

Kvalitetsvurdering: Kvalitative studier

Studie (forfatter, år):		Alexanderson (2014)	Barnes (2007&2012)	Barns brukarmedverkan i den sociala barnvården: Västernorrlands modell för att göra barnens röster hörda	Barns medvirkning i hjelpetiltak i barnevernet [masteroppgave]
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	<i>indefensible no details on sampling, data collection or data analysis</i>
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>Unclear regarding research circles and interviews with children and how these two things fit together. Also unclear how many people were in each research circle. Seemed like user testing rather than a qualitative study per se.</i>	Appropriately	Appropriately	Inappropriately Lack of information about how included studies were chosen.
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>No description of who the researchers are, or their epistemological standpoints.</i>	Not described <i>- no discussion of relationship of researcher to participants. Researcher appears to be concerned with the voice of the child in both the formation of the study, and the topic choice. Unclear how research was explained and presented to the participants.</i>	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and no details how research was explained to participants</i>	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and theme. Not relevant if research was explained to participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Clear	<i>unclear - no details</i>
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Not sure <i>Two different ways of collecting data, but unclear if it was</i>	Reliable	Not sure Lack of information on how study was conducted.	Not sure unclear rationale for choice of literature to summarize.

		<i>related to the same topic.</i>			
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>not reported</i>	Rigorous	Rigorous	Not sure Lack of details
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor <i>no primary data reported to illustrate points.</i>	Rich	Rich	Poor Thin data with few extracts to support
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>not reported</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear whether data analysis was conducted by more than one researcher</i>	Reliable	Not sure Lack of details
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure <i>no real findings presented</i>	Convincing	Convincing	Not sure Lack of details
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Irrelevant <i>seems like authors opinions of research circles?</i>	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Not sure <i>not reported</i>	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Not sure/not reported <i>not reported</i>	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported No details	Not sure /not reported Lack of details
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, researchers' role, analysis, richness of data, findings, conclusions</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researcher' roles, analysis</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, researcher's role, ethics</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Researcher design, data collection, researchers' role, analysis, richness of data, findings, ethics</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Bell (2002)	Bell (2006)	Bergli (2017)	Bolin (2016)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Not sure/inadequately reported - no description of record keeping of data collection or materials used for analysis (e.g. transcription of audio recording, observation notes, etc.)	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>no description of relationship of researcher to participants or research theme. Unclear how research was explained and presented to the participants</i>	Not described <i>Researcher does not describe her relationship to the research topic or the participants.</i>	Unclear <i>role of researcher to theme is clear "my interest in, and earlier work with, emergency child welfare" role of researcher to participants is clearly described (former colleagues) - unclear whether research was explained and presented to the participants</i>	Unclear <i>The role of the researcher, nor their relationship to the participants or the research topic, is clearly described. They do describe how research was explained to participants and where they received funding and it appears to be unproblematic.</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Unclear <i>Unclear of the make-up of the family conference groups and the families involved. Whether both parents attended or just one, and what the problem was being addressed. This could influence how participants experienced the conference.</i>	Clear	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>Not reported</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>"A theme-based qualitative analysis" No details of analysis, inductive or deductive.</i>	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported Unclear how many cases were included in analysis
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Rich	Rich

	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported Unclear how data analysis was conduct or whether data was checked	Not sure/not reported <i>no discussion of how data was coded, negative cases, etc</i>	Not sure <i>unclear regarding double checking and addressing negative cases</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>no description of how many researchers themed and coded or how differences were resolved. no discussion of negative results.</i>
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Inadequate <i>does not account for negative cases - data shows rather ambiguous feelings on the part of the children, but conclusion is more bombastic that it is a promising practice</i>	Adequate	Not sure Long conclusion and difficult to identify important findings
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Not sure/not reported <i>no discussion of ethical approval or adherence to ethical guidelines</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>no information on either ethics approval or ethical considerations in dealing with children</i>	Appropriate	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, researchers' role, analysis, ethics</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, analysis, conclusions, ethics</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, analysis, conclusions</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Boylan (2005)	Boylan (2006)	Brady (2019)	Cossar (2016)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Unclear <i>less than 1/3 of participants have experience with phenomenon of interest. what are they being interviewed about?</i>	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Indefensible <i>focus seems to be on children's participation in research, not in review meetings, since only 11/39 children actually had experience with an advocate. No discussion as to why qualitative methods were used. sample reflects population.</i>	Indefensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>unsure as to the context of the interviews and the relationship of the researcher to the interview subject. unsure of the questions asked. Unclear who conducted the interviews.</i>	Not sure/inadequately reported Data collection methods not clearly described.	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>not reported. could vary significantly between inspections.</i>	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>From contact info they belong to the university. but unsure of their relationship to the topic or the participants or who conducted the physical interviews. Clear how research was explained to participants</i>	Unclear <i>the relationship between the researcher and participants. their relationship to theme is described (feminist). Unclear if research was explained to participants.</i>	Not described <i>the researchers are conducting secondary analysis, but unsure of the relationship of the people collecting the data to the research participants (inspectors).</i>	Unclear <i>there was one adult and one young researcher, but no explanation of the adult's relationship to the participants, the young researchers, or the topic. The research was explained to participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Not sure <i>make up of focus groups, where the interviews/focus groups took</i>	Clear	Unclear <i>characteristics of settings and participants not clearly described,</i>	Clear

