

Service User Experience: Methodologies, Tools, Requirements and Feedback Mechanisms

Detailed Quality Assessments as part of a Rapid Integrative Review

September 2023

Table of Contents

Summary	4
Quality Assessments of Guidelines.....	5
Practice and service-level guidelines.....	5
Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for Care Inspectorate (2012).....	6
Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for Commissioner for Children and Young People Western Australia (2009)	9
Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for The National Children's Office et al. (2005)	12
Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2021).....	15
Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for Wells and Sametz (1985)	18
System-level guidelines.....	21
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Council of Europe (2011).....	22
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Council of Europe (2012, 2016)	31
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for McAuley and Brattman (2002).....	40
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for the National Complaints Managers' Group (England) (2016).....	49
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (2020, 2022)	57
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Save the Children (2018)	67
Quality Assessments of Standards	85
System-level standards.....	85
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for the Department of Health and Children (2003)	86
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2012)	96
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2014)	105
Detailed AGREE-HS assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2018)	115
Quality Assessments of Evidence Syntheses	123
Integrative reviews	130
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2020).....	130
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2021).....	140
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Shamrova and Cummings (2017)	159
Scoping reviews	168
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Bovarnick et al. (2018).....	168
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Bradbury-Jones et al. (2018)	178
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Brodie et al. (2016)	188
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment for Gathen et al. (2022)	197
Mixed-method systematic reviews	206

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment for Kennan et al. (2016)	206
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of ten Brummelaar et al. (2018)	215
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Zuchowski et al. (2019)	224
Overview of reviews	235
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2017)	235
Qualitative systematic reviews	244
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Baran and Sawrikar (2022)	244
Quantitative systematic reviews	253
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Ayala-Nunes (2014)	253
Other	263
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Waddington et al. (2019)	263
Detailed RAMESES quality assessment of Waddington (2019)	273
Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Kelly et al. (2023)	277
References	291

Summary

This document is a companion to *Service User Experience: Methodologies, Tools, Requirements and Feedback Mechanisms: A Rapid Integrative Review*. It contains the full, detailed quality assessments of the guidelines, standards and evidence syntheses that were eligible for inclusion after full-text screening.

The quality assessment tools used to assess the literature were:

- AGREE-GRS for practice and service-level guidelines.
- AGREE-HS for system-level guidelines and standards.
- Adapted AMSTAR-2 for systematic reviews, scoping reviews, rapid reviews, overviews of reviews and integrative reviews.
- RAMESES for realist reviews.

The rationale for using these tools, as well as their content and how they were applied, are described in the main report and protocol for this review.

In total, 5 guidelines were assessed using AGREE-GRS; 9 guidelines and 4 standards with AGREE-HS; and 16 evidence syntheses with the adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment tool¹. The results were as follows:

Table 1: Summary of results of the quality assessment appraisals

Quality	Guidelines*	Standards	Evidence Syntheses
High	1	0	0
Moderate	1	0	0
Low	6	4	1
Critically Low	4	0	13

*Companion documents (Council of Europe, 2012, 2016; Partnership for Maternal Newborn and Child Health, 2020, 2022) were quality assessed together, meaning the total guidelines add up to 12 instead of 14.

This document is structured to show the quality assessments of practice and service-level guidelines first, followed by quality assessments of system-level guidelines, followed by quality assessments of standards, followed by quality assessments of evidence syntheses. The quality assessments of evidence syntheses are grouped together based on evidence synthesis type, starting with integrative reviews, scoping reviews, mixed-method reviews, overviews of reviews, qualitative systematic reviews and finally quantitative systematic reviews.

¹ During the assessment of one of the evidence syntheses (Waddington et al., 2019), it was noticed that it did not fully meet the eligibility criteria for the review and should have been excluded at the full-text screening stage. Similarly, for Kelly et al. (2023), a quality assessment was fully completed, but the review was later excluded during the assessment of primary study overlap when it was again noticed it should have been excluded at the full-text screening stage. As such, the results for both evidence syntheses are not discussed in this summary but their quality assessments are still available at the end of this document.

