APPENDIX 1: QUALITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR QUANTITATIVE STUDIES
(EFFECTIVE PUBLIC HEALTH PRACTICE PROJECT)

COMPONENT RATINGS

Selection Instruction
For all ratings, please use the following criteria and circle as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>(no WEAK ratings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>(one WEAK rating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>(two or more WEAK ratings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) SELECTION BIAS
(Q1) Were the individuals selected to participate in the study likely to be representative of the target population?
1 Very likely
2 Somewhat likely
3 Not likely
4 Can’t tell
(Q2) What percentage of selected individuals agreed to participate?
1 80 - 100% agreement
2 60 – 79% agreement
3 less than 60% agreement
4 Not applicable
5 Can’t tell

B) STUDY DESIGN
Indicate the study design
1 Randomized controlled trial
2 Controlled clinical trial
3 Cohort analytic (two group pre + post)
4 Case-control
5 Cohort (one group pre + post (before and after))
6 Interrupted time series
7 Other specify __________________________
8 Can’t tell
(Q1) Was the study described as randomized? If NO, go to Section C.
   No   Yes
(Q2) If Yes, was the method of randomization described?
   No   Yes
(Q3) If Yes, was the method appropriate? (See dictionary)
   No   Yes

C) CONFOUNDERS

Q1) Were there important differences between groups prior to the intervention?
1 Yes
2 No
3 Can’t tell
   The following are examples of confounders:
   1 Race
   2 Sex
   3 Marital status/family
   4 Age
   5 SES (income or class)
   6 Education
   7 Health status
   8 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)?

1  80 – 100% (most)
2  60 – 79% (some)
3  Less than 60% (few or none)
4  Can’t Tell

D) BLINDING
(Q1) Was (were) the outcome assessor(s) aware of the intervention or exposure status of the participants?
1  Yes
2  No
3  Can’t tell

(Q2) Were the study participants aware of the research question?
1  Yes
2  No
3  Can’t tell

E) DATA COLLECTION METHODS
(Q1) Were data collection tools shown to be valid?
1  Yes
2  No
3  Can’t tell

(Q2) Were data collection tools shown to be reliable?
1  Yes
2  No
3  Can’t tell

F) WITHDRAWALS AND DROP-OUTS

(Q1) Were withdrawals and drop-outs reported in terms of numbers and/or reasons per group?
1  Yes
2  No
3  Can’t tell
4  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).
1  80 -100%
2  60 - 79%
4  less than 60%
5  Can’t tell
6  Not Applicable (i.e. Retrospective case-control)

G) INTERVENTION INTEGRITY
(Q1) What percentage of participants received the allocated intervention or exposure of interest?
1  80 -100%
2  60 - 79%
3  less than 60%
4  Can’t tell

(Q2) Was the consistency of the intervention measured?
1  Yes
2  No
3  Can’t tell

(Q3) Is it likely that subjects received an unintended intervention (contamination or co-intervention) that may influence the results?
1  Yes
2  No
3  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?
1 Yes
2 No
3 Can’t tell

(Q4) Is the analysis performed by intervention allocation status (i.e. intention to treat) rather than the actual intervention received?
1 Yes
2 No
3 Can’t tell

OVERALL RATING

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1. STRONG</th>
<th>2. MODERATE</th>
<th>3. WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Selection Bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Study Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Confounders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Blinding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Data Collection Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Withdrawals and Dropouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL RATING FOR THIS PAPER (X 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 (X one):