		<i>place not reported.</i>		<i>however, observations were made in a variety of circumstances</i>	
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Not sure <i>not sure whether interviews, observations and focus groups were done with overlapping cases.</i>	Unreliable <i>the data collection methods certainly varied across inspections, but are not reported and were done with a different aim than research so unlikely to have the same rigor as a study.</i>	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>no description of how data was analysed.</i>	Rigorous	Rigorous	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Poor <i>Data is rich, but no data from participants (children). no information on the type of home the information came from (e.g. number/age of children, adults, etc.) data comes from inspectors summary of inspection of homes.</i>	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>no info re. coding, themes, etc.</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>analysis method not reported in detail.</i>	<i>not reported. data was coded in NVivo. No information on how the themes were developed. discrepant results were reported.</i>	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Partially relevant <i>The findings are that current practice should be examined critically. The questions is the role of advocacy in review meetings. I don't see how these quite match.</i>	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Inadequate <i>the conclusion is that current practice should be examined critically. The conclusion should rather talk about how children</i>	Adequate	Adequate

			<i>view participation in review meetings and interactions with advocates, based on the findings presented</i>		
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No discussion of ethical approval or adherence to ethical guidelines.</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>No discussion of ethical approval or adherence to ethical guidelines.</i>	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, researchers' role, context, analysis</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Study aim, research design, data collection, researchers' role, data collection, analysis, findings, conclusions, ethics</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Study design, data collection, researchers' role, context, analysis, richness of data</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: researchers' role</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Diaz (2019a,b&c)	Dillon (2016)	Edwards (2019)	Fern (2014 a&b)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Not sure <i>Collective case study seems inappropriate to examine such a complicated issue as participation in FGC. Also unclear which</i>

					<i>elements from which cases were incorporated in analysis.</i>
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Unclear <i>given that this collective case study incorporates elements from many case studies, it is unclear re. age and gender or issues facing the participants in the case studies. this would likely have an impact on both the implementation of the FGC and how it is experienced.</i>
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described	Clearly described	Clearly described (Fern 2014b)	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear <i>very little information provided on participants</i>	Clear	Unclear <i>no details provided on the young people even though they were interviewed, unclear what "had interacted with social services" means (e.g. foster home, complaints, cases?)</i>	Unclear <i>given that this collective case study incorporates elements from many case studies, it is unclear re. age and gender or issues facing the participants in the case studies. this would likely have an impact on both the implementation of the FGC and how it is experienced.</i>
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Not sure <i>Collective case study seems inappropriate to be examining such a complicated topic</i>
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous	Rigorous	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported <i>No information regarding how data from the case studies was extracted or analysed.</i>
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Rich	Not sure/not reported

					<i>NO information on original case studies and what information was extracted.</i>
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Not sure/not reported <i>NO information on data coding or negative results.</i>	Unreliable <i>NO information and lacks detail on individual case studies that were rolled into one case study.</i>
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing	Not convincing <i>No data.</i>
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Inadequate <i>little focus on children's perspectives in the conclusion</i>	Inadequate <i>Cannot see that it is based on any data.</i>
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No information re. ethical conduct or approval for study.-</i>
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Context</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>No concerns</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Design, data collection, context, analysis, richness of data, conclusions, ethics</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Design, data collection, context, analysis, findings, conclusions, ethics</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Frederiksen (2012)	Fylkesnes (2018)	Giertz (2013)	Glynn (2013)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described	Unclear <i>- researchers relationship to the theme and their analysis is described (children as storytellers) agree that relationship between researcher and participants not described</i>	Clearly described	Not described <i>NO information on the researchers relationship to the participants or the research topic.</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Unclear Unclear description of context and how many participants included in analysis.	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported Unclear analysis methods and procedures	Rigorous	Rigorous	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Not sure/not reported Little data presented	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>NO information on data coding or negative results.</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>Seems more than 1 researcher analyzed, no mention of how resolved differences, not stated whether participants gave feedback transcripts/data, no mention of negative/discrepant results</i>	Convincing	