Quality Assessments of Guidelines

Practice and service-level guidelines

5 practice-level guidelines were assessed with the AGREE-GRS quality assessment tool. An overview of the results are shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: AGREE-GRS quality assessment results of practice-level guidelines

Citation	Quality Assessment Domains				Overall Quality Rating
	Development Process	Presentation Style	Reporting Completeness	Recommendations	
Care Inspectorate (2012)	4	4	4	4	4.0
CCYPWA (2009)*	1	4	2	3	2.5
NICE (2021)**	7	6	4	6	5.8
The National Children's Office et al. (2005)	3	4	2	3	3.0
Wells and Sametz (1985)	3	5	3	5	4.0
Keys:	Critically Low 1.0 - 2.5	Low 2.6 - 4.0	Moderate 4.1 - 5.5	High 5.6 - 7.0	

*Commissioner for Children and Young People Western Australia (2009).

**National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2021).

The detailed assessments are presented below.

Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for Care Inspectorate (2012)

Citation: (Care Inspectorate, 2012)

Title: Practice guide: Involving children and young people in improving services

Items

1. Process of Development

Rate the overall quality of the guideline development methods.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| A. Were the appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of the guideline? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Was the evidentiary base developed systematically? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Were recommendations consistent with the literature? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Youth Ambassadors with experience of using social work services were recruited and trained to help develop the guidelines. A support worker and service inspector were also on the team. A range of stakeholders were consulted by the team, including frontline staff, managers and children accessing children's services.
- B. Requests for submissions of good practice and consultations with appropriate stakeholders indicate that there were at least some systematic processes in place. However, a systematic evidence synthesis of some kind may have helped with assessing and understanding the relevant literature.
- C. The literature does not appear to have been consulted to any great extent as the guidelines are based almost exclusively on practice wisdom, so it is difficult to assess this criteria with confidence.

Rating:

4

2. Presentation Style

Rate the overall quality of the guideline presentation.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| A. Was the guideline well-organised? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Were the recommendations easy to find? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The headings and content is logical structured, describing specific examples of good practice before drawing key learnings and recommendations from them.
- B. Specific recommendations can be challenging to find as they are not labelled as 'recommendations' and are often mixed in amongst narrative discussion.

Rating:

4

3. Completeness of Reporting

Rate the completeness of reporting.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| A. Was the guideline development process transparent and reproducible? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. How complete was the information to inform decision-making? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The approach to guideline development is described at a high-level. It is reasonably transparent though more detail would be needed to reproduce it fully.
- B. The information was reasonably comprehensive in terms of the process of the planning and delivery of youth participation, however, the recommendations are relatively high-level at times and would benefit from additional detail about how to implement them, their relative strengths and weaknesses, their appropriate context, etc.

Rating:

4

4. Clinical Validity

Rate the overall quality of the guideline recommendations.

Consider:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Are the recommendations clinically sound? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Are the recommendations appropriate for the intended patients? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The recommendations are based on practice wisdom and experiential evidence from appropriate stakeholders. However, a systematic consideration of the literature would help to strengthen confidence in the recommendations.
- B. As above.

Rating:

4

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 4
- Item 2 rating: 4
- Item 3 rating: 4
- Item 4 rating: 4

Rating:

4

= Low quality

Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for Commissioner for Children and Young People Western Australia (2009)

Citation: (Commissioner for Children and Young People Western Australia, 2009)

Title: Involving children and young people: Participation guidelines

Items

1. Process of Development

Rate the overall quality of the guideline development methods.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| A. Were the appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of the guideline? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Was the evidentiary base developed systematically? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Were recommendations consistent with the literature? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find reference to the stakeholders involved in developing the guidelines.
- B. The methodology is not described in detail, too little information to assess this criteria.
- C. The literature does not appear to have been systematically selected and analysed, so it is difficult to assess this criteria with confidence. There are links throughout the guidelines to external resources and literature but most (if not all) of these hyperlinks no longer appear to work.

Rating:

1

2. Presentation Style

Rate the overall quality of the guideline presentation.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| A. Was the guideline well-organised? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Were the recommendations easy to find? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The headings and content is logical and well-structured, based around the 'participation cycle'.
- B. Specific recommendations can be challenging to find. They are not labelled as 'recommendations' and are often mixed in amongst narrative discussion. Though the guideline is well-organised overall, the reader still has to do considerable work to find specific sub-topics of interest and the related recommendations.

Rating:

4

3. Completeness of Reporting

Rate the completeness of reporting.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| A. Was the guideline development process transparent and reproducible? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. How complete was the information to inform decision-making? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The guideline development process is not described.
- B. The information was reasonably comprehensive in terms of the process of the planning and delivery of youth participation, however, additional detail on the Implementability of specific recommendations, their effectiveness, their relative strengths and weaknesses, their appropriate context, etc., may have been helpful.

