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.

IS THIS PAPER WORTH READING?

1. Did the article describe an important clinical problem addressed via a clearly formulated question?
   - Yes
   - Can't tell
   - No

2. Was a qualitative approach appropriate?
   Consider:
   - Does the research seek to understand or illuminate the experiences and/or views of those taking part.

ARE THE RESULTS CREDIBLE?

3. Was the sampling strategy clearly defined and justified? In particular,
   Consider:
   - 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

4. What methods did the researcher use for collecting data?
   Consider:
   - 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)?
5. What methods did the researcher use to analyse the data, and what quality control measures were implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Can’t tell</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Consider:
- 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?

6. Was the relationship between the researcher(s) and participant(s) explicit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Can’t tell</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Consider:
- 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?

7. What are the results, and do they address the research question?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Can’t tell</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Are the results credible? For example,

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

| Yes | Can’t tell | No |

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

10. To what extent are the findings of the study transferable to other clinical settings?

Consider:
- Were the subjects in the study similar in important respects to your own patients?
- Is the context similar to your own practice?