	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Relevant	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Adequate	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Appropriate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>Unclear how many researchers coded data, unsure whether negative results were addressed or ignored.</i>	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Analysis</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers role, analysis</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Context, richness of data, ethics</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Goodyer (2016)	Griffiths (2006)	Hedin (2011)	Hjelte (2017)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear

Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>unclear how data was collected - e.g. what materials used for analysis. observation notes or transcriptions of audio recordings</i>	Appropriately	Appropriately	Not sure/inadequately reported Information on preparation for interviews with children, but no information on how interviews were conducted
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clear	Not described <i>no information regarding the relationship of the researcher to the participants or the research theme or how research was explained to participants</i>	Not described <i>no information regarding the relationship of the researcher to the participants or the research theme or how research was explained to participants</i>	Not described <i>no information regarding the relationship of the researcher to the participants or the research theme or how research was explained to participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Unclear <i>No information on the characteristics of the participants or the context of the interviews.</i>	Clear	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Not sure <i>unclear how data was collected (observation, transcription, etc.) - does not appear to be triangulation - does appear to investigate what they claim to investigate</i>	Not sure <i>Analysis methods were not described at all. Nothing at all about interviews with children or observations of court cases</i>	Reliable	Not sure <i>Unclear how data was collected</i>
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>No info on analysis, except appears to be thematic</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>No info on analysis,</i>	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported Unclear analysis
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Not sure/not reported <i>little data and difficult to find data. no data presented on children's views or observations of courtroom</i>	Rich	Poor Poorly described data

	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>Difficult to say because appears 1 person did analysis. no mention of coding, whether participants gave feedback on the transcripts/data, how/if addressed negative/discrepant results</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on analysis provided</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>Lack of information on analysis procedure</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>Lack of information on analysis procedure</i>
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not sure <i>Difficult to see exactly what the findings are; a lot of extracts from the original data; data appropriately referenced; reporting is clear and coherent</i>	Not convincing <i>few original data extracts, not clear reporting.</i>	Convincing	Not sure Lack of information
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Partially relevant <i>only present findings from interviews with panel members. nothing from interviews with children or observations of hearings.</i>	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Inadequate <i>Unclear links between data, interpretation and conclusions; vague conclusions; no exploration of alternative explanations; to some extent enhance understanding; little on implications of the research and limitations encountered</i>	Inadequate <i>Not enough findings to make a conclusion. Furthermore, counted for and against in the end (5 vs 24)</i>	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Adequate	Not sure/not reported <i>no information.</i>	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>no information.</i>

Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, analysis, findings, conclusions</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, data collection, analysis, findings, conclusions</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' roll, analysis</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, researchers' role, analysis, richness of data, findings, ethics</i>
---------------------------	--	---	--	---	---

Studie (forfatter, år):		Hoikkala (2019)	Holland (2006)	Holt (2011)	Howes (2005)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described <i>No need to explain research to participants (document analysis)</i>	Clearly described	Clearly described	Not described <i>no information regarding the relationship of the researcher to the participants or the research theme or how research was explained to participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear

	7. Were the methods reliable?	Unreliable <i>Only one method, and no discussion of triangulation</i>	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure <i>not clear how the data was analysed to arrive at the results, not clear how the themes/findings were derived from the data</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear how themes and concepts were derived from the data</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear how themes and concepts were derived from the data</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on data analysis methods- procedure or approach to developing concepts/themes</i>
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Poor <i>Limited description of the contexts of the data, diversity of perspectives, detail and depth, comparisons across documents</i>	Rich	Rich	Poor <i>Just a short summary of findings without data extracts</i>
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>Seems 2 researchers coded and analyzed. that's all we know</i>	Reliable	Not sure/not reported <i>NO info regarding coding or negative results</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on data analysis - how data was coded, how negative results were addressed</i>
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Not convincing <i>Difficult to see what the findings are. Some but not a lot of extracts from the original data, , the data is not appropriately referenced (who said what, which case, etc.)</i>	Convincing	Convincing	Not convincing <i>Very little information presented regarding findings and no extracts from original data.</i>
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Partially relevant <i>many of the findings relate to aspects outside of the formal hearing</i>	Adequate	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Not sure <i>Some links between data, interpretation and conclusions; plausible & coherent conclusions; to some extent enhance understanding of the research topic; little by way of implications of the research; adequate discussion of limitations</i>	Adequate	Adequate	Inadequate <i>Difficult to assess link between data, interpretation and conclusions because so little information on findings presented. implications for research addressed. Conclusion focuses on how children can be involved, but not what they think about the conferences</i>

Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on ethics approval.</i>	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on ethical approval or ethical conduct.</i>
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, analysis, richness of data, findings, conclusions, unclear relationship between researcher and theme - unclear reporting of findings - difficult to assess legitimacy of conclusions based on findings</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns Data analysis, ethics</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Analysis</i>	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis, richness of data, findings, conclusions, ethics</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Husby (2018, 2019)	Iversen (2014)	Jensen (2014)	Kriz (2017)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Mixed Clear reference to the literature, but <i>unclear aims of the study</i>	Clear	Clear

Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Not sure <i>design appears appropriate to the research question; little by way of rational/justifications. unclear why those particular 35 of possible 250 interviewees.</i>	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>data collection methods somewhat clearly described; who transcribed?</i>	Appropriately	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>no information regarding transcription, observation, etc or where the interviews took place.</i>
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described	Unclear <i>little/no info on relationship between the researcher and the participants, how the research was explained and presented to the participants</i>	Clearly described	Not described <i>No information on researchers relationship to the participants or the research topic.</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Unclear <i>characteristics of the participants and settings are not clearly defined; not stated if interviews were flexible</i>	Clear	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Not sure <i>data collected by interviews. no mention of triangulation. appears methods investigate what they claim to</i>	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous	<i>not sure/not reported procedure is not explicit; unclear if it is systematic and procedure is reliable/dependable; unclear how themes/concepts were derived from the data</i>	Rigorous	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Poor <i>No/little info about contexts of the data, diversity of perspectives, details,</i>	Rich	Rich

			<i>comparisons</i>		
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable	Unreliable <i>1 researcher, no feedback from participants, no attention to negative/discrepant results. Appears findings were decided before analysis done</i>	Reliable	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Not convincing <i>findings somewhat vaguely presented, some extracts from the original data are included. appears findings are decided before the data analysis done</i>	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Partially relevant <i>difficult to assess because unclear what the aim of the study is.</i>	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Inadequate <i>ok links between data, interpretation and conclusions; but conclusions thin; no mention of alternative explanations; provides little additional understanding of the research topic; minimal on implications of the research</i>	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No description of ethical approval or adherence to ethical guidelines</i>	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>no information regarding ethics approval or ethical conduct.</i>
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter	– Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter <i>Concerns:</i>	++ 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

		No concerns	<i>Unclear research aim, design, researchers' role, data collection, analysis, richness of data, findings, conclusion, ethics</i>	No concerns	<i>Concerns: Data collection, researchers' role, ethics</i>
--	--	-------------	---	-------------	---

Studie (forfatter, år):		Leeson (2007)	Lucas (2017)	Lundberg (2014)	Magnussen (2015)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Not sure/inadequately reported unclear data collection methods (type of interview structure, record keeping of data)	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Unclear PhD student, but unsure of their relationship to research topic or participants. Unclear if research was explained to participants	Not described unclear relationship between researcher and participants and theme and how the research was explained to participants	Clearly described	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Unclear characteristics of the participants and settings vague, not stated which county board(s) (where in Norway)
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Not sure data collected by 1 method, no mention of triangulation

Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>NO details on analysis procedure. Unclear how themes and concepts were derived from the data.</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>- unclear procedure and how the themes and concepts were derived from the data. - used Nvivo software</i>	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported <i>procedure a bit vague, unclear if systematic and how the themes and concepts were derived from the data</i>
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Rich	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>NO details on how coding was conducted or negative cases were addressed. Negative cases are evidenced in reporting of findings</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear how many researchers coded the data - unclear how differences were resolved, how negative results were addressed</i>	Reliable	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>very limited on ethical considerations; no mention of consent and anonymity; no mention of approval by an ethics committee</i>
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns:</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>No concerns</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns:</i>

			<i>Data collection, researchers' role, analysis</i>		<i>Context, data collection, analysis, ethics</i>
--	--	--	---	--	---

