|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **evaluating qualitative studies checklist**  drug-related community impacts indicators of open drug scenes | | | | | | | | |  |
| **Questions** | **Assessment** | **Studies a** | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 23 |
| **1.Theoretical/ epistemological issues** | | | | | | | | |  |
| a)ls a qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question? | Appropriate | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inappropriate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b)Is a qualitative approach justified by the author?  Does the research methodology seek to understand or illuminate the subjective experiences or views of those being researched?  Does the research methodology seek to understand WHAT is happening and the reasons WHY observed situations, outcomes or discourses occur? | Justified | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not justified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c)Is the purpose of conducting the research adequately described and justified?  Was a review of the secondary data conducted and is it presented?  ls the research linked to policy or practice development processes? | Justified | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not justified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2. Study design** | | | | | | | | |  |
| a)Is the context of the research adequately described? | Adequate | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |
| Inadequate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b)Is the research question relevant to the context described? | Relevant | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not relevant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c)Are the research aims/objectives/questions clearly defined and focused? | Adequately defined | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poorly defined |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d) Are the methods used appropriate to the research question?  Is a range of methods used for triangulation, or is use of a single method justified?  Do the methods investigate what they claim to?  Have the best methods been chosen to address the research question? | Appropriate | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inappropriate |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |
| **3. Sampling and data collection** | | | | | | | | |  |
| a) Is the sampling strategy appropriate to the research question?  Usually purposive or theoretical NOT random or representative,  ls the sample sufficient to understand the study context and population?  Was the sampling pre-determined or did it evolve as the fieldwork progressed? | Appropriate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |
| Unclear |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |  |
| Inappropriate | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Is the choice of sampling strategy justified?  Are the reasons for this choice discussed/compared to other Strategies?  Who was selected and why? (consider gender, age, ethnicity, marital status)  How were participants selected and why?  Is it clear why some participants were not selected? | Adequately justified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |
| Unclear | \* | \* |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |
| Not justified |  |  | \* | \* |  |  | \* |  |
| c) Are data collection procedures clearly described?  How was data collected’? (topic guides, checklists}  Were data collection tools pilot tested?  Where data was collected and why was this location chosen? (privacy, confidentiality, familiarity)  How was the data recorded and why? (tape recorded, notes} | Clear |  |  | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  |
| Unclear | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  | \* |
| d) Are the roles of researchers clearly described?  Who conducted the research, how were they selected?  Are the researcher’s skills, motives, background, position in terms of power-relations (gender, age, ethnicity, employment relations etc.) and perspective described and discussed? | Clear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unclear | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| e) Are ethical issues addressed in data collection and adequately discussed?  How was the research explained to the participants?  What consent procedure were used?  How were confidentiality and privacy assured? | Adequate |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  | \* |
| Unclear | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inadequate |  |  |  | \* | \* |  | \* |  |
| **4. Analysis** | | | | | | | | |  |
| a) Is the data analysis procedure explicit?  Is it clear how the researcher processed the raw data to arrive at the stated results?  Were the categories and themes identified in advance, or derived from the data?  Are all data taken into account in the analysis?  Are responses/experiences compared and contrasted across different groups/individuals/study sites? | Explicit |  |  |  |  | \* | \* |  | \* |
| Unclear | \* |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |
| Vague |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  |  |
| b) Is the data analysis procedure reliable/ dependable?  Who was involved in the analysis and at what stage?  Did more than one person (including researchers and other stakeholders) identify themes and code transcripts? | Reliable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unclear | \* |  |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Potential bias |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5. Findings/interpretation/trustworthiness** | | | | | | | | |  |
| a) Are the findings valid/internally coherent /trustworthy?  Are findings drawn from analysis of collected data rather than the researcher's preconceptions?  Is there adequate critical discussion for and against the researcher's arguments? E.g. Are negative and divergent views adequately discussed’? Are quotes used to substantiate the researcher’s conclusions from the analysis?  Is triangulation or data cross-checking used?  Have findings been validated by respondents?  Has the researcher critically reflected on his/her own bias, role and influence?  Has the research critically reflected on the quality of the data collected and skills of the research team? | Valid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unclear | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* |
| Invalid/ potential bias |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |
| b) Are the findings relevant?  Are the findings relevant to the study aims/objectives/questions?  Do they contribute new knowledge or understanding?  How important are the findings in local context? (geographical, cultural, political, socio-economic) | Relevant | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited relevance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6.implications/limitations** | | | | | | | | |  |
| a) Are the implications of the study clearly defined?  Are the findings placed in local context? (geographical, cultural, political, socio-economic)  Have findings been disseminated to key stakeholders including participants?  Are the findings discussed In wider context? (in relation to other studies on the same topic)  Are recommendations made for policy and practice? | Clear | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Is there adequate discussion of the study limitations?  Are study limitations described and accounted for? (cost, time, resources)  Are the weaknesses of the study design discussed? | Adequate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unclear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inadequate | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |

a The number of studies is according to the number of studies in table 1 (characteristics of the studies)