<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rating tool #1</th>
<th>Rater #1</th>
<th>Rater #2</th>
<th>Rater #3</th>
<th>Rating tool #2</th>
<th>T2 Rater #1</th>
<th>T2 Rater #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnett et al</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Grey literature</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with no control group</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopra et al</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Mixed methods (case series and qualitative)</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Case Series Studies</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farhall et al</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Prospective cohort study</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden et al</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pre-post studies with no control</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with no control group</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs et al</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Mixed methods (prospective cohort and qualitative)</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenna et al</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Qualitative study</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meehan et al</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cross sectional study</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meurck et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Qualitative study</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munroe et al</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Qualitative study</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Qualitative study</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker et al</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Qualitative study</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker et al</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Qualitative study</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Grey literature</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Case Series Studies</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CASP - Qualitative Checklist</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauer et al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Case Series Studies</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauer et al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Pre-post studies with no control</td>
<td>NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with no control group</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with no control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 1; RATER 2: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 1; RATER 2: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 1; RATER 2: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 1; RATER 2: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 1; RATER 2: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was the test/service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 1; RATER 2: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 0; RATER 2: CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 0; RATER 2: CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 0; RATER 2: CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 0; RATER 2: CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 0; RATER 2: CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If the intervention was conducted at a group level (e.g., a whole hospital, a community, etc.) did the statistical analysis take into account the use of individual-level data to determine effects at the group level?</td>
<td>RATER 1: 0; RATER 2: CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality rating:
- Rater #1: SP Poor
- Rater #2: GH Poor

Additional Comments (If POOR, please state why):
The report fails to provide adequate description of the methods used, and description data is incomplete.

* CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported
**CASP Qualitative Checklist**


**Additionnal Comments (If LOW, please state why):**

The absence of description of the methodology with regards to the qualitative data reported undermines the trustworthiness of conclusions drawn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? Consider: (1) what were the goals of the research; (2) why was it thought important; (3) its relevance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Consider: (1) if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and / or subjective experiences of research participants; (2) is qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goal?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research? Consider: If the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study; (3) if there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue? Consider: (1) if the setting for data collection was justified; (2) if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc); (3) if the researcher has justified the methods chosen; (4) if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how the interviews were conducted, or did they use a topic guide); (5) if the methods were modified during the study, if so has the researcher explained how and why; (6) if the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video materials, notes); (7) if the researcher has discussed saturation of the data.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? Consider: (1) if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of the research questions; (2) if the researcher responds to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? Consider: (1) if there is sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained; (2) if the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study); (3) if approval has been sought from the ethics committee.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? Consider: (1) if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process; (2) if thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data?; (3) whether the researcher explains how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process; (4) if sufficient data are presented to support the findings; (5) to what extent contradictory data are taken into account; (6) whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during the analysis and selection of data for presentation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there a clear statement of the findings? Consider: (1) if the findings are explicit; (2) if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers argument; (3) if the researcher has discussed the credibility of their findings (e.g. triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analytic); (4) if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research question.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How valuable is the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research-based literature?; (2) if they identify new areas where research is necessary; (3) if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered ways the research may be used.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL RATING: Quality rating**
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### NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Case Series Studies

**Study:** Chopra P, Herman HE. The long-term outcomes and unmet needs of a cohort of former long-stay patients in Melbourne, Australia. Community mental health journal. 2011;47(5):531-41.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abstract states: This study assessed the long-term outcomes for the original cohort of 18 residents of the Footbridge Community Care Unit (CCU), a residential psychiatric rehabilitation unit at St Vincent’s Mental Health Melbourne. Objectives are defined clearly, but the ability of the design to meet the stated primary objective of assessing the long-term outcome of the initial cohort is unclear. The design permits consideration of post-CCU functioning but not the outcome achieved through engagement in CCU care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some relevant details including gender are omitted. Measures of central tendency are inconsistently reported (mean vs median +/- range, and there is no documentation of SE/SD). No details are provided about the presence/absence of community treatment order. Additional detail around medication including CPZ dose equivalence would be informative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were the cases consecutive?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indicates full capture of the initial cohort (therefore by implication consecutive entry) for the quantitative component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were the subjects comparable?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sample was the 18 initial patients who were resident in CCU upon its opening in 1995. 14/18 patients (2 deaths, 2 did not consent) to the prospective part of the interview. There are some differences in the population i.e. a range of duration of contact with service and type of co-morbidities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the intervention clearly described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adequate description of CCU intervention is provided and detailed efforts to explore interventional aspects through the chart review process is evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medical record review assessed according to a set, standardised template. LSP/HONOS are widely used and validated tools. COLI used tape recorded interviews and transcription for accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adequate duration and completeness. Follow-up after 8 years allowed time for meaningful assessment of the patients after their discharge from CCU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were the statistical methods well-described?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics only. Statistical analysis not mentioned or reported in the results, no p values. There was no description of how the themes from the COLI interviews/Qualitative aspect of study were decided on in a systematic way by the researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the results well-described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes there is adequate description of the results, but without the statistical analyses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater #1</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rater #2</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported*
RATER 2

Justification for the research design provided with limited sample pool with efforts towards exhaustive not addressed. Role of the interviewer (Psychiatrist) in prior care of patients not considered, as well as the potential bias introduced by a clinical interviewer working within the system under investigation. Findings are made explicit. Limited consideration of relatively brief description (context of mixed methods not discussed, there is potential for a power imbalance and bias if a member of the service carried out the interviews, potentially suppressing more negative viewpoints.

RATER 1

Objectives clearly stated and contextualised with reference to the appropriateness of a semi-structured interview given problems with initiating narrative description in the participant group anticipated. Theoretical orientation not addressed. Cohort review process and quantitative measures create opportunity for triangulation.

Rater #1 SP Poor
Key issues arising are the lack of consideration of reflexivity and description of the analytic process.
### NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies

**Study:** Farhall J, Trauer T, Newton R, Cheung P. Minimizing adverse effects on patients of involuntary relocation from long-stay wards to community residences. Psychiatri Serv. 2003;54(7):1022-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
<th>RATER 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD, NR, NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study specified and applied uniformly to all participants?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For the analysis in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variables)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Was loss to followup after baseline 20% or less?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

1. **[This study](#) aimed to determine whether patients experienced relocation trauma and whether adjustment in the first month after the move was associated with the transition process** (Relocation trauma was defined as specific changes on PANSS and SOAS scores)

2. **87 patients transitioning from long-stay care. Demographics clearly detailed in table 1 with relevant considerations documented. By definition population is free of the key outcome considered.**

3. **All 87 patients transitioning were included**

4. **There is some variation in the sample. Unclear what the admission criteria for the CCU was. Some missing data**

5. **Exhaustive sampling, all relevant cases included.**

6. **Yes outcomes measured one month after move. Differences obtained however prior to their final move, so the intensity of 'exposure' was not consistent and might have been mitigated by pre-preparation**

7. **One month between pre-and post move, 'relocation trauma' is more likely to occur in early stages of relocation however this is an assumption. I note however that some had more preparation and site visits than others which may have reduced their trauma**

8. **There were differences between CCUs in some transitional or 'permanent' - so these likely had different models of service**

9. ***CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported*
NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with no control group


Study:

1. Were all study question or objective clearly stated? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Justification (CD, NR, NA)*

2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Justification (CD, NR, NA)*

3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the interventions/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Justification (CD, NR, NA)*

4. Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Retrospective administrative data for the quantitative research. Inadequate detail provided to establish the equivalence or completeness of the study sample.

5. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Justification is provided for both PAQ and MANSA - both have face validity in assessing the target outcomes/constructs. However the planned analysis based on these measures was not calculated before admission to CCU for current residents, and for CCU residents that were discharged only after they left CCU without clear justification, additionally inadequate information provided about the decision to combine or separate groups on individual outcomes.

6. Was the test/service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Insufficient detail provided to establish the equivalence or completeness of the study sample.

7. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Inadequate detail provided to establish the equivalence or completeness of the study sample.

8. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants’ exposures/interventions? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - Inadequate detail provided in relation to the process of blinding (i.e., who was blinded and to what extent). Changes to model of service, or improvements in the community's provision of care between 1996-2007 and this was not adequately described.

9. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis? Yes No
   - Criteria: Yes No
   - No the outcome measures were not calculated before admission to CCU for current residents, and for CCU residents that were discharged only after they left CCU without clear justification, additionally inadequate information provided about the decision to combine or separate groups on individual outcomes.

10. Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes? Yes No
    - Criteria: Yes No
    - No evidence of adjustment (also differential outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)?

11. Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)? Yes No
    - Criteria: Yes No
    - No evidence of adjustment (also differential outcome measures). Inadequate detail provided to establish the equivalence or completeness of the study sample.

12. If the intervention was conducted at a group level (e.g., a whole hospital, a community, etc.) did the statistical analysis take into account the use of individual-level data to determine effects at the group level? Yes No
    - Criteria: Yes No
    - Inadequate detail provided to establish the equivalence or completeness of the study sample.

Quality rating
Kane 81
Kane 81

Additional Comments (If POOR, please state why):

* CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple objectives are detailed and the paper represents a summation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous work. A greater degree of specification could be provided,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but adequate detail is given in the associated publications. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objective of the 6-year follow-up was twofold: (a) to determine the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation style and level of care required by residents; (b) to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate clinical changes over time; and (c) to gain the residents’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectives of their lives. To this end the 6-year evaluation included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both quantitative and qualitative components. “(p61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate description is provided in the references sub-ordinate paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail on demographics referenced an earlier study, with diagnosis,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration of illness, age at discharge, all were considered not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for discharge if the hospital were not forced to close.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience sample exhaustive of the specific context under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniformly to all participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect estimates provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience sample exhaustive of the specific context under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational cohort shared exposure (transition to community residence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exposure was the relocation event. The four community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential facilities were described similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years represents an adequate time period to explore post-transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variable)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined,</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined,</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are defined and justified. Non blinded assessments, no specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration of inter-rater reliability within study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to this study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and outcome(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of the comparison of community and hospital based residents at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up is limited by the small number of hospital based residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor) (see guidance): SP, Fair; GH, Fair

Additional Comments (If POOR, please state why):

*CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported
### CASP Qualitative Checklist

**Study:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) what were the goals of the research; (2) why was it thought important; (3) its relevance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initials**

Rater #1: SP  POOR
Rater #2: GH  POOR

**ADDITIONAL RATING: Quality rating**

Inadequate information is provided about the methodology to support the trustworthiness of reported findings.
### CASP Qualitative Checklist


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? Consider: (1) what were the goals of the research; (2) why was it thought important; (3) its relevance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Consider: (1) if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants; (2) is a qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goals?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the research design appropriate to the aims of the research? Consider: if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study; (3) if there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue? Consider: (1) if the setting for data collection was justified; (2) if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc); (3) if the researcher has justified the methods chosen; (4) if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, there is an indication of how the interviews were conducted, or did they use a topic guide); (5) if the methods were modified during the study; (6) if the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video materials, notes); (7) if the researcher has discussed saturation of the data.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of the research questions as data collection (including sample selection and choice of location); (2) how the researcher responds to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How ethical issues have been taken into consideration? Consider: (1) if there is sufficient detail of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained; (2) if the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study); (3) if approval has been sought from the ethics committee.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? Consider: (1) if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process; (2) if thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data; (3) whether the researcher explains how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process; (4) if sufficient data are presented to support the findings; (5) to what extent contradictory data are taken into account; (6) whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during the analysis and selection of data for presentation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? Consider: (1) if the findings are presented in an order that reflects the logical sequence of the research; (2) whether the findings are clearly presented. Evidence against the findings is not considered, as well as detailed acknowledgment of study limitations. Multiple raters used, no discussion of respondent validation. Findings are not linked back to the original question.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How valuable is the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research-based literature? (2) if they identify new areas where research is necessary; (3) if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered ways the research may be used.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL RATING: Quality rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments (if LOW/POOR, please state why):** NA
### NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad intention clearly stated. However specific rationale for selection of measures for comparison not clear. How were the variables to be included/not included selected?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The objective is stated, however the basis for comparison i.e. the variables looked at are not justified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear description of services, and these were placed in the context of the relevant literature.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The population are clearly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative audit. 100% of data available for most variables with the exception of routine outcomes, CPS equivalence and family contact data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation rate above 50% (it is an audit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhaustive sampling but no consideration of power to detect differences based on the available sample.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't see a power calculation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No exposure, intention to establish the comparability of the groups.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No information reported on the training of raters beyond the site visits from benchmarking staff to ensure understandings of the information collection requirements. Reliance on administrative data systems, presumably multiple raters etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence of blinding, reliance on routine administrative data sets for outcome measures.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not blinded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential impact of patient-level characteristics on group level data not considered. Points of interest include comparison of consumers with shorter or longer length of stay (given the expected over-representation of long-stays), voluntary versus involuntary engagement etc on functional measures.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient exploration of confounding variables</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not blinded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor) (see guidance)**

**Rater #1**
- **Rating:** Fair

**Rater #2**
- **Rating:** Fair

Additional Comments (If POOR, please state why):

*CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if there were any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Consider: (1) if the research seeks to examine how peer support has been implemented into the CCU model of service and both PSW and clinical staff's perspective on this, it is clearly outlined in introduction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research aims? Consider: (1) if the study protocol of the data collection setting and approach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? Consider: (1) if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of the research questions and data collection (including sample selection and choice of location); (2) how the researcher responds to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in their role.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASP Qualitative Checklist**

- **Study:**
  - **Title:**
  - **Authors:**
  - **Methodology:**
  - **Sample:**
  - **Data Collection:**
  - **Data Analysis:**
  - **Findings:**
  - **Discussion:**
  - **Conclusion:**
  - **References:**

**Rater 1:**
- **DS:** Fair
- **Note:**
- **Classification:**

**Rater 2:**
- **DS:** Poor
- **Note:**
- **Classification:**

**Additional Comments (if LOW/POOR, please state why):**
- NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? Consider: (1) what were the goals of the research; (2) why was it thought important; (3) its relevance.</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>Presentation of single consumer and carer cases as testimonials not well contextualised within the overall aim of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Consider: (1) if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/ or subjective experiences of research participants; (2) is qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goal?</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>Only verbatim statement of a carer, and consumer provided. No methodology explored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research? Consider: if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)?</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>Nil description of qualitative methodology, single voice. No discussion of the methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study; (3) if there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part).</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Nil description of qualitative methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue? Consider: (1) if the setting for data collection was justified; (2) if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc.); (3) if the researcher has justified the methods chosen; (4) if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview methods, is there an indication of how the interviews were conducted, or did they use a topic guide); (5) if the methods were modified during the study, if so has the researcher explained how and why; (6) if the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video materials, notes); (7) if the researcher has discussed saturation of the data.</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Nil description of qualitative methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? Consider: (1) if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of the research questions and data collection (including sample selection and choice of location); (2) how the researcher responds to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design.</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Nil description of qualitative methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? Consider: (1) is there sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained; (2) if the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study); (3) if approval has been sought from the ethics committee.</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Nil description of qualitative methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? Consider: (1) if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process; (2) if thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data?; (3) whether the researcher explains how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process; (4) if sufficient data are presented to support the findings; (5) to what extent contradictory data are taken into account; (6) whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during the analysis and selection of data for presentation.</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Nil description to support analytic process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there a clear statement of the findings? Consider: (1) if the findings are explicit; (2) if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers argument; (3) if the researcher has discussed the credibility of their findings (e.g. triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst); (4) if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research question.</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How valuable is the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research-based literature?; (2) if they identify new areas where research is necessary; (3) if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered ways the research may be used.</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>As above. Lack of methodological description limits value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL RATING: Quality rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater #1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consumer and carer qualitative information is presented as a testimonial, no description of the method through which these individuals came to be samples, the analytic process and of the relationships between the researchers and the respondents.