Studie (forfatter, år):		McCarthy (2016)	McGregor (2019)	McLeod (2006, 2010)	Morrison (2019)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Not sure <i>little information provided on the rationale for using the qualitative approach, the sampling, data collection or data analysis techniques used</i>
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>no info on the relationship between the researcher and the participants, how the research was explained and presented to the participants</i>	Not described <i>no info on the relationship between the researcher and the participants, how the research was explained and presented to the participants</i>	Clearly described	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear <i>little about characteristics of the participants and settings, only interviews, don't know where interviews done, how long they lasted</i>	Unclear <i>little about characteristics of the participants and settings, only interviews, don't know where interviews done, how long they lasted</i>	Clear	Not sure <i>few details regarding characteristics and settings where observations were made</i>
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported <i>No information provided on analysis procedure or how themes and contexts were</i>	Rigorous

				<i>derived from the data.</i>	
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Not sure/not reported <i>No details on context of data extracts</i>	Rich	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>1 researcher analyzed, no feedback mentioned, no mention of negative/discrepant results</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>Unclear how many researchers involved in analysis, no feedback mentioned, no mention of negative/discrepant results</i>	Unreliable <i>Doubtful that more than 1 researcher coded the data (only one author). No information on negative results.</i>	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Not sure <i>Few details on context of data extracts</i>	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Not sure/not reported <i>ethical issues considered; no/little info on consent, anonymity, study approval by an ethics committee</i>	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>no mention of approval by ethics board; role of researcher unexplored</i>
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns:</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns:</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Analysis</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns:</i>

		<i>Researchers' role, context, analysis, ethics</i>	<i>Researchers' role, context, richness of data, analysis, findings</i>		<i>Research design, context, ethics</i>
--	--	---	---	--	---

Studie (forfatter, år):		Muench (2017)	Munro (2001)	Palsson (2017)	Paulsen (2016)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Unclear <i>Unclear relationship between research and participants/theme not described. Details on how research was explained to participants</i>	Unclear <i>Unclear relationship between the researcher and participants /theme. Discussion of how research was explained to participants.</i>	Not described <i>Researcher's relationship to participants and themes not discussed, but maybe not important given the focus on observation and document analysis.</i>	Not described <i>Unclear relationship between research and participants/theme not described. No details on how research was explained to participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Unclear <i>No information about the children involved in the cases being studied (e.g. age, gender, time in placement). Very little information about the case workers.</i>	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Not sure Only one method used. No discussion on triangulation	Not sure <i>No discussion of triangulation.</i>	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>no details</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>No discussion of data analysis procedure or how themes and</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>Aside from discussing data as coming from remarks, no</i>	Rigorous

			<i>concepts were derived.</i>	<i>information on analysis procedure or how themes and codes were derived.</i>	
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Poor <i>no information on the context of the data (e.g. how old child had been or how many placements/how long in placement)</i>	Poor <i>No information on the context of the cases described. Little detail and cannot see comparing and contrasting.</i>	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear how many researchers themed and coded data, unsure how negative results were addressed</i>	Unreliable <i>No discussion of analysis methods and unlikely to have been coded by more than one researcher (only one author).</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>little description of analysis.</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>How many researchers? How did they deal with negative findings?</i>
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Not convincing <i>very thin data presented, not appropriately referenced and interspersed with findings from other studies.</i>	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No discussion of ethics. Maybe not important since no interaction with children occurred.</i>	Appropriate

Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	<p>++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter</p> <p><i>Concerns</i> <i>Researchers' role, data collection, analysis</i></p>	<p>+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter</p> <p><i>Concerns:</i> <i>Researchers' role, data collection, analysis, richness of data, ethics</i></p>	<p>+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter</p> <p><i>Concerns:</i> <i>Researchers' role, context, analysis, richness of data, ethics</i></p>	<p>++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter</p> <p><i>Concerns:</i> <i>Researchers' role, analysis</i></p>
---------------------------	--	---	---	---	---

Studie (forfatter, år):		Pert (2017)	Pietiläinen (2018)	Pithouse (2007)	Polkki (2012)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>Unclear relationship between research and participants/theme not described. Details on how research was explained to participants</i>	Unclear <i>limited/no info</i>	Not described <i>Unclear relationship to participants and theme. no details on how/if research was explained to participants.</i>	Unclear <i>no description of how research was explained to participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Unclear <i>limited/no info</i>	Clear	Clear

