

Quality Assessment

Article ID

(enter ID # from Covidence)

Selection Bias

Are the individuals selected to participate in the study likely to be representative of the target population?

- Very likely
 Somewhat likely
 Not likely
 Can't tell

What percentage of selected individuals agreed to participate?

- 80-100% agreement
 60-79% agreement
 less than 60% agreement
 Not applicable
 Can't tell

Rate this section

- Strong Moderate
 Weak

Study Design

Indicate the study design

- Randomized controlled trial
 Controlled clinical trial
 Cohort analytic (two group pre + post)
 Case-control
 Cohort (one group pre + post (before and after))
 Interrupted time series
 Other
 Can't tell

Was the study described as randomized?

- Yes
 No

Was the method of randomization described?

- Yes
 No

Was the method appropriate?

- Yes
 No

Rate this section

- Strong Moderate
 Weak

Confounders

Were there important differences between groups prior to the intervention?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell
 (race, sex, marital status/family, age, SES, education, health status, Pre-intervention score on outcome measure)

Indicate the percentage of relevant confounders that were controlled (either in the design (e.g. stratification, matching) or analysis)?

- 80 - 100% (most)
 60 - 79% (some)
 Less than 60% (few or none)
 Can't Tell

Rate this section

- Strong Moderate
 Weak

Blinding

Was (were) the outcome assessor(s) aware of the intervention or exposure status of participants?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

Were the study participants aware of the research question?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

Rate this section

- Strong Moderate
 Weak

Data Collection Methods

Were data collection tools shown to be valid?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

Were data collection tools shown to be reliable?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

Rate this section

- Strong Moderate
 Weak

Withdrawals and Drop-Outs

Were withdrawals and drop-outs reported in terms of numbers and/or reasons per group?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell
 Not applicable (i.e. one time surveys or interviews)

Indicate the percentage of participants completing the study. (If the percentage differs by groups, record the lowest).

- 80 - 100%
 60 - 79%
 Less than 60%
 Can't Tell
 Not Applicable (i.e. Retrospective case-control)

Rate this section

- Strong Moderate
 Weak Not applicable

Intervention Integrity

What percentage of participants received the allocated intervention or exposure of interest?

80 - 100%

60 - 79%

Less than 60%

Can't Tell

Was the consistency of the intervention measured?

Yes

No

Can't tell

Is it likely that subjects received an unintended intervention (contamination or co-intervention) that may influence the results?

Yes

No

Can't tell

Analyses

Indicate the unit of allocation

Community

Organization/Institution

Practice/Office

Individual

Indicate the unit of analysis

Community

Organization/Institution

Practice/Office

Individual

Are the statistical methods appropriate for the study design?

Yes

No

Can't tell

Is the analysis performed by intervention allocation status (i.e. intention to treat) rather than the actual intervention received?

Yes

No

Can't tell

Component Ratings

	Strong	Moderate	Weak
Selection Bias	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Study Design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confounders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Blinding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data Collection Methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Withdrawals and Drop-Outs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

GLOBAL RATING FOR THIS PAPER

Strong (no weak ratings)

Moderate (one weak rating)

Weak (2 or more weak ratings)

Is there a discrepancy between the two reviewers with respect to the component ratings?

Yes No
(With both reviewers discussing the ratings)

Indicate the reason for the discrepancy

Oversight

Differences in interpretation of criteria

Differences in interpretation of study

Final decision of both reviewers

- Strong
- Moderate
- Weak