Additional Comments (If LOW/POOR, please state why):
## CASP Qualitative Checklist

**Study:** Newton et al. (2000) Deinstitutionalisation for long-term mental illness: an ethnographic study. ANZJP

### Section 1: Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>Aims are poorly defined which limits the ability to communicate the goals of the research; (2) there was no introduction (1)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>The aims are limited in their description and it is not clear whether the research is addressing an underresearched area; (3) if so, then the limitations are not considered or are not well defined. 0.0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Methodology is used to describe the research questions and the design of the study.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the research design appropriate for the aims of the research?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>The research design is appropriate to the aims of the research; (2) the research was undertaken in a way that was consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if the research was undertaken in a way that was consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>The recruitment strategy is appropriate to the aims of the research; (2) the recruitment strategy is consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if the recruitment strategy is consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>The data were collected in a way that addressed the research issue; (2) the data were collected in a way that was consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if the data were collected in a way that was consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>The relationship between the researcher and the participants has been adequately considered; (2) the relationship between the researcher and the participants is consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if the relationship between the researcher and the participants is consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Ethical issues have been taken into consideration; (2) ethical issues are consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if ethical issues are consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Analysis and Findings

| 7. The analysis process is described (e.g. does the flow chart include sampling, observation methods, data collection, analysis and presentation)? | 1 | Yes | 1.0 | The analysis process is described (e.g. does the flow chart include sampling, observation methods, data collection, analysis and presentation)? |
| 8. Are the findings presented in a coherent, consistent and logical manner? | 1 | Yes | 1.0 | The findings are presented in a coherent, consistent and logical manner; (2) the findings are presented in a way that is consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if the findings are presented in a way that is consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated. |
| 9. Are the findings interpretable? | 1 | Yes | 1.0 | The findings are interpretable; (2) the findings are presented in a way that is consistent with the methodological approach; (3) if the findings are presented in a way that is consistent with the methodological approach, the reasons for this are clearly stated. |

### Additional Comments

There is limited description of the methods including sampling, observation methods, establishment of boundaries (e.g., interviews) and participant role. This limits the transparency of the findings reported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Rater 3</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>This study had a clear statement of the aims of the research, which was essential for guiding the research and ensuring that the study was conducted in a focused and relevant manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Consider: (1) if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and / or subjective experiences of research participants; (2) if qualitative research is the right methodology for addressing the research goal.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>This study aimed to explore the subjective experiences of CCU residents in terms of their expectations of CCU and their previous experience of care. Qualitative research was chosen as the right methodology to address this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>The study used semi-structured interviews as the data collection method, which was appropriate for exploring the subjective experiences of CCU residents. The research design was justified and explained in the introduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the methodological strategy appropriate to address the aims of the research? Consider: (1) if the interviewer has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to address the research questions; (3) if there were any discussions around recruitment (e.g. only some people chose not to take part).</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>The study used convenience sampling approach. Did not use purposive sampling as would be typically employed in grounded theory. However, the approach was justified by the small potential sample pool. Iterative sampling to achieve saturation was used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue? Consider: (1) if the setting for data collection was justified; (2) if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, telephone interviews, etc.); (3) if the data collection was guided by the study's goals; (4) if the data collection was guided by the research questions.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>The study used semi-structured interviews as the data collection approach. Data analysis is very rigorous and is evidenced in detail in the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? Consider: (1) if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of the research questions and design; (2) if they considered any changes in the research design.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>The study acknowledged and the potential impact considered in limitations. Issues relating to dual roles in the research team acknowledged and the potential impact considered in limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is there a clear statement of the findings? Consider: (1) if the findings are explicit; (2) if the findings are clearly stated; (3) if the findings are discussed in the context of findings from other studies.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Findings clearly articulated and the relationship between the findings and the research questions discussed in detail in the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How valuable is the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the relevance of the findings to other settings.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Article provides valuable insights about rehabilitation units and is methodologically rigorous. It particularly provides context to services in Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there a clear statement of the analysis process? Consider: (1) if thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how data were analyzed (e.g. coding, categorization, etc.)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Multiple extracts provided in support of themes. Some excerpts provide evidence of critical reflection on methodology. Use of respondent verification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How valuable is the research? Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the relevance of the findings to other settings.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Article provides valuable insights about rehabilitation units and is methodologically rigorous. It particularly provides context to services in Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER 2</td>
<td>Findings clearly articulated and the relationship between</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is explicitly explored in the parent study protocol as</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The involvement of researcher and their existing role</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulated in parent study protocol and justified in text.</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical approval was sought by the appropriate Metro</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information relating to an unresearched / under-</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploratory goal fits with the qualitative methods chosen.</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The researchers have used a convenience sample of 48</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is extensive discussion of the data analysis.</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This study contributes to an under researched area,</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear description is provided of the approach to the</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The researchers have adhered to the data collection and</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical approval is documented. Ethical issues considered</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The recruitment strategy was appropriate to the aims of</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The researchers critically examined their own role, potential</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The researchers handled the effects of the study on the</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The data analysis was sufficiently rigorous.</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The data analysis was adequately described.</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDED COMMENTS:</td>
<td>1. The principles of the original study were adhered to. The</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>context of the study was maintained in the current study.</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
<td>( \frac{0}{0} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:** (If LOW/POOR, please state why): NA

