

# Critical Review Form - Qualitative Studies (Version 2.0)

© Letts, L., Wilkins, S., Law, M., Stewart, D., Bosch, J., & Westmorland, M., 2007  
McMaster University

CITATION:

	Comments
<p><b>STUDY PURPOSE:</b></p> <p>Was the purpose and/or research question stated clearly?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>Outline the purpose of the study and/or research question.</p>
<p><b>LITERATURE:</b></p> <p>Was relevant background literature reviewed?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>Describe the justification of the need for this study. Was it clear and compelling?</p>
<p><b>STUDY DESIGN:</b></p> <p>What was the design?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> phenomenology</p> <p><input type="radio"/> ethnography</p> <p><input type="radio"/> grounded theory</p> <p><input type="radio"/> participatory action research</p> <p><input type="radio"/> other</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>How does the study apply to your practice and/or to your research question? Is it worth continuing this review?<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Was the design appropriate for the study question? (i.e., rationale) Explain.</p>

<sup>1</sup> When doing critical reviews, there are strategic points in the process at which you may decide the research is not applicable to your practice and question. You may decide then that it is not worthwhile to continue with the review.

<p>Was a theoretical perspective identified?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>Describe the theoretical or philosophical perspective for this study e.g., researcher's perspective.</p>
<p>Method(s) used:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> participant observation</p> <p><input type="radio"/> interviews</p> <p><input type="radio"/> document review</p> <p><input type="radio"/> focus groups</p> <p><input type="radio"/> other</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Describe the method(s) used to answer the research question. Are the methods congruent with the philosophical underpinnings and purpose?</p>
<p><b>SAMPLING:</b></p> <p>Was the process of purposeful selection described?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>Describe sampling methods used. Was the sampling method appropriate to the study purpose or research question?</p>
<p>Was sampling done until redundancy in data was reached?<sup>2</sup></p> <p><input type="radio"/> yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> no</p> <p><input type="radio"/> not addressed</p>	<p>Are the participants described in adequate detail? How is the sample applicable to your practice or research question? Is it worth continuing?</p>
<p>Was informed consent obtained?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> no</p> <p><input type="radio"/> not addressed</p>	
<p><b>DATA COLLECTION:</b></p> <p><b>Descriptive Clarity</b></p> <p>Clear &amp; complete description of site: <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no</p> <p>participants: <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no</p> <p>Role of researcher &amp; relationship with participants: <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no</p> <p>Identification of assumptions and biases of researcher: <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>Describe the context of the study. Was it sufficient for understanding of the "whole" picture?</p> <p>What was missing and how does that influence your understanding of the research?</p>

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the form, "no" means the authors explicitly state reasons for not doing it; "not addressed" should be ticked if there is no mention of the issue.

<p><b>Procedural Rigour</b>  Procedural rigor was used in data collection strategies?  <input type="radio"/> yes  <input type="radio"/> no  <input type="radio"/> not addressed</p>	<p>Do the researchers provide adequate information about data collection procedures e.g., gaining access to the site, field notes, training data gatherers? Describe any flexibility in the design &amp; data collection methods.</p>
<p><b>DATA ANALYSES:</b></p> <p><b>Analytical Rigour</b>  Data analyses were inductive?  <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> not addressed</p> <p>Findings were consistent with &amp; reflective of data?  <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>Describe method(s) of data analysis. Were the methods appropriate? What were the findings?</p>
<p><b>Auditability</b>  Decision trail developed?  <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> not addressed</p> <p>Process of analyzing the data was described adequately?  <input type="radio"/> yes <input type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> not addressed</p>	<p>Describe the decisions of the researcher re: transformation of data to codes/themes. Outline the rationale given for development of themes.</p>
<p><b>Theoretical Connections</b>  Did a meaningful picture of the phenomenon under study emerge?  <input type="radio"/> yes  <input type="radio"/> no</p>	<p>How were concepts under study clarified &amp; refined, and relationships made clear? Describe any conceptual frameworks that emerged.</p>