Rating:

2

4. Clinical Validity

Rate the overall quality of the guideline recommendations.

Consider:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Are the recommendations clinically sound? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Are the recommendations appropriate for the intended patients? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. This item is challenging to assess given the limited evidence base used to support the recommendations.
- B. Again, this item is relatively challenging to assess due to the poor description of the development process and evidence base for the recommendations. However, in general the assessor had little reason to doubt their appropriateness as most recommendations did appear to be appropriately geared towards children and young people.

Rating:

3

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 1
- Item 2 rating: 4
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 3

Rating:

2.5

= Critically low quality

Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for The National Children's Office et al. (2005)

Citation: (The National Children's Office et al., 2005)

Title: Young voices: Guidelines on how to involve children and young people in your work

Items

1. Process of Development

Rate the overall quality of the guideline development methods.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| A. Were the appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of the guideline? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Was the evidentiary base developed systematically? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Were recommendations consistent with the literature? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. A reference group with a broad range of stakeholders, including young people, was established to support the development of the guidelines.
- B. The methodology is not described in detail, too little information to assess this criteria.
- C. The literature does not appear to have been systematically selected and analysed, so it is difficult to assess this criteria with confidence. However, where literature is discussed, the recommendations do not appear to contradict this.

Rating:

3

2. Presentation Style

Rate the overall quality of the guideline presentation.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---|---|
| A. Was the guideline well-organised? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Were the recommendations easy to find? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The headings and content is logical and well-structured.
- B. Specific recommendations can be challenging to find. They are not labelled as 'recommendations' and are often mixed in amongst narrative discussion. Though the guideline is well-organised overall, the reader still has to do considerable work to find specific sub-topics of interest and the related recommendations.

Rating:

4

3. Completeness of Reporting

Rate the completeness of reporting.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| C. Was the guideline development process transparent and reproducible? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. How complete was the information to inform decision-making? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- C. The guideline development process is only briefly mentioned in the acknowledgement section, with far too little detail to be considered transparent or reproducible.
- D. The information was reasonably comprehensive in terms of the process of the planning and delivery of youth involvement, however, additional detail on the implementability of specific recommendations, their effectiveness, their relative strengths and weaknesses, their appropriate context, etc., may have been helpful.

Rating:

2

4. Clinical Validity

Rate the overall quality of the guideline recommendations.

Consider:

- | | |
|---|---|
| C. Are the recommendations clinically sound? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Are the recommendations appropriate for the intended patients? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- C. This item is challenging to assess given the limited evidence base used to support the recommendations, however, the recommendations do appear to be supported by the examples of good practice presented.
- D. Again, this item is challenging to assess. There is some discussion of alternative methods for 'hard to reach' children and young people, however, this discussion is not done systematically for all recommendations.

Rating:

3

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 4
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 3

Rating:

3

= Low quality

Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2021)

Citation: (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2021)

Title: Looked-after children and young people: NICE guideline

Items

1. Process of Development

Rate the overall quality of the guideline development methods.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| A. Were the appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of the guideline? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Was the evidentiary base developed systematically? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Were recommendations consistent with the literature? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The advisory committee (see <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng205/documents/committee-member-list>) includes a broad range of appropriate stakeholders, including looked-after and young people, from across a range of relevant disciplines and sectors. Consultations with a wide range of stakeholders were also held and are publicly available (see <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng205/documents/consultation-comments-and-responses>).
- B. Yes, systematic evidence reviews were conducted following a pre-specified protocol (see <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng205/documents/evidence-review-13>), in addition to consultations with stakeholders and equality impact assessments, all of informed the decisions of the committee making the recommendations.
- C. The rationale and evidence underpinning the recommendations are clearly articulated and align.

Rating:

7

2. Presentation Style

Rate the overall quality of the guideline presentation.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| A. Was the guideline well-organised? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Were the recommendations easy to find? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Overall, the guideline is well-structured and logically organised.
- B. The section containing the recommendation of relevance to this review is not immediately obvious in the table of contents, and requires some work on the part of the reader to locate. However, once the relevant recommendations are found, there are clear hyperlinks to the rationale and evidence review underpinning the recommendation.

Rating:

6

3. Completeness of Reporting

Rate the completeness of reporting.