---

### CASP Qualitative Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) what were the aims of the research, were they explicit, and adequately contextualised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants; (2) if qualitative research is the right methodology for addressing the research goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the research has involved a suitable design (e.g. focus groups, interviews, focus groups, focus groups); (2) if the research design was explicit and feasible; (3) if the analysis phase was described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants they sought were selected; (3) if there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people were not invited to take part).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the data collection tool that was used to elicit the relevant data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the data collection tool had met the research's needs; (2) if the data collection tool was piloted; (3) if the data collection tool was appropriate for the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was the data collection method appropriate to the aims of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the data collection methods have been piloted; (2) if the data collection method was appropriate for the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the data collection methods have been piloted; (2) if the data collection methods were feasible; (3) if the data collection methods were sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) is there sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained; (2) if the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there a clear statement of the findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the findings are explicit; (2) if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers argument; (3) if the researcher considers the implications of any findings for peer researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How valuable is the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding, e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to other research conducted in the same area; (2) if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research question; (3) if it would be valuable to others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments (If LOW/POOR, please state why):** NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were the cases consecutive?</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were the subjects comparable?</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the intervention clearly described?</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the outcome measures defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were the statistical methods well-described?</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the results well described?</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality rating**

- **Rater #1**: SP (Poor)
- **Rater #2**: GH (Poor)

Additional Comments (If LOW/POOR, please state why):

Conclusions drawn are not adequately supported by the data, minimal description of methodology.

*CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) what were the goals of the research; (2) why was it thought important; (3) its relevance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal well described</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report has clearly stated brief, with four main objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants; (2) is qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goal; (3) how well the aims are achieved.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology hasn't been well described</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the research design appropriate to the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to comment as little detail provided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected; (2) if they explained why the participants they chose were an appropriate sample for the study; (3) if there are any discussions around recruitment.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the setting for data collection was justified; (2) if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus groups, semi-structured interviews); (3) if the data has been coded and analyzed; (4) if the researcher has described and evaluated the methods chosen; (5) if the researcher has included the methods used (e.g. for thematic analysis, if there is an indication of how the interviews were conducted, or did they use a basic guide); (6) if the methods were modified during the study, if so has the researcher explained why; (7) if they have discussed saturation of the data.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of the research questions and data collection; (2) if there are reflections and clear view of the role of the researcher; (3) if the researcher has discussed how they designed data collection; (4) if the researcher has discussed how they handled any ethical issues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) is there sufficient information provided to ensure participants are aware of the study, including potential benefits and risks of participation; (2) if the researcher has discussed how they informed the participants; (3) if the researcher has discussed how they handled any ethical issues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process; (2) if thematic analysis is used.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there a clear statement of the findings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the findings are explicit; (2) if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers argument; (3) if the researcher has discussed the limitations of the study.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How valuable is the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider: (1) if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding; (2) if they have considered the implications for practice; (3) if the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered ways the research may be used.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil description of methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL RATING: Quality rating

