

**CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR AN ARTICLE ON
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH.**

Study Design: This is a generic checklist covering different types of qualitative research methodology, e.g. interviews, focus groups

Adapted from:

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP), Public Health Resource Unit, Institute of Health Science, Oxford.

Greenhalgh T. Papers that go beyond numbers (qualitative research). In: *How to read a paper. The basics of evidence based medicine*. BMJ Publishing Group, 1997.

IS THIS PAPER WORTH READING?

<p>1. Did the article describe an important clinical problem addressed via a clearly formulated question?</p>	Yes	Can't tell	No
<p>2. Was a qualitative approach appropriate?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the research seek to understand or illuminate the experiences and/or views of those taking part. 			

ARE THE RESULTS CREDIBLE?

<p>3. Was the sampling strategy clearly defined and justified? In particular,</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the method of sampling (for both the subjects and the setting) been adequately described? • Have the investigators studied the most useful or productive range of individuals and settings relevant to their question? • Have the characteristics of the subjects been defined? • Is it clear why some participants chose not to take part? 	Yes	Can't tell	No
<p>4. What methods did the researcher use for collecting data?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have appropriate data sources been studied? • Have the methods used for data collection been described in enough detail? • Was more than one method of data collection used? • Were the methods used reliable and independently verifiable (e.g. audiotape, videotape, fieldnotes)? • Were observations taken in a range of circumstances (e.g. at different times)? 			

<p>5. What methods did the researcher use to analyse the data, and what quality control measures were implemented?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were themes and concepts derived from the data? • Did more than one researcher perform the analysis, and what method was used to resolve differences of interpretation? • Were negative or discrepant results fully addressed, or just ignored? 	Yes	Can't tell	No
<p>6. Was the relationship between the researcher(s) and participant(s) explicit.</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the researchers perspective? • Had the researcher critically examined his or her own role, potential bias and influence? • Was it clear where the data were collected and why that setting was chosen? • How was the research explained to the participants? • Confidentiality, ethics, implications and consequences for research findings for all of the above. 			

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS?

<p>7. What are the results, and do they address the research question?</p>	Yes	Can't tell	No
<p>8. Are the results credible? For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have sequences from the original data been included in the paper (e.g. direct quotation)? • Is it possible to determine the source of data presented (e.g. by numbering of extracts)? • How much of the information collected is available for independent assessment? • Are the explanations presented plausible and coherent? 			

<p>9. What conclusions were drawn, and are they justified by the results? In particular, have alternative explanations for the results been explored?</p>			
--	--	--	--

ARE THE FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY TRANSFERABLE TO A WIDER POPULATION?

<p>10. To what extent are the findings of the study transferable to other clinical settings?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the subjects in the study similar in important respects to your own patients? • Is the context similar to your own practice? 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Can't tell</p>	<p>No</p>
---	-------------------	--------------------------	------------------