Consider:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| A. Was the guideline development process transparent and reproducible? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. How complete was the information to inform decision-making? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The guideline development process is extremely transparent and reproducible. There are hyperlinks to the section of the NICE website that makes publicly available all aspects of the development process in sufficient detail to be replicated.
- B. While the evidence and rationale for the recommendations are clearly articulated, the actual recommendations of relevance to this review are very high-level with almost no supporting information that would help to operationalise them in practice, which is a considerable limitation.

Rating:

4

4. Clinical Validity

Rate the overall quality of the guideline recommendations.

Consider:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Are the recommendations clinically sound? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Are the recommendations appropriate for the intended patients? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The evidence review supporting the recommendation found extremely limited and poor quality literature to support the recommendation. However, the extensive consultations and wide range of relevant stakeholders (including people with care-experience) on the board making the recommendations, lends confidence to the assessor that the recommendations are as sound and appropriate to the intended population as can be given the limited evidence-base in the literature.
- B. As above.

Rating:

6

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 7
- Item 2 rating: 6
- Item 3 rating: 4
- Item 4 rating: 6

Rating:

5.8

= High quality

Detailed AGREE-GRS assessment for Wells and Sametz (1985)

Citation: (Wells & Sametz, 1985)
Title: Involvement of institutionalized children in social science research: some issues and proposed guidelines
Items
1. Process of Development
Rate the overall quality of the guideline development methods.
Consider:
A. Were the appropriate stakeholders involved in the development of the guideline? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. Was the evidentiary base developed systematically? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Were recommendations consistent with the literature? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:
A. The guidelines were developed by researchers for researchers, however, there appears to be no input from the subjects of the guidelines, namely "institutionalized children".
B. There is a consideration of the literature and evidence base from "federal regulations, research ethics, and developmental psychology", and sources are cited in line with academic standards. However, the methods of development are not actually described.
C. The recommendations are consistent with the literature cited in the article, however, because the evidence base is not deemed to be developed systematically it is difficult to say whether the recommendations were consistent with the relevant literature as a whole at that time.
Rating:
3

2. Presentation Style

Rate the overall quality of the guideline presentation.

Consider:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Was the guideline well-organised? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Were the recommendations easy to find? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Overall, the guidelines are reasonably well-organised within the constraints of the norms required for academic journal articles. Ideally, a short table of contents could be helpful for readers, however, as the article is short this is not considered to be a major issue.
- B. Yes, specific recommendations are listed as in sections labelled under 'guidelines' which distinguishes them from other sections of the article. However, the recommendations are phrased as questions for researchers to consider, and a more directive style of phrasing might make it easier to interpret the guidelines as recommendations.

Rating:

5

3. Completeness of Reporting

Rate the completeness of reporting.

Consider:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. Was the guideline development process transparent and reproducible? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. How complete was the information to inform decision-making? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The methodology is not described.
- B. For the specific ethical topics that are covered, the guidelines are likely to be pose relevant (yet basic) questions that can usefully inform decision-making on those topics, particularly if considered with the literature described in the article and underpinning the guidelines. However, the current context is different in many ways compared to when these guidelines were originally produced (1985), with the advent of things like GDPR, the UNCRC and digital technologies, for example, which add additional ethical considerations for researchers today.

Rating:

3

4. Clinical Validity

Rate the overall quality of the guideline recommendations.

Consider:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Are the recommendations clinically sound? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Are the recommendations appropriate for the intended patients? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The recommendations are largely sound in that they are likely to protect children and not inflict harm.
- B. The recommendations are largely appropriate for the reasons above, however, though a stronger incorporation of children's voice into the development of the guidelines may have helped to improve/validate their appropriateness further.

Rating:

5

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 5
- Item 3 rating: 3
- Item 4 rating: 5

Rating:

4

= Low quality

System-level guidelines

7 system-level guidelines were assessed with the AGREE-HS quality assessment tool. An overview of the results are shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3: AGREE-HS quality assessment results of system-level guidelines

Citation	Quality Assessment Domains					Overall Quality Rating
	Topic Description	Participants	Methods	Recommendations	Implementability	
Guidelines						
Council of Europe (2011)	3	1	2	4	2	2.4
Council of Europe (2012, 2016)	3	2	2	4	2	2.6
McAuley and Brattman (2002)	6	3	5	5	5	4.8
NCMG (2016)*	3	2	2	4	1	2.4
PMNCH (2020, 2022)**	5	4	3	5	3	4.0
Save the Children (2018)	3	3	2	3	2	2.6
Steinitz (2009)	2	1	1	3	2	1.8
Keys:	Critically Low 1.0 - 2.5		Low 2.6 - 4.0	Moderate 4.1 - 5.5	High 5.6 - 7.0	

*National Complaints Managers' Group (England) (2016).

**Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (2020, 2022).

The detailed assessments are presented below.

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Council of Europe (2011)

Citation: (Council of Europe, 2011)	
Title: Council of Europe Recommendation on children's rights and social services friendly to children and families	
Items	
1. Topic	
This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.	
Criteria:	
A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
A. The challenge is implied in certain paragraphs but not described explicitly	
B. The assessor could not find discussion of the causes of the challenge	
C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of child participation, though extensive discussion of participation as a child's right could be interpreted as implying high priority.	

- D. Yes, the guidelines describe in detail the relevant populations, services and system-levels to which the guidelines (as a whole) are relevant and appropriate to.

Rating:

3

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find any description of a guidance development team, except for text stating the recommendations were adopted by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers.
- B. As above.
- C. As above.

D. As above.

E. The assessor could not find any description of precautions taken to avoid or minimise influence of a funding agency.

Rating:

1

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

H. The **rationale** behind the recommendations is clear.

Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

I. **Systematic** and **transparent** methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods).

Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find a description of whether, or which, methods were used to identify and review the evidence systematically and transparently.
- B. The documents acknowledges a variety of contextually-relevant evidence sources that appear to have informed its development, such as pre-existing legal conventions, other Council of Europe recommendations and strategies, and reports prepared for the European Committee for Social Cohesion, each of which relate to the rights and well-being of children, either generally or relation to social services specifically.
- C. These guidelines were published in 2011, though this review indicates that relevant systematic evidence syntheses may not have started to be published until around 2014 (though the review team except they may have missed earlier publications). However, many legal conventions informing the guidelines are still in place.
- D. The assessor could not find descriptions of the evidence of effectiveness of potential options.
- E. As above, with regard to cost and cost-effectiveness.
- F. As above, with regard to a weighting of benefits and harms.
- G. There is a link between the guidelines/recommendations as a whole and the evidence sources which informed there development, however, there is no description of how specific sources of evidence informed specific recommendations.
- H. There is rationale for the guidelines/recommendations as a whole, as well as “fundamental principles” which underpin the specific recommendations.
- I. Reference to the Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers adopting the recommendations at the 1126th meeting of Ministers’ Deputies on 16th November 2011, but additional detail is missing.

Rating:

2

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Anticipated outputs are clearly described but these are not considered the same as outcomes. Anticipated outcomes do not appear to be specifically articulated in any one particular section but potential outcomes can be implied by close reading of the document. Indicators, targets and standards for measurement are not discussed.
- B. Insofar as specific recommendations relate to the specific phenomena of interest to this review, they appear to be described in relatively general terms and may lack sufficient detail to guide implementation. There is description of the sectors that the guidelines are relevant to.
- C. The assessor could not find a description of the ethical principles *per se* used to develop the recommendations. Fundamental principles are described, some of which could be considered as ethical principles (e.g. provisions in the best interest of the child).
- D. The recommendations are explicitly stated to apply “to all children without discrimination” (pg. 5).
- E. The recommendations are intended to strongly align with, and support, children’s rights standards which in turn are intended to have universal applicability. However, in practice, children’s rights and the sociocultural/political interests of certain groups/populations may not always align, and there appears to be little consideration of this.
- F. Yes, the guidelines are well-organised and formatted, and the recommendations can be easily identified.
- G. See comment B.
- H. The assessor could not find a description of a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**4**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | |
|--|---|
| H. Strategies for disseminating the systems guidance are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Strategies for assessing the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find a discussion of the barriers and enablers to implementation.
- B. As above, with regards to costs and resources.
- C. As above, with regards to acceptability of the recommendations.
- D. As above, with regards to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, with regards, to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. The items of relevance to this review are described in general-enough terms that there is room for flexibility in how they are applied in specific settings, but the assessor could not find a discussion of how to adapt/tailor the recommendations to specific settings.
- G. The guidelines were developed for social services, with some discussion at a general level about the different system-levels the guidelines are relevant to, but no discussion of transferability on the items of relevance to this review.
- H. Vague, high-level references to dissemination strategies (see pg. 5).
- I. Section J (pg. 15) of the guidelines describes 'monitoring and evaluation' strategies "to ensure the implementation of this recommendation".

Rating:

2

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 1
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 4
- Item 5 rating: 2

Overall Rating:**2.4.****= Critically Low Quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Council of Europe (2012, 2016)

Citation: (Council of Europe, 2012, 2016)	
Title: Council of Europe Recommendation on the participation of children and young people under the age of 18 (2012); and Child Participation Assessment Tool (2016)	
Items	
1. Topic	
This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.	
Criteria:	
A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
A. The challenge is implied in certain paragraphs but not described explicitly.	
B. The assessor could not find discussion of the causes of the challenge.	
C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of child participation, though extensive discussion of participation as a child's right could be interpreted as implying high priority.	

- D. In the guidelines, target populations appear to be “children” and Council of Europe “member states”. The guidelines appear to be written in general enough terms to be universally applicable regardless of the context, however, the Assessment Tool supporting the guidelines provides some on the specific contexts, systems or sub-systems certain parts of the guidelines are applicable to.

Rating:

3

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find any description of a guidance development team, however, certain passages of text imply that the Council of Europe's Children's Rights Division and Youth Department formed part of the team and the children were at least consulted as part of the development of the recommendations (see Council of Europe, 2016, pg. 4).
- B. Cannot assess due to lack of information.
- C. As above.
- D. As above.
- E. As above.

Rating:

2

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | |
|---|---|
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
-

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find a description of whether, or which, methods were used to identify and review the evidence systematically and transparently.
 - B. The documents acknowledges a variety of contextually-relevant evidence sources that appear to have informed its development, such as pre-existing legal conventions, other Council of Europe recommendations and strategies, each of which relate to the rights and well-being of children.
 - C. The guidelines were published in 2011, though this review indicates that relevant systematic evidence syntheses may not have started to be published until around 2014 (though the review team except they may have missed earlier publications). However, many legal conventions informing the guidelines are still in place. The assessment tool supporting the guidelines is also the most recent to the best of the assessors knowledge.
 - D. The assessor could not find descriptions of the evidence of effectiveness of potential options.
 - E. As above, with regard to cost and cost-effectiveness.
 - F. As above, with regard to a weighting of benefits and harms.
 - G. There is a link between the guidelines/recommendations as a whole and the evidence sources which informed there development, however, there is no description of how specific sources of evidence informed specific recommendations
 - H. There is rationale for the guidelines/recommendations as a whole.
-

- I. Reference to the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers adopting the recommendations at the 1126th meeting of Ministers' Deputies on 16th November 2011, but additional detail is missing.

Rating:

2

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- G. The recommendations are **actionable** and are sufficiently detailed to be **operationalised**. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- H. A **plan for updating** the recommendations is described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. Anticipated outputs are clearly described but these are not considered the same as outcomes. Anticipated outcomes do not appear to be specifically articulated in any one particular section but potential outcomes can be implied by close reading of the document. Indicators are included as part of the Assessment Tool.
- B. Insofar as specific recommendations relate to the specific phenomena of interest to this review, they appear to be described in relatively general terms and may lack sufficient detail to guide implementation. The Assessment Tool provides some additional details, including reference to specific sectors recommendations may be relevant to, but not enough detail for the assessor to consider the recommendations comprehensive.
- C. The assessor could not find a description of the ethical principles per se used to develop the recommendations, though principles are described, some of which could be considered as ethical principles.
- D. The recommendations are explicitly stated to apply to all children “without discrimination on any grounds” (pg. 6).
- E. The recommendations are intended to strongly align with, and support, children’s rights standards which in turn are intended to have universal applicability. However, in practice, children’s rights and the sociocultural/political interests of certain groups/populations may not always align, and there appears to be little consideration of this.
- F. The guidelines are reasonably well-organised but may require some effort on the part of the reader to find recommendations of relevance.
- G. See comment B.
- H. The assessor could not find a description of a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:

4

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. The Assessment Tool provides some discussion of barriers and enablers by describing nine basic requirements for effective and ethical participation.
- B. In certain passages, brief reference is made to resources but not in sufficient detail to guide implementation.
- C. The assessor could not find a discussion of the acceptability of the recommendations to stakeholders.
- D. As above, with regards to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, with regards, to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. The items of relevance to this review are described in general-enough terms that there is room for flexibility in how they are applied in specific settings, but the assessor could not find a discussion of how to adapt/tailor the recommendations to specific settings.
- G. As with items C-E, with regards to the transferability of the recommendations.
- H. Vague, high-level references to dissemination strategies (see pg. 5).
- I. The Assessment Tool is specifically intended to facilitate this process.