Initials | Rating
--- | ---
Rater #1 | SP Poor
Rater #2 | GH Poor

Additional Comments (If LOW/POOR, please state why): No description of the methodology is provided, this undermines the trustworthiness of the findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exploratory focus. No specific hypotheses were stated, however the background contextualised the study with reference to the failure to observe symptomatic change in an equivalent UK setting 6/12 post transition.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objective was to measure symptoms and functioning of residents and explore variations after one year using PANSS and MCAS. I don’t think the study question is clearly defined. I told they anticipate an improvement or disimprovement after one year. We also don’t know how long some of the residents had been out of hospital already so they were perhaps at different stages of transition (the purpose if the study is to examine the transition from institution to community).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Full sampling of all 20 residents present at a single CCU. Model of service offered was clearly described. Adequate description of demographics including age, illness duration, diagnosis and co-morbidity, mental health act status, and financial situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pragmatic sample from one CCU (18/20 residents) with demographic details, and other relevant information provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were the cases consecutive?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comprehensive sampling of a single group.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pragmatic sample from the CCU, not consecutive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were the subjects comparable?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>All resided at the same CCU, therefore the service level intervention was equivalent. Diagnostically homogenous. No consideration of how individual level confounders may have impacted the pattern of results.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>All had psychotic disorder, similar MHA status, co-morbidities, all on antipsychotic medication and resident at the CCU.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the intervention clearly described?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Adequate description of CCU model provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is a description of CCU provided in introduction. 2 interviewers giving PANSS and MCAS at baseline, then 1 interviewer at one year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PANSS is well validated. MCAS is less widely used, but has been used to demonstrate functional change across several studies. Concerns have been raised about reliability and fit of the original factor structure (see Babors et al, 2009). PANSS interviews were completed by ‘trained’ (do elaboration) staff in pairs (with known)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PANSS and MCAS. These are valid tools. 2 interviewers, then 1 at one year. Process for Inter-rater reliability given in detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the length of follow-up adequate?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-year is an appropriate timeframe given studies in similar services in the UK have also failed to demonstrate symptomatic gains over a similar timeframe. However, <a href="https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?pii=000021671010265">https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?pii=000021671010265</a>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, after one year of residential rehab one would expect some clinical changes reflected in the scores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were the statistical methods well-described?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Adequate description provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is a lot of description of the statistical methods working to inter-rater reliability, intercorrelations between scales, correlation of scores one year apart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were the results well-described?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Adequate description provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is detail provided about results i.e. symptom levels and functioning levels being positively related, broadly little changes in symptoms and functioning after one year and reference to similar findings in other studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality rating

Rater #1: SP
Rater #2: GH

Additional Comments (if LOW/POOR, please state why):
N/A

* CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported
# NIHL Checklist - Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies with no control group

**Summary**


## Quality ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>SP Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td>GH Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments (If POOR, please state why):**

- CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

---

### Notes and Considerations

- CD means that the information is not clearly stated or not documented.
- NA means that the information is not applicable.
- NR means that the information is not reported.

---

**Study**

Patrick T, Trefil, B, Chong, E, From long-stay psychiatric hospital to Community Care Unit: evaluation at 1 year. Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology. 2001;36(8):416-9

---

**Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objectives are not clearly stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were eligibility or inclusion criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL criteria not prespecified, but the focus is on patients transferred to CCU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD Aim of exhaustive sampling stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125 patients in long term open wards and a few from elsewhere in the hospital with similar needs, were proposed for transfer to CCU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD No documentation provided in relation to sample size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes lots of dropouts and missing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did the statistical methods examine changes in the outcome measures before and after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P-values only reported for significant changes. No documentation in relation to correction for multiple comparisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did the intervention and control groups change over time? Did the intervention and control groups change over time?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification**

- **EL** Documented in relation to sample size. |
- **CD** Cannot be determined. |
- **NA** Not applicable. |
- **NR** Not reported. |