

Bilag G Kritisk vurdering af kvalitative studier forældreperspektiv vha QUARI JBI checklist

Studie	SPG 1	SPG 2	SPG 3	SPG 4	SPG 5	SPG 6	SPG 7	SPG 8	SPG 9	SPG 10
Lilliesköld, S et al 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Noren, J et al. 2018	N/A (Design)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Føreland, AM et al, 2022	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gulla, K. et al 2017	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	U	Y
Olsson, E, 2017	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blomqvist Y et al 2010 A retrospective survey design.	N	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Blomqvist Y et al 2011	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y
Blomqvist Y et al 2012	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Mgl barriere citations	Y	Y
Johnson et al. 2007	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roller et al, 2005	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y
Fegran et al 2008	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?
2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?
3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?
4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?
5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?
6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?
7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?
8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?
9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?
10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?

Disse studier er ikke kritisk vurderede:

Dong, Q et al. 2022 (Scoping review), MU, PF et al 2019 (qualitative systematic review), Anderzén-Carlsson, A 2014, part 1(qualitative systematic review), Anderzén-Carlsson, A 2014, part 2(qualitative systematic review)