Rating:

2

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 2
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 4
- Item 5 rating: 2

Rating:**2.6.****= Low quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for McAuley and Brattman (2002)

Citation: (McAuley & Brattman, 2002)	
Title: Hearing Young Voices: Consulting Children and Young People, including those experiencing Poverty or other forms of Social Exclusion, in relation to Public Policy Development in Ireland: Key Issues for Consideration	
Items	
1. Topic	
This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.	
Criteria:	
A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
A. Yes, chapter 1 describes the system challenge at length.	
B. The causes are explored in Chapter 4.	
C. Although not described using the language of 'priority', the system challenges is contextually situated and its growing prominence over time in the policy and practice landscape is detailed extensively in Chapter 1.	

- D. The guidance has some appropriateness to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest, though the guidelines were not originally developed for these PICO aspects specifically, so some caution may be needed in assessing the relevance and appropriateness of the guidance.

Rating:

6

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Advisory group established with stakeholders from a range of NGO and statutory bodies.
- B. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- C. Cannot tell the sector of all research and advisory group members, though a quick google search suggests the advisory group at least contains representatives from several sectors, including children's rights, youth services, and housing.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency, with the exception of transparency about who the funding agencies involved.

Rating:

3

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | |
|---|---|
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The methodology for identifying evidence is systematic (combines and triangulates a narrative literature review with primary research of key stakeholders) and transparent (described in detail chapter 2).
 - B. The methodology for gathering evidence includes multiple diverse sources and does not over-rely on any one particular source. The primary research also is conducted with contextually relevant stakeholders.
 - C. The research was conducted over 20 years.
 - D. The researchers present some of examples of 'good practice', however, overall the research supporting the recommendations is exploratory and non-experimental, making it difficult to comment with confidence on the effectiveness of potential options.
 - E. Cost and funding considerations are discussed at length in Chapter 5, however, there is no cost-comparison of different potential options.
 - F. There are examples of a consideration of the benefits and harms when discussing aspects of the research findings, however, the potential harms or risks of specific recommendations are not always addressed.
 - G. The evidence is discussed at length before presenting recommendations and the recommendations can be clearly linked back to the research with close reading.
 - H. As above, but with regards to the rationale for recommendations.
-

- I. There is clearly a systematic effort to gather and consider evidence, and to base recommendations on the evidence. Explicit decision-making methods for arriving at recommendations are not described, however.

Rating:

5

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- G. The recommendations are **actionable** and are sufficiently detailed to be **operationalised**. Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- H. A **plan for updating** the recommendations is described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. An overarching anticipated outcome is clearly described for the recommendations (i.e. “meaningful, equitable and sustainable opportunities for children and young people, including those experiencing poverty and other forms of social exclusion, to be heard in relation to public policy developments affecting them at national and local level” (pg. 165)), but indicators or standards to measure them do not appear to be described.
- B. The recommendations cover a wide-range of topics related to the phenomena of interest and consultations with children more broadly, with reference to specific system levels and sectors when necessary, though the recommendations are described as having “quasi universal” interest.
- C. Recommendations related to ethics are made, though how ethical considerations explicitly influenced the formulation and development of recommendations is not described.
- D. The recommendations explicitly promote opportunities for “those experiencing poverty and other forms of social exclusion” (pg. 165).
- E. This is done as part of a consideration of the evidence throughout the report.
- F. The recommendations are easily identifiable but are not always succinct.
- G. The recommendations are comprehensive, with sufficient detail to action them, particularly if considered within a broader consideration of the research underpinning the recommendations.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations, though future research is recommended.

Rating:

5

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. Barriers and enablers are discussed at length when reviewing the research, however, a specific plan for barriers and enablers to implementation of the recommendations is not included.
- B. Chapter 5 discussed cost and resource issues at length, with recommended actions proposed.
- C. This is discussed at length when reviewing the evidence in each chapter and is used to inform the development of recommendations.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to affordability of the recommendations, beyond what is discussed in terms of resourcing.
- E. Sustainable is a significant focus of the research supporting the recommendations, and the recommendations themselves are intended to support the creation of sustainable opportunities for consulting children and young people.
- F. There are some brief references to adaptation but generally there appears to be little attention paid adapting/tailoring the recommendations for specific contexts as it they are described as 'quasi universal'.
- G. Similar to above, the recommendations are described as 'quasi universal' so it is assumed they are transferable across many different contexts.
- H. Dissemination of guidance and good practice is referenced throughout the report, but few if any specific strategies for dissemination are described.
- I. Several recommendations relate to feedback and evaluation of consultative processes, but not necessarily for monitoring implementation of the recommendations themselves.

