provided)
		to overall credibility, completeness, applicability to other populations and settings, etc.)