

Search Terms (Medline)

1. cerebrovascular disorders/ or exp basal ganglia cerebrovascular disease/ or exp brain ischemia/ or exp carotid artery diseases/ or exp cerebrovascular trauma/ or exp intracranial arterial diseases/ or exp intracranial arteriovenous malformations/ or exp "intracranial embolism and thrombosis"/ or exp intracranial hemorrhages/ or stroke/ or exp brain infarction/ or stroke, lacunar/ or vasospasm, intracranial/ or vertebral artery dissection/ or exp hypoxia, brain/
2. (stroke\$ or post stroke or poststroke or post-stroke or apoplex\$ or cerebral vasc\$ or cerebrovasc\$ or cva or SAH).tw.
3. ((brain or cerebr\$ or cerebell\$ or vertebrobasil\$ or hemispher\$ or intracran\$ or intracerebral or infratentorial or supratentorial or middle cerebr\$ or mca\$ or anterior circulation or basilar artery or vertebral artery) adj5 (isch?emi\$ or infarct\$ or thrombo\$ or emboli\$ or occlus\$ or hypoxi\$)).tw.
4. ((brain\$ or cerebr\$ or cerebell\$ or intracerebral or intracran\$ or parenchymal or intraparenchymal or intraventricular or infratentorial or supratentorial or basal gangli\$ or putaminal or putamen or posterior fossa or hemispher\$ or subarachnoid) adj5 (h?emorrhag\$ or h?ematoma\$ or bleed\$)).tw.
5. exp hemiplegia/ or exp paresis/ or exp aphasia/ or exp gait disorders, neurologic/ or hemianopsia
6. (hemipar\$ or hemipleg\$ or paresis or paretic or aphasi\$ or dysphasi\$ or hemianopsia or hemianopia or transient isch\$ or isch?emic attack\$ or TIA or TIAs).tw.
7. ((unilateral or visual or hemispatial or attentional or spatial) adj5 neglect).tw.
8. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
9. exp aphasia/
10. language disorders/ or anomia/
11. (aphasi\$ or dysphasi\$ or dysarthri\$ or apraxi\$ or anomia or anomic).tw.
12. ((language or linguistic or communication) adj5 (disorder\$ or impair\$ or problem\$ or dysfunction)).tw.
13. attention/ or arousal/
14. ((attention\$ or concentrat\$ or arousal or alert\$ or vigilance) adj5 (impair\$ or deficit\$ or disorder\$ or problem\$ or diminish\$ or decreas\$ or reduc\$)).tw.
15. (inattention or distract\$).tw.
16. (error adj3 control\$ adj5 (impair\$ or deficit\$ or disorder\$ or problem\$ or diminish\$ or decreas\$ or reduc\$)).tw.
17. (speed adj3 information adj3 process\$ adj5 (impair\$ or deficit\$ or disorder\$ or problem\$ or diminish\$ or decreas\$ or reduc\$)).tw.
18. (mental adj5 (slow\$ or fatig\$)).tw.
19. (cognitive or cognition or attention\$ or memory or concentration or distract\$ or alert\$).tw.
20. ((attention\$ or cognit\$ or scanning\$) adj5 (training or retraining or rehabilitation or intervention or therapy)).tw.
21. language therapy/ or speech therapy/
22. Speech-Language Pathology/
23. ((speech or language or aphasia or dysphasia or dysarthria or apraxia) adj5 (therap\$ or train\$ or rehabilitat\$ or treat\$ or remedi\$ or pathol\$)).tw.
24. remedial therap\$.tw.
25. cognition disorders/
26. ((cognit\$ or memory or mental\$) adj5 (declin\$ or impair\$ or los\$ or deteriorat\$)).tw.
27. (cognit\$ adj2 (abnormal\$ or defect\$ or disorder\$)).tw.
28. (cognit\$ adj abilit\$).tw.
29. or/9-28

30. interview:.mp.

31. experience:.mp.

32. qualitative.tw.

33. 30 or 31 or 32

34. Qualitative Research/

35. 33 or 34

36. 8 and 29 and 35

Table: Results of quality assessment by study

Baylor et al. [48]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Mixed
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Indefensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Inappropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Unreliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	-

Brady et al. [49]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Not sure/not reported
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Brady et al. [50]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Brown et al.[51]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Unreliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Brown et al.[52]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Brown et al.[53]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Cruice et al.[54]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Indefensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Not sure/inadequately reported
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Not sure
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Cyr [55]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Inadequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	-

Dalemans et al. [56]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Davidson et al. [57]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Davidson et al. [58]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Dickson et al. [59]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Dietz et al. [60]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Fotiadou et al. [61]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Grohn et al. [62]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Grohn et al. [63]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Hinckley [64]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Howe et al. [65]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Howe et al. [66]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Johannsson et al. [67]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

LeDorze and Brassard [68]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Indefensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	-

LeDorze et al. [69]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Mixed
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

LeDorze et al. [70]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Not sure
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	2. +

Matos et al. [71]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Natterlund. [72]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not Sure
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Niemi and Johansson.[73]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Parr. [74]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+

Parr. [75]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Unclear
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Not sure/not reported
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Inadequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Inappropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	-

Pound. [76]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Unclear
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++

Pringle et al. [77]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Unclear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Indefensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Inadequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	-

Runne. [78]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Mixed
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Not sure
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	-

Worrall et al. [79]		
Theoretical Approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing
	12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant
	13. Conclusions	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?	Not sure/not reported
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+