

Supplementary Information 4
Quality Appraisal Checklist – Qualitative Studies

Concerns about disclosing a high-risk cervical human papillomavirus (HPV) infection to a sexual partner: a systematic review and thematic synthesis.

ID Number (on Excel spreadsheet)		
Date form completed		
Assessed by		
Authors		
Title		
Journal		
Year		
Volume		
Issue		
Pages		
THEORETICAL APPROACH		
Is a qualitative approach appropriate? <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question? 	Appropriate Inappropriate Not sure	Comments:
Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question/s? Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed? 	Clear Unclear Mixed	Comments:
STUDY DESIGN		
How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? <i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the design appropriate to the research question? Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the 	Defensible Indefensible Not sure	Comments:

<p><i>sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?</i> 		
DATA COLLECTION		
<p>How well was the data collection carried out? <i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the data collection methods clearly described?</i> • <i>Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question?</i> <p><i>Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?</i></p>	<p>Appropriately Inappropriately Not sure/inadequately reported</p>	<p>Comments:</p>
<p>Is the context clearly described? <i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined?</i> • <i>Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances?</i> • <i>Was context bias considered?</i> 	<p>Clear Unclear Not sure</p>	<p>Comments:</p>
<p>Were the methods reliable? <i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Was data collected by more than 1 method?</i> • <i>Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating?</i> • <i>Do the methods investigate what they claim to?</i> 	<p>Reliable Unreliable Not sure</p>	<p>Comments:</p>
ANALYSIS		
<p>Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? <i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is the procedure explicit – i.e. is it clear how the data was analysed to arrive at the results?</i> • <i>How systematic is the analysis, is the procedure reliable/dependable?</i> • <i>Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?</i> 	<p>Rigorous Not rigorous Not sure/not reported</p>	<p>Comments:</p>
<p>Is the data 'rich'? <i>For example:</i></p>	<p>Rich Poor Not sure/not reported</p>	<p>Comments:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored? • How well has the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites? 		
<p>Is the analysis reliable? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did more than 1 researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feedback on the transcripts/data if possible and relevant? • Were negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored? 	Reliable Unreliable Not sure/not reported	Comments:
<p>Are the findings convincing? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Are the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent? 	Convincing Not convincing Not sure	Comments:
<p>Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?</p>	Relevant Irrelevant Partially relevant	Comments:
<p>Conclusions For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this enhance understanding of the research topic? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? 	Adequate Inadequate Not sure	Comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?</i> 		
Ethics		
<p>How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics? <i>For example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</i> • <i>Are they adequately discussed e.g. do they address consent and anonymity?</i> • <i>Have the consequences of the research been considered i.e. raising expectations, changing behaviour?</i> • <i>Was the study approved by an ethics committee?</i> 	Appropriate Inappropriate Not sure/not reported	Comments:
Overall assessment		
<p>As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted? (see guidance notes)</p>	++ + -	Comments:

++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter.

+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter.

- Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter.