

**Online Supplementary Material**

Cohen DJ, Crabtree BF. Evaluative criteria for qualitative research in health care: controversies and recommendations. *Ann Fam Med*. 2008;6(4):331-339.

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

**Supplemental Appendix 2. Publications Analyzed: Health Care Journals and Frequently Referenced Books and Book Chapters (1980-2005) That Posited Criteria for 'Good' Qualitative Research**

<b>Author(s) Year</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Publication Information</b>	<b>Criteria for Qualitative Research</b>
Angen MJ 2000	Evaluating interpretive inquiry: reviewing the validity debate and opening the dialogue	<i>Qual Health Res</i> . 10(3):378-395	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rich substance and content with evidence of interpretive choices made and ethical implications of choices</li> <li>▪ Import for target audiences</li> <li>▪ Assessment of bias inherent in interpretation</li> <li>▪ Seek out alternative explanations than those identified by the researchers</li> <li>▪ Researcher self-reflection</li> <li>▪ Carefully articulated research question</li> <li>▪ Carrying out respectful research</li> <li>▪ Written account develops persuasive argument</li> </ul>
Altheide DL, Johnson JM 1994	Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research	<i>Handbook of Qualitative Research</i> Denzin N, Lincoln Y, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp 485-499	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assess the goals of the research</li> <li>▪ Researcher must clearly delineate the process by which the ethnography occurred</li> <li>▪ Research should come from an ethical and humane framework</li> <li>▪ Report verifiable knowledge about the interpretive process and observer's way of knowing</li> <li>▪ Researchers must try to understand observed perspectives on social reality; there are many perspectives, must report this multivocality</li> <li>▪ The goal is to report the lived experience of the observed</li> <li>▪ My account for the observer's judgment; researcher must deal with the relationship between observed and observer</li> <li>▪ Account of how researcher dealt with tacit knowledge must be included (explain how we know what we know)</li> </ul>
Britten N, Jones R, Murphy E, Stacy R 1995	Qualitative research method in general practice and primary care	<i>Fam Pract</i> . 12(1):104-114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research should be of value and importance</li> <li>▪ Evidence that researchers reflected on how the research process influenced data collection</li> <li>▪ Research question clearly formulated</li> <li>▪ Clear and concise description of how data were analyzed</li> <li>▪ Use of appropriate methods to answer research question</li> <li>▪ Evidence of rigorous and systematic analysis, including a search for disconfirming cases</li> <li>▪ Generalizability – relevance of research in other settings</li> <li>▪ There should be strong evidence to support study's conclusions that includes excerpts</li> <li>▪ Clear rationale behind case selection and evidence to support success of strategy</li> <li>▪ Clear and succinct communication of research process and findings</li> <li>▪ Methods clearly described and rationale for methodological choices provided</li> <li>▪ Trustworthiness – descriptions that seem faithful to issue under investigation</li> <li>▪ Analysis should have face validity</li> </ul>

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
Creswell JW 1998	<i>Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions</i>	Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Achieves understanding – a deep knowledge of a social setting or phenomenon</li> <li>▪ Verification of findings via at least 2 of the following (prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer review, debriefing, negative case analysis, clarification of research bias, member checking, thick description, external auditing)</li> <li>▪ Trustworthiness, credibility, and authenticity</li> </ul>
Cutcliff JR, McKenna HP 1999	Establishing the credibility of qualitative research findings: the plot thickens	<i>J Adv Nurs.</i> 30(2):374-380	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focuses on credibility</li> <li>▪ Researcher should make explicit what approach they used</li> <li>▪ Researcher should make explicit what attempts or methods were used to establish credibility of study</li> <li>▪ Member checking, using participant's own words, report discrepancies between researcher's view and participant's view</li> <li>▪ Combine several methods of checking data and findings, including triangulation</li> <li>▪ The final test is if readers and practitioners find the results meaningful and applicable in terms of their experiences</li> </ul>
Eakin JM, Mykhalovskiy E 2003	Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences	<i>J Eval Clin Pract.</i> 9(2):187-194	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focus on analytical content and consider proper method as an aid to engaging with substantive findings</li> <li>▪ Research question as way of understanding nature of the investigation</li> <li>▪ Make researcher subjectivity understandable; not a problem of bias but something used actively and creatively throughout research process</li> <li>▪ Researcher must choose and justify which features of his/her relationship with participants and data are relevant and describe this role and its implications</li> <li>▪ Explain sampling process and how it affects the data collected and interpretations made of the data. This will enhance reader's understanding of the meaning attributed to the data; enhances capacity to "feel" the texture of account</li> </ul>
Elder NC, Miller WL 1995	Reading and evaluating qualitative research studies	<i>J Fam Pract.</i> 41(3):279-285	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research question should be practical and important and clearly stated</li> <li>▪ Sampling approach well defined and appropriate for answering research question</li> <li>▪ The study design should be best for addressing research question</li> <li>▪ Rationale for methodological choices are provided</li> <li>▪ Specifics of study design (eg, who are study participants, how are they chosen, how are data collected) are provided</li> <li>▪ Trustworthiness – study's interpretation valid relative to intent; it is believable and makes sense</li> <li>▪ Sufficient explanation of how data are analyzed, including steps to examine negative cases</li> <li>▪ Study should make a contribution (import)</li> </ul>
Fitzpatrick R, Boulton M 1994	Qualitative methods for assessing health care	<i>Qual Health Care.</i> 3:107-113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Theoretical sampling</li> <li>▪ Validation – obtain evidence from as diverse and independent a range of sources as possible (triangulation); are the materials/data collected able to be independently inspected by others? Have investigators sought out alternative explanations or deviant cases? Have respondents validated the data and findings (member checking)? Is this incorporated into the report?</li> </ul>

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
Frankel RM, Devers K 2000	Qualitative research: a consumer's guide	<i>Educ Health.</i> 13(1):113-123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clearly stated and important research question; description of how research question evolved</li> <li>▪ Investigators' perceptions and assumptions should be clearly stated, explaining how these affect study design and research question</li> </ul>
Frankel RM 1999	Standards of qualitative research	Crabtree BJ, Miller WL, eds. <i>Doing Qualitative Research.</i> 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clear and detailed description of study context, researcher's role in context, how the context may have changed</li> <li>▪ Is research strategy most approach for answering research question?</li> <li>▪ Clear description of purposeful sampling method used and why it was selected</li> <li>▪ Specific criteria for particular research domain(s) should be used</li> <li>▪ Data archiving/creating audit trail</li> <li>▪ Reflective journal keeping</li> <li>▪ Search for disconfirming cases and testing "rival" hypotheses</li> <li>▪ Skeptical peer review</li> <li>▪ Subject review (member checking)</li> <li>▪ Triangulation</li> <li>▪ Does the research represent a breakthrough, is the approach used new or novel, is the approach parsimonious?</li> </ul>
Giacomini MK, Cook DJ 2000	Users' guides to the medical literature XXIII. Qualitative research in health care are the results of the study valid? Evidence- based Medicine Working Group	<i>JAMA.</i> 284(4):478- 482	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rigorous study design that is able to answer research question</li> <li>▪ Sample relevant to research question, sampling process justified and well articulated</li> <li>▪ Data collection methods described and choices justified for answering research question and for the setting</li> <li>▪ Comprehensive data collection; robust description of phenomenon</li> <li>▪ Iterative data collection and analysis process to assess data needs and return to collection process as needed</li> <li>▪ Authors describe data collection and analysis process such that another could follow it</li> <li>▪ Multiple iterations between data collection and analysis to refine finding</li> <li>▪ Appropriate analysis conducted and findings have face validity</li> <li>▪ Evidence of use of techniques such as triangulation</li> </ul>
Hall JM, Stevens PE 1991	Rigor in feminist research	<i>Adv Nurs Sci.</i> 13(3):16-29	<p>Adequacy of the whole process of inquiry relative to the purpose of the study. To achieve adequacy in feminist research includes the doing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research process and outcomes are well-grounded</li> <li>▪ Congruence among behavioral, verbal, and affective elements of observations, verbal responses, and written records</li> <li>▪ Cogent, justifiable, relevant in study design</li> <li>▪ Construction of credible description/explanation</li> <li>▪ Relevance – do the questions address women's concerns, serve their interests, and improve the condition of their lives?</li> <li>▪ Meaningful involvement of researcher with participants to develop rapport</li> <li>▪ Depth/scope of data collection and assessment of participants' realities</li> <li>▪ Information about research and design provided so that they are understandable and relevant to participants</li> <li>▪ Research conclusions are consistent with raw data</li> <li>▪ Research should attempt to reflect complexity of reality</li> <li>▪ Avoiding use of categories uncritically; learning to see beyond and behind what one is socialized to believe</li> <li>▪ Use of collaborative working methods</li> </ul>

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
Hamberg K, Johansson E, et al 1994	Scientific rigour in qualitative research – examples from a study of women’s health in family practice	<i>Fam Pract.</i> 11(2):176-181	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Credibility</li> <li>▪ Transferability</li> <li>▪ Dependability</li> <li>▪ Confirmability</li> </ul>
Hammersley M 1990	<i>Reading Ethnographic Research</i>	New York, NY: Longman Publishing Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ethnographer’s judgment related to his/her claims should seem accurate, given the nature of the phenomenon, the circumstances of the research, the characteristics of the researcher, etc (validity)</li> <li>▪ Evidence should be provided to support the researcher’s claims. The evidence should be plausible and credible (validity)</li> <li>▪ Research should be important. Evaluation of relevance occurs within the context of a community (for which research has implications)</li> </ul>
Hinds PS, Scandrett- Hibden S, McAulay LS 1990	Further assessment of a method to estimate reliability and validity of qualitative research findings	<i>J Adv Nurs.</i> 15:430-435	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reliability</li> <li>▪ Validity</li> </ul>
Inui TS, Frankel RM 1991	Evaluating the quality of qualitative research: a proposal pro tem	<i>J Gen Intern Med.</i> 6(5):485-486	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clear and important research question</li> <li>▪ Evidence of investigator self-reflection (role and perceptions of research from inception)</li> <li>▪ Appropriate sampling strategy, data sources, data gathering, and analysis methods</li> <li>▪ Rich, coherent, salient, strong, and trustworthy inferences and conclusions</li> <li>▪ Evidence of data archiving and appropriate data management</li> <li>▪ External audit review, member checking/review</li> <li>▪ Investigator journal keeping</li> <li>▪ Seek out and analyze deviant or negative cases</li> </ul>
Kirk J, Miller ML 1986	<i>Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research</i>	Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications	The authors discuss the applicability of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reliability</li> <li>▪ Validity</li> </ul> to qualitative research
Koch T 2006	Establishing rigour in qualitative research: the decision trail	<i>J of Adv. Nurs.</i> 19:976-986	Researchers should incorporate an ongoing reflexive accounting process into the research process that involves self-critique and self-appraisal. This should also be incorporated into the research product. By telling readers what is going on while doing the research, readers will be able to understand the world of participants and researcher and judge the plausibility and rigor of the work
Koch R, Harrinton A 1998	Reconceptualizing rigour: the case for reflexivity	<i>J Adv Nurs.</i> 28(4):882-890	
Krefting L 1991	Rigor in qualitative research: assessment of trustworthiness	<i>Am J Occup Ther.</i> 45(3):214-222	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Credibility</li> <li>▪ Fittingness and Transferability</li> <li>▪ Dependability</li> <li>▪ Confirmability</li> </ul>
Kuzel AJ 1994	Desirable features of qualitative research	<i>Fam Prac Res J.</i> 14(4):369-378	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research should embody values of empathy, collaboration, service, and moral sensitivity</li> </ul>
Engel JD, Kuzel AJ 1992	On the side of what constitutes good qualitative research	<i>Qual Health Res.</i> 2(4):504-510	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research report should be clear and coherent</li> <li>▪ Trustworthy. To achieve trustworthiness, research should include some of the following: purposeful sampling, immersion in context; member checking, searching for disconfirming evidence; triangulation; thick description</li> </ul>
Kuzel AJ,	Standards for	<i>Primary Care</i>	

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
Like R 1990	trustworthiness in qualitative studies in primary care	<i>Research: Traditional and Innovative Approaches</i> . Norton PG, et al, eds. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research should entail participatory dialogue</li> <li>▪ Research should report useful outcomes effectively shared with readers</li> </ul>
Leininger M 1987	Importance and use of ethnomethods: ethnography and ethnonursing research	In Cahoon M, ed. <i>Research Methodology</i> . Recent Advances in Nursing, Vol 1. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; pp12-35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Credibility – the “truth,” “value,” or “believability” of the findings should be established by the researcher through prolonged observation, engagement, or participation with information</li> <li>▪ Confirmability – the researcher should obtain directed and often repeated affirmations of what the researcher has heard, seen, or experienced with respect to the phenomenon of study (audit trails, informant checks, feedback sessions are all techniques to foster confirmability)</li> <li>▪ Meaning in context – data should be understood and understandable with reference to the context – these are meanings as known to people in their environments, lived experience, and meaning</li> <li>▪ Recurrent patterning – research aims to describe and understand repeated instances, sequences of events or behaviors that tend to be patterned and occur the same or in similar ways over time</li> <li>▪ Saturation – the researcher should demonstrate that he or she has done an exhaustive exploration of a phenomenon and redundancy is apparent</li> <li>▪ Transferability – findings should have the ability of being translated to other contexts, situations, settings than the one studied reserving the specific meanings that emerged from the study</li> </ul>
1994	Evaluation criteria and critique of qualitative research studies	<i>Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Studies</i> . Morse J, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications	
Lincoln YS, Guba EG 1985	<i>Naturalistic Inquiry</i>	Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transferability – showing the findings have applicability in other contexts (thick description)</li> <li>▪ Dependability – showing findings are consistent and repeatable (inquiry audit)</li> <li>▪ Confirmability – the extent to which findings are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation or interest (confirmability audit, audit trail, triangulation, reflexivity)</li> <li>▪ Credibility – confidence in the truth of findings (prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, referential adequacy, member checks)</li> </ul>
Malterud K 2001	Qualitative research: standards, challenges and guidelines	<i>Lancet</i> . 358(9280):483-488	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reflexivity</li> <li>▪ Thorough well-documented analysis (no superficial conjecture)</li> <li>▪ Transferability (external validity) and thorough consideration of sampling issues</li> <li>▪ Researcher’s standpoint declared</li> <li>▪ Adequate presentation of background and contextual material</li> <li>▪ Detailed description of principles and choices underlying analysis, pattern recognition and coding well defined</li> <li>▪ Accurate and unexaggerated description of material</li> </ul>
Marshall C, Rossman GB 1999	<i>Designing Qualitative Research 3rd ed.</i>	Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Ch. 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Credibility</li> <li>▪ Transferability</li> <li>▪ Dependability</li> <li>▪ Confirmability</li> <li>▪ In addition, they offer a number of criteria for preparing a research proposal</li> </ul>

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
Maxwell JA 1992	Understanding validity in qualitative research	<i>Harv Educ Rev.</i> 62(3):279-300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Descriptive validity – factual accuracy of the account; not making up or distorting things</li> <li>▪ Interpretive validity – while always constructed by the researcher, attempt to understand meaning from the perspective of the participants in the situations studied</li> <li>▪ Theoretical validity – addresses the theoretical constructions researcher brings to or develops during study. The use of theory should be legitimate and this depends on agreement by some community of scholars</li> <li>▪ Generalizability – ability to which one can extend an account to others persons, times, settings. In qualitative research, this often takes place through theory development</li> <li>▪ Evaluative validity – application of evaluative framework (what is taken to be right or wrong) to that which is studied</li> <li>▪ Reliability can't be addressed in qualitative research. Differences in interpretation and meaning may be due to perspective and purpose. Multiple accounts may be valid</li> </ul>
Mays N, Pope C 1995	Qualitative research: rigour and qualitative research	<i>BMJ.</i> 311(6997):109-112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coherent and plausible explanation of the phenomenon</li> <li>▪ Account should be comprehensible to someone in the setting</li> <li>▪ Adequate description of sampling process; rationale for sampling strategy relevant to research question</li> </ul>
2000	<i>Quality in Qualitative Health Research</i>	London: BMJ Books	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report should correspond with and advance current knowledge</li> <li>▪ Attainment of validity (triangulation, negative case analysis, member checking, prolonged engagement)</li> </ul>
2000	Qualitative research in health care: Assessing quality...	<i>BMJ.</i> 320(7226):50-52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reader should be able to distinguish data from interpretation</li> <li>▪ Account should explain people's behavior</li> <li>▪ Reflexivity – researcher reflects on his or her own influence on data collection, analysis, and interpretive process</li> <li>▪ Adequate account of methods and data analysis process, another researcher could analyze (audit trail)</li> </ul>
Miles MB, Huberman AM 1994	<i>Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook</i>	Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objectivity/confirmability – relative neutrality, freedom from unacknowledged researcher bias, explicitness about inevitable bias</li> <li>▪ Reliability/dependability/auditability – the study process should be consistent and reasonably stable over time and across researchers and methods</li> <li>▪ Internal validity/credibility/authenticity – truth value. The study findings should make sense and be credible to the people studied, members of the research community, and others</li> <li>▪ External validity/transferability/fittingness – conclusions of the study should have larger import, be transferable to other contexts, and fit with what is already known</li> <li>▪ Utilization/application/action orientation – study should have pragmatic value and value for participants</li> </ul>
Morse JM, Barrett M, et al 2002	Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research	<i>Int J Qual Methods</i> 1(2):1-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rigor should be ensured during the research process, not assessed by the reader or consumer of the research. They argue that reliability and validity are appropriate concepts for attaining rigor in qualitative research and researchers should implement verification strategies during the conducting of the research process</li> </ul>
Munhall P 1991	<i>Nursing Research: A Qualitative Perspective.</i> 3rd ed.	Boston, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, pp 603-604	<p>Each qualitative methodological tradition has unique principles by which it may be judged as sound research. The following are some general principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research should demonstrate epistemological integrity – defensible line of reasoning, assumptions made about nature of knowledge,</li> </ul>

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
			<p>description of decisions about research process. Research question should be consistent with epistemological standpoint, data collection, and interpretation of data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Credibility in that theoretical claims are consistent with the manner in which phenomenon was studied</li> <li>▪ Reports of qualitative research should reveal an analytic logic that makes the researcher's reasoning clear from the proposal stage to the interpretive stage of the research</li> <li>▪ Assurance that the researcher's claims are trustworthy and that they fairly illustrate or reveal some "truth" outside the researchers own biases, assumptions, experiences, and belief system</li> </ul>
Patton MQ 1990	<i>Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods</i>	Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data should be carefully analyzed with attention to issues of reliability, validity, and triangulation</li> <li>▪ Researchers should be credible (training, experience, track record)</li> </ul>
1999	Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis	<i>Health Serv Res.</i> 34(5):1189-1208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis should be creative and methodical</li> <li>▪ Sufficient detail reported (audit trail) to allow others to judge quality</li> <li>▪ Credibility – research should employ rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high-quality data</li> <li>▪ Rigorous, iterative sampling</li> <li>▪ Examination of rival explanations</li> <li>▪ Analysis of negative or deviant cases</li> <li>▪ Triangulation</li> <li>▪ Care with regard to transferability</li> </ul>
Popay J, Rogers A, Williams G 1998	Rationale and standards for the systematic review of qualitative literature in health services research	<i>Qual Health Res.</i> 13(9):341-351	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research illuminates subjective meaning, contexts, and actions of those investigated</li> <li>▪ Evidence of responsiveness to social context and flexible design</li> <li>▪ Adequate sample for generating understanding and sampling process should be well described</li> <li>▪ Transparent data collection and analysis process</li> <li>▪ Detailed description allows reader to interpret meaning of context and what is being described</li> <li>▪ Commitment – prolonged engagement with the topic and development of competence and skill in the methods used, immersion in the relevant data</li> <li>▪ Rigor – refers to the resulting completeness of the data collection and analysis. Adequacy of the sample in terms of its ability to supply all information needed for comprehensive analysis or reaching saturation; completeness of interpretation, which should address all the variation and complexity observed. Might involve triangulation – collecting data from multiple sources or by different methods</li> <li>▪ Transparency and coherence relate to clarity and cogency or the rhetorical power or persuasiveness of the report; fit between research question and the philosophical perspective adopted and the method and analysis undertaken; degree to which all relevant aspects of the research process are disclosed; open reflection on factors that shaped research process</li> <li>▪ Impact, importance, and utility</li> </ul>
Sandelowski M 1986	The problem of rigor in qualitative research	<i>Adv Nurs Sci.</i> 8(3):27-37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research should be credible</li> <li>▪ Research should be applicable across settings and situation</li> </ul>
1993	Rigor or rigor mortis: the problem of rigor in qualitative research	<i>Adv Nurs Sci.</i> 16(2):1-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The findings should be confirmable and the researcher's position one of neutrality when portraying the reality of those studied</li> </ul>

## Online Supplementary Data

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/6/4/331/DC1>

Author(s) Year	Title	Publication Information	Criteria for Qualitative Research
Seale C, Silverman D 1997	Ensuring rigour in qualitative research	<i>Eur J Public Health.</i> 7:379-384	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Understand context of study by examining relevant historical, cultural and political artifacts</li> <li>▪ Mix methods and support qualitative generalizations with counts of events</li> </ul>
Seale C 1999	<i>The Quality of Qualitative Research</i>	Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Test emerging hypotheses and include deviant case analysis</li> <li>▪ Record data objectively and comprehensively</li> </ul>
Silverman D 1994	<i>Interpreting Qualitative Data</i>	London: Sage Publications, Ch. 8	
Shortell SM 1999	Editorial: The emergence of qualitative methods in health services research	<i>Health Serv Res.</i> 34(5 Pt 2):1083- 1090	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Importance and interest of the topic or question under investigation</li> <li>▪ Appropriateness and description of the specific qualitative strategy used given the topic</li> <li>▪ Clear description of the purpose or rationale for sampling strategy</li> <li>▪ Analytic rigor, including verification with secondary informants and data, using multiple raters familiar with the topic were possible</li> </ul>
Yardley L 2000	Dilemmas in qualitative health research	<i>Psych Health.</i> 15:215-228	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pragmatic and theoretically useful</li> <li>▪ Evidence of reflection of how researcher's perspective, motivation, interest shaped research</li> <li>▪ Thorough analysis and interpretation of data, social context, including an analysis of the relationships between researcher and observed (researcher's membership role, prolonged engagement, immersion in the data)</li> <li>▪ Completeness of data collection, analysis, and interpretation (adequate sampling, transparency in account of methods, analysis, coding and interpretive choices, data excerpts presented so patterns are discernible)</li> </ul>