	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Not sure <i>focus group interviews but limited info</i>	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>No discussion of analysis procedure or how themes and codes were derived.</i>	Rigorous	Rigorous	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Poor <i>the context of the data is not described. No evidence of comparing and contrasting.</i>	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>Not details</i>	Not sure/not reported not enough details on analysis procedure	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on who coded or how it was coded. No evidence of negative results</i>	Not sure/not reported Unsure how many researchers coded
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Not convincing <i>No extracts from original data, data is not appropriately referenced.</i>	Convincing But data is not adequately referenced
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Inadequate <i>Because the data is not used to support interpretation, difficult to see how conclusions relate to data.</i>	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>No discussion of ethics approval or adherence to ethical guidelines</i>	Not sure/not reported No information on ethical approval
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the

		adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis</i>	described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, data collection, analysis</i>	adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, richness of data, analysis, findings, conclusions, ethics</i>	conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis, findings, ethics</i>
--	--	---	--	--	--

Studie (forfatter, år):		Rap (2019)	Rasmussen (2004)	Roesch-Marsh (2017)	Roose (2009)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>unclear relationship of researcher to participants or theme. Unclear how/if research was explained to participants</i>	Unclear <i>limited info on relationship between the researcher and the participants</i>	Clearly described	Not described <i>unclear relationship of researcher to participants or theme. Unclear how/if research was explained to participants. Unlikely to be important since it was document analysis.</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Unclear <i>- unclear if they came from different municipalities/centres, what kind of centres, what kind of cases/social workers</i>
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable

Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on data analysis provided</i>	Rigorous	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported Lack of information on data analysis methods
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Rich	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on data analysis provided.</i>	Reliable	Reliable	Not sure/not reported Lack of information on data analysis procedure
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing	Not convincing <i>no data extracts data is not referenced appropriately</i>
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Not sure/not reported <i>No information on ethics approval or adherence to ethical guidelines.</i>	Appropriate	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported No details provided
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis, ethics</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns Researchers' role</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>No concerns</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, analysis, findings, ethics</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):	Saebjornsen (2017)	Sanders (2006)	Serholt (2018)	Stanley (2012)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Not sure/inadequately reported Unclear how interviews were conducted	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and no details how research was explained to participants</i>	Clearly described
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear <i>no details on where or how long interviews were undertaken</i>	<i>unclear no details of settings of interviews - no consideration of context bias</i>	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported Lack of information on data analysis methods	Rigorous
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich		Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Reliable	Not sure/not reported Lack of information on data analysis procedure	Reliable
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Not sure Unclear presentation of data	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant

	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported No details provided	Appropriate	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Context</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Data collection, researchers' role, analysis, findings, ethics</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>No concerns</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Stevens (2008)	Strandbu (2007)	Thomas (2017)	Timms (2006)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible	<i>Defensible</i>	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and unclear</i>	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and unclear</i>	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and unclear</i>	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and unclear</i>

		<i>how research was explained to participants</i>	<i>how research was explained to participants</i>	<i>how/if research was explained to participants</i>	<i>how/if research was explained to participants. Unlikely to matter in a survey.</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Clear	Clear	Unclear <i>unclear characteristics of participants and settings of observations</i>	Clear
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	<i>Unreliable only one method of data collection - no discussion of triangulation of data</i>
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>thematic analysis, no other details</i>	Rigorous	Not rigorous <i>unclear analysis procedure unclear how themes and concepts were derived from the data</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear analysis procedure and how themes/concepts were derived from the data</i>
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Rich	Rich	Rich	Rich <i>rich but note - contexts of data not described well. this is related to the method - not a lot of depth or detail due to nature of data collection</i>
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported Lack of details	Reliable	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear how many researchers coded data or how negative cases were dealt with</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear how many researchers involved in analysis or how negative cases were addressed</i>
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing <i>inappropriate referencing of data sources</i>	Convincing <i>data not appropriately referenced - maybe not possible</i>
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Inadequate does not clearly tie to findings	Adequate	Not sure <i>unclear link between data, interpretation and conclusions - little consideration of alternative</i>	Adequate

				<i>explanations</i>	
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>no details</i>	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported <i>no details</i>
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis, conclusions</i>	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, ethics</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, analysis, conclusions</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, data collection, analysis, ethics</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Tjelflaat (2007)	Van Bijleveld (2014)	Bijleveld (2019)	Viblemo (2017)
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate	Appropriate
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Not sure Limited information	Defensible	Defensible	Defensible
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Not sure/inadequately reported <i>inadequately reported</i>	Appropriately	Appropriately	Appropriately

Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Not described <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme and unclear how research was explained to participants</i>	Unclear <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme. research was explained adequately to research participants</i>	Unclear <i>Unclear relationship between researcher and participants and theme. clear description of how research was described</i>	Unclear <i>unclear relationship between researcher and participants/theme. research was explained adequately to research participants</i>
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Unclear <i>characteristics of the participants and settings not clearly defined</i>	unclear <i>unclear setting of interviews and context bias</i>	Clear	Unclear <i>no/limited info on characteristics of the participants and settings</i>
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Not sure Limited description of methods	Reliable	Reliable	<i>unreliable only one data collection method. no discussion of triangulation</i>
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not sure/not reported <i>limited info</i>	rigorous	Rigorous	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear analysis procedure or how themes and concepts were derived from the data</i>
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Not sure/not reported <i>no or unclear description of contexts of the data, diversity of perspectives, detail and depth, comparisons</i>	<i>poor</i> <i>contexts of the data not described - not a lot of depth or detail - very little comparing and contrasting of young people and case workers experiences/viewpoints</i>	Rich	Rich
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>no/limited info</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>unclear whether more than 1 researcher theme and code transcripts/data, how were differences resolved, and how negative/discrepant results addressed or ignored?</i>	Not sure <i>no description of how many researchers themed and coded or how differences were resolved. no discussion of negative results.</i>	Not sure/not reported <i>no/limited info on analysis</i>

	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing	Convincing
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant	Relevant
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure Unclear regarding ethics approval	Not sure/not reported <i>no description of whether ethical approval was granted or ethical guidelines adhered to</i>	Appropriate
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Research design, data collection, researchers' role, analysis, richness of data,</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, analysis, richness of data, ethics</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, analysis, ethics</i>	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Researchers' role, context, data collection, analysis</i>

Studie (forfatter, år):		Warming 2006	Winter (2010)		
Theoretical approach	1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?	Appropriate	Appropriate		
	2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?	Unclear <i>no aims or research questions discussed</i>	Clear		

Study design	3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology?	Defensible	Defensible		
Data collection	4. How well was the data collection carried out?	Appropriately	Appropriately		
Trustworthiness	5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?	Clearly described	Clearly described		
	6. Is the context clearly described?	Not sure <i>limited/no info on characteristics of the participants and settings</i>	Clear		
	7. Were the methods reliable?	Reliable	Reliable		
Analysis	8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Not rigorous <i>limited/no info on how the data were analyzed</i>	Rigorous		
	9. Is the data 'rich'?	Not sure/not reported <i>contexts of data not described</i>	Rich		
	10. Is the analysis reliable?	Not sure/not reported <i>difficult to sat given the limited info provided</i>	Reliable		
	11. Are the findings convincing?	Convincing	Convincing		
	12. Are the finding relevant to the aims of the study?	Relevant	Relevant		
	13. Conclusions – Is there adequate discussion of any limitation encountered?	Appropriate	Adequate		
Ethics	14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics	Appropriate	Not sure/not reported No details on ethical approval		
Overall assessment	As far as can be ascertained from the	+ Some of the checklist criteria have been	++ All or most of the checklist criteria have		

	paper, how well was the study conducted?	fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled, or not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Unclear aim, context, analysis, richness of data</i>	been fulfilled, where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter <i>Concerns: Ethics</i>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Kvalitetsvurdering: Kaskontrollstudier

Vis 2013

Spørsmål	Svar med begrunnelse
Var kasus- og kontrollpersoner hentet fra sammenliknbare befolkningsgrupper?	Ja
Er gruppene sammenliknbare i forhold til viktige forvekslingsfaktorer?	Uklart – ikke nok detaljer om deltakerne beskrevet
Er kasusgruppens tilstand tilstrekkelig beskrevet og/eller diagnosen validert?	Ja
Er det tydelig at kontrollgruppen var fri for den aktuelle tilstanden?	Ja
Har forfatterne tatt hensyn til viktige forvekslingsfaktorer i studiens design og/eller analyse?	Uklart – “Logistic regression was used in simple and multivariable analyses to determine the odds of a ruling about care being in accord with a child’s wishes.”
Er eksponering for fare/skade/tiltak målt og gradert på samme måte i kasus- og kontrollgruppen?	Ja
Var den som målte eksposisjonen blindet mht. hvem som var kasus eller kontroll?	Uklart – ingen beskrivelse

