Additional File 2 – Quality assessment tool for quantitative studies

QUALITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR QUANTITATIVE STUDIES

COMPONENT RATINGS

A) SELECTION BIAS

(Q1) Are the individuals selected to participate in the study likely to be representative of the target population?

Very likely Somewhat likely Not likely Can't tell

(Q2) What percentage of selected individuals agreed to participate?

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

RATE THIS SECTION	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK
See dictionary	1	2	3

B) STUDY DESIGN

Indicate the study design

Randomized controlled trial Controlled clinical trial

Cohort analytic (two group pre + post)

Case-control

Cohort (one group pre + post (before and after))

Interrupted time series

Other specify _

Can't tell

Was the study described as randomized? If NO, go to Component C.

No Yes

If Yes, was the method of randomization described? (See dictionary)

No Yes

If Yes, was the method appropriate? (See dictionary)

No Yes

No Yes RATE THIS SECTION	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK
See dictionary	1	2	3

(Q1) Were there important differences between groups prior to the intervention?

Yes

No

Can't tell

The following are examples of confounders:

Race

Sex

Marital status/family

Age

SES (income or class)

Education

Health status

Pre-intervention score on outcome measure

(Q2) If yes, indicate the percentage of relevant confounders that were controlled (either in the design (e.g. stratification, matching) or analysis)?

80 – 100% (most) 60 – 79% (some)

Less than 60% (few or none)

Can't Tell

RATE THIS SECTION	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	
See dictionary	1	2	3	

D) BLINDING

(Q1) Was (were) the outcome assessor(s) aware of the intervention or exposure status of participants?

Yes

No

Can't tell

(Q2) Were the study participants aware of the research question?

Yes

No

Can't tell

RATE THIS SECTION	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	
See dictionary	1	2	3	

E) DATA COLLECTION METHODS

(Q1) Were data collection tools shown to be valid?

Yes

No

Can't tell

(Q2) Were data collection tools shown to be reliable?

Yes

No

Can't tell

RATE THIS SECTION	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK
See dictionary	1	2	3

F) WITHDRAWALS AND DROP-OUTS

(Q1) Were withdrawals and drop-outs reported in terms of numbers and/or reasons per group?

Yes No

Can't tell

Not Applicable (i.e. one time surveys or interviews)

(Q2) Indicate the percentage of participants completing the study. (If the percentage differs by groups, record the lowest).

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

Not Applicable (i.e. Retrospective case-control)

RATE THIS SECTION	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	
See dictionary	1	2	3	Not Applicable

G) INTERVENTION INTEGRITY

(Q1) What percentage of participants received the allocated intervention or exposure of interest?

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

(Q2) Was the consistency of the intervention measured?

Yes

No Can't tell

(Q3) Is it likely that subjects received an unintended intervention (contamination or co-intervention) that may influence the results?

Yes

No

Can't tell

H) ANALYSES

(Q1) Indicate the unit of allocation (circle one)

community organization/institution practice/office individual

(Q2) Indicate the unit of analysis (circle one)

community organization/institution practice/office individual

(Q3) Are the statistical methods appropriate for the study design?

Yes

No

Can't tell

(Q4) Is the analysis performed by intervention allocation status (i.e. intention to treat) rather than the actual intervention received?

Yes

No

Can't tell

GLOBAL RATINGS

COMPONENT RATINGS

Please transcribe the information from the gray boxes on pages 1-4 onto this page. See dictionary on how to rate this section.

Α	Selection Bias	Strong	Moderate	Weak	
		1	2	3	
В	Study Design	Strong	Moderate	Weak	
		1	2	3	
С	Confounders	Strong	Moderate	Weak	
		1	2	3	
D	Blinding	Strong	Moderate	Weak	
		1	2	3	
E	Data Collection Method	Strong	Moderate	Weak	
		1	2	3	
F	Withdrawals and	Strong	Moderate	Weak	
	Dropouts				
		1	2	3	Not Applicable

GLOBAL RATING FOR THIS PAPER (circle one):

1 STRONG (no WEAK ratings)
2 MODERATE (one WEAK rating)

3 WEAK (two or more WEAK ratings)

With both reviewers discussing the ratings:

Is there a discrepancy between the two reviewers with respect to the component (A-F) ratings?

No Yes

If yes, indicate the reason for the discrepancy

- 1 Oversight
- 2 Differences in interpretation of criteria
- 3 Differences in interpretation of study

Final decision of both reviewers (circle one): 1 STRONG

2 MODERATE

3 WEAK