

Appendix B

Preliminary item development and revisions

Table B1.

Decisions to keep, revise, or delete items for RA checklist

Item	Agreement (%)	Decision	Explanation
1. Did one of the authors develop the treatment?	88	Keep	Main discrepancies here were whether or not outside sources were used to answer this item. Rater must check previously published work that is cited as well as the Internet. It must be noted if it is clear from the publication (“We developed”) or if it was looked up (in previous publication, internet, etc.).
2. Do the authors advocate the treatment through their writing?	91	Revise	Reword to: Do authors provide self-cited or uncited statements that advocate the treatment?
3. Have the authors published evidence supporting the efficacy of the treatment?	85	Revise	Reword to: Do authors refer to <u>self-published</u> evidence supporting the efficacy of the treatment?
4. Does the introduction of the current paper provide evidence that the author contributed to an etiological model of the disorder that is consistent with the intervention of interest?	62	Keep	Low agreement came from rater outlier. Major problem here was identifying reference to etiological models. We talked this out and came to decision on all disagreements. More examples will be added to manual to help with this item.
5. Do the author(s) believe that one of the interventions is effective or widely approved <u>AND</u> that the purpose of this trial is to test modifications or its application in an atypical population of clients?	84	Delete	Too much overlap with items 2 and 3 (first part of item) and the second half of the item does not give us anything extra.

6.	Is evidence presented in the introduction of the current paper that one of the interventions is <u>superior</u> to other interventions?	90	Revise	Reword to: Is evidence presented in the introduction of the current paper that one of the interventions is superior to other interventions (that are not a non-treatment control or standard care and that does not have any counter evidence also presented)?
7.	Does the current paper state an explicit hypothesis that one of the treatments is superior to the other?	96	Revise	Reword to include "research aim/question"
8.	Is the title of the intervention mentioned in the title of the current paper?	99	Keep	Straight forward item.
9.	Is the intervention predominately discussed in the Introduction?	97	Revise	Will combine with item 10 to be one item: Is the intervention predominately discussed in the Introduction/Methods?
10.	Is the intervention predominately discussed in the Methods?	99	Revise	Will combine with 9 to be one item: Is the intervention predominately discussed in the Introduction/Methods?
11.	Did the author(s) write the manual and/or modify the intervention for the study?	88	Keep	This is a difficult yet important question. Many ratings of "Not Clear" here. More examples will be added to the manual to clearly differentiate from item 1. Also, this has already been [thoroughly] answered for a large subset of papers for another project. This will be used in answering this item.
12.	Did one or more of the authors participate in the training and/or supervision of the therapists?	88	Keep	Problem here is differentiating between "No" and "Not Reported". More examples were added to the manual.
13.	Were the supervisors/trainers experts in the intervention model?	91	Delete	Not relevant. Item before and after is more important. This is more about therapist allegiance.
14.	Did the author(s) take on the role as a therapist?	91	Keep	High agreement due to ratings of "Not Reported".

15. Were therapists only extensively trained in one intervention or the other or were they in their own condition (only practiced one intervention)?	73	Delete	Due to discussion on its relevance to RA.
16. Were therapists considered experienced in the intervention?	85	Delete	Due to problems with interpretability: So it is RA if they are or are not experienced with the intervention? It was decided this was not as important as if the author was involved in the training/acted as a therapist.
17. Was a manual used in the administration of the intervention?	93	Delete	Hardly reported and not as important as if the author wrote the manual/modified the treatment. High agreement due ratings of "Not Reported".
18. Were sessions audio taped and reviewed by an expert to inform supervision?	85	Delete	The important part here was if they used the audiotapes to inform feedback/supervision. However, this is hardly reported and most trials are recorded to check fidelity.
19. Were there any other noteworthy differences in the implementation methods of the interventions (i.e. number of sessions, face-to-face/phone, group/individual)?	97	Delete	Not very important and very intervention specific (i.e. may be that they compare a telephone intervention to a group intervention)
20. If Supportive Therapy was the comparative intervention, was it explicitly stated in the article that it was used as credible control condition or as a minimal therapy (contrasting the intervention of interest?)	91	Keep	Clarify better and add more examples to the manual.
21. Are authors of the current study affiliated with a private organization?	94	Delete	Will be answered during validation phase from CVs.
22. Do the authors declare any funding for this research?	100	Delete	Does not add anything as all these projects were funded. Will be answered during validation phase from CVs where we can see specific amounts and from who.
23. Are there any other noteworthy conflicts of or competing interests?	70	Delete	Will be answered during validation phase from CVs.