Var responsraten tilstrekkelig i begge grupper?	Ja
---	----

Kvalitetsvurdering: Systematiske oversikter

Kennan 2018

Spørsmål	Svar	Begrunnelse
Beskriver forfatterne klart hvilke metoder de brukte for å finne primærstudiene?	Ja	<i>Page 3: There were three rounds of searches to locate the relevant studies. First, searches were conducted using the following social science databases: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts, Scopus, Sociological Abstracts and the Campbell Collaboration Library. Second, additional searches were conducted using our University Library Catalogue, Open Grey database and Google to identify relevant internet-based published reports, as well as journal articles, book chapters and theses not identified in searches using the initial databases. Third, the reference lists of included articles were reviewed to check for missing studies of relevance. Searches were conducted for studies published in English with a publication date from the year 2000 onwards.</i>
Ble det utført et tilfredsstillende litteratursøk?	Ja	<i>Page 3: There were three rounds of searches to locate the relevant studies. First, searches were conducted using the following social science databases: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts, Scopus, Sociological Abstracts and the Campbell Collaboration Library. Second, additional searches were conducted using our University Library Catalogue, Open Grey database and Google to identify relevant internet-based published reports, as well as journal articles, book chapters and theses not identified in searches using the initial databases. Third, the reference lists of included articles were reviewed to check for missing studies of relevance. Searches were conducted for studies published in English with a publication date from the year 2000 onwards.</i>
Beskriver forfatterne hvilke kriterier som ble brukt for å bestemme hvilke studier som skulle inkluderes?	Ja	<i>Page 3: Inclusion and exclusion criteria</i>
Ble det sikret mot systematiske skjevheter (bias) ved seleksjon av studier?	Uklart	<i>Page 5: Initially, two reviewers screened the publications by title and by abstract. Following this round of screening, 1,008 articles were removed. The second stage involved a full-text screening of the remaining seventy articles (after duplicates were removed). After the second round of screening, ten studies were retained. The second and third rounds of searches identified a further ten publications for inclusion.</i>
Er det klart beskrevet et sett av kriterier for å vurdere intern validitet?	Ja	<i>Page 9: two reviewers independently appraised each study and assigned a high, medium or low WoE to the trustworthiness, appropriateness and relevance of the study. The reviewers subsequently discussed any discrepancies and agreed on the overall WoE by calculating the average agreed weights (Table 2).</i>

Er validiteten til studiene vurdert ved bruk av relevante kriterier?	Ja	<i>EPPI-Centre weight-of-evidence (WoE)</i>
Er metodene som ble brukt da resultatene ble sammenfattet, klart beskrevet?	Ja	<i>Page 5: A narrative synthesis approach is used to describe and compare the findings of the quantitative and qualitative studies included, using both text and Table 1. The following data were extracted and are detailed in Table 1: author(s), date, country where the study was conducted, study context (classified as a child-welfare, child-protection or alternative-care process), relevant process reviewed, study design and sample, and level and type of evidence the study yielded. The findings section provides a narrative description of the results of the individual studies. Quantitative data synthesis was not possible as standardised measures were not used across the studies.</i>
Ble resultatene fra studiene sammenfattet på forsvarlig måte?	Ja	<i>Page 5: A narrative synthesis approach is used to describe and compare the findings of the quantitative and qualitative studies included, using both text and Table 1. The following data were extracted and are detailed in Table 1: author(s), date, country where the study was conducted, study context (classified as a child-welfare, child-protection or alternative-care process), relevant process reviewed, study design and sample, and level and type of evidence the study yielded. The findings section provides a narrative description of the results of the individual studies. Quantitative data synthesis was not possible as standardised measures were not used across the studies.</i>
Er forfatterens konklusjoner støttet av data og/eller analysen som er rapportert i oversikten?	Ja	<i>Page 13: This review provides evidence of how effective the use of advocates, a child's attendance at a meeting, Family Welfare Conferences and the re-cording of a child's views are as processes to support the realisation of a child's right to participate in decisions pertaining to their welfare, protection and care. The evidence available is primarily indicative, drawing on service-user and service-provider testimonies in studies that are relatively small in scale. There is also very little focus in the literature on the effectiveness of processes to enable young children to have their views taken into consideration.</i>
Hvordan vil du rangere den vitenskapelige kvaliteten i denne oversikten?	Høy kvalitet	