**Table 4.2**: Methodological Quality Appraisal Tool

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q1 Selection Bias**1. The selected individuals are very likely to be representative of the target population and there is greater than 80% participation.
2. The selected individuals are at least somewhat likely to be representative of the target population and there is 60 - 79% participation.
3. The selected individuals are not likely to be representative of the target population; or there is less than 60% participation or selection is not described; and the level of participation is not described.
 | 12 3 |
| **Q2 Design**1. Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) and Controlled Clinical Trial (CCT).
2. Cohort analytic study, a case control study, a cohort design, or an interrupted time series.
3. Any other method or did not state the method used.
 | 12 3 |
| **Q3 Data Collection Methods**1. Data collection tools have been shown to be valid; and the data collection tools have been shown to be reliable.
2. Data collection tools have been shown to be valid; and the data collection tools have not been shown to be reliable or reliability is not described.
3. Data collection tools have not been shown to be valid or both reliability and validity are not described.
 | 12 3 |
| **Q4 Data Source**1. Primary data source interview observation; action research; case studies; life histories; questionnaires; ethnographic research; longitudinal studies
2. Secondary data source previous research; Official statistics; Mass media; products; Diaries; Letters; Government reports; Web information; Historical data and information
3. Will be assigned when data source is not clear.
 | 12 3 |
| **Q5 Withdrawals And Drop-Outs** 1. The follow-up rate is 80% or greater.
2. The follow-up rate is 60 – 79%.
3. The follow-up rate is less than 60% or if the withdrawals and drop-outs were not described.
 | 12 3 |
| **Q6 Analyses**1. Statistical methods appropriate and all the data (participants) represented in the study are analysed.
2. Statistical methods appropriate and decision-making approaches or styles not appropriate.
3. Statistical methods used to analyse the data have not been shown to be appropriate
 | 12 3 |
| **Dictionary** 1= Strong 2= Moderate 3= Weak |
| **Global Rating** 1. STRONG (no WEAK ratings)
2. MODERATE (one WEAK rating)
3. WEAK (two or more WEAK ratings)
 |
| **Final Decision****Include:** moderate to strong **Exclude:** weak rating |

**Table 4.3:** Methodological Appraisal

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Citation**  | **Q1** | **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q5** | **Q6** | **Rating** | **Decision**  |
| Cesario, Cesario, and Cesario 2013, 141-146 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Moderate | Include  |
| Salamonson, Andrew, and Everett 2009, 123-132 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Moderate | Include  |
| Wan Chik et al. 2012, 387-393 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Salamonson and Andrew 2006, 342-349 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Everett et al. 2013, 709-713 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| McCarey, Barr, and Rattray 2007, 357-364 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Week | Exclude  |
| Glew et al. 2015, 1142-1147 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | Strong  | include |
| Koch et al. 2011, 611-616 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Salamonson et al. 2012, 579-585 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | Week  | Exclude  |
| Lancia et al. 2013, 1501-1505 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Moderate  | Include |
| Pitt et al. 2014, 866-871 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Moderate  | Include  |
| Salamonson et al. 2014, 127-131 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Moderate  | Include  |
| Ali and Naylor 2010, 157-162 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Timer and Clauson 2011, 601-606 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Wambuguh, Eckfield, and Van Hofwegen 2016, 10.1515/ijnes-2015-0088 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Moderate | Include  |
| Kowitlawakul, Brenkus, and Dugan 2013, 38-43 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Abele, Penprase, and Ternes 2013, 258-261 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |
| Wolkowitz and Kelley 2010, 498-503 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Weak | Exclude  |
| Fernandez, Salamonson, and Griffiths 2012, 3485-3492 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Strong | Include  |
| Goff 2011, 1-1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Strong  | Include  |