Rating:

5

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 6
- Item 2 rating: 3
- Item 3 rating: 5
- Item 4 rating: 5
- Item 5 rating: 5

Rating:**4.8****= Moderate quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for the National Complaints Managers' Group (England) (2016)

Citation: (National Complaints Managers' Group (England), 2016)

Title: Good practice guidance for handling complaints concerning adults and children social care services (England)

Items

1. Topic

This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Page 3 describes the nature of the system challenge but not its frequency or intensity.
- B. The assessor could not find discussion of the causes of the system challenge.
- C. The assessor could not find discussion of the level of priority of the system challenge.
- D. The guidance does have specific relevance to the phenomena of interest and the contexts of interest for this review.

Rating:

3

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The document was developed by complaints managers in local authorities. There is no indication of an involvement of service users in the development of the guidance.
- B. The contributors all appear to be complaints managers. It is not possible to say, from the information available, the backgrounds or disciplines of the contributors beyond their role as complaints managers.
- C. The contributors all appear to be complaints managers of local authorities.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency, with the exception of transparency about the funding agency.

Rating:**2****3. Methods**

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- I. **Systematic** and **transparent** methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. The methods are not described.
- B. The guidance is “informed by” (pg. 4) a small number of statutory and regulatory documents which are likely to be contextually relevant, but it is not clear if these can be considered ‘the best available evidence’.
- C. The literature referenced were published between 1989 and 2015. The guidance document itself was published in 2016 and is an update of a 2009 guidance document. It is possible that further update may be required based on more current literature and evidence.
- D. For items D-G, the assessor could not find information relating to these items discussed in the guidance.
- E. As above.
- F. As above.
- G. As above.
- H. The guidance document describes a clear rationale for each set of recommendations.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:

2

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The outcomes of good practice in handling complaints can be inferred from the principles and underpinning user-led visions. However, indicators or standards to measure them are not described.
- B. The recommendations are relatively comprehensive covering what are described as key principles, however, the guidance also states the recommendations should be “used as the minimum requirement for the handling of social care complaints” (pg. 3), indicating more recommendations could improve comprehensiveness.
- C. The guidance is based around 5 principles, but its questionable whether these could be considered ‘ethical principles’ per se.
- D. Equity is not discussed explicitly, however, the recommendations are intended to be applicable to all service users, with one recommendation specifically advising that equality and diversity should be “recognised, promoted and facilitated throughout the complaints process” (pg. 6).
- E. The document does reference relevant legislation, regulations and statutory guidance, but only very briefly.
- F. Recommendations and specific guidance is clearly labelled and easy to find.
- G. Some recommendations could be actioned relatively easily, but others would likely require further guidance or support to operationalise.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**4**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described.

Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described.

Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

A. The assessor could not find information relating to the items above for implementability in the guidance document.

Rating:

1.

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 2
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 4
- Item 5 rating: 1

Rating:

12

= Low quality

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (2020, 2022)

Citation: (Partnership for Maternal Newborn and Child Health, 2020, 2022)

Title: Global consensus statement: Meaningful adolescent & youth engagement (2020); and Practical guidance resource to operationalize the global consensus statement on meaningful adolescent and youth engagement (MAYE) (2022)

Items

1. Topic

This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The introduction section of the 2022 guidance document describes in relative detail the nature and intensity of the challenge.
- B. The introduction of the 2022 guidance document discusses the causes of the system challenge.
- C. The level of priority is not specified explicitly but the system challenge is well situated within the context of existing children's right declarations and instruments, and as such the level of priority can be reasonably inferred.

- D. The documents have specific guidance to the phenomena of interest for this review, and also clarify they are intended for “all... who seek to work with young people in an inclusive and equitable way” (2022, pg. vi). However, the broad applicability of the guidance means the reader has to make decisions about the transferability and appropriateness of the specific recommendations for the specific contexts of interest in this review.

Rating:

5

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Further detail is desirable, however, the acknowledgements section of the 2022 guidance document suggests a wide range of stakeholders contributed to the guidance. It is difficult to tell which stakeholders contributed to the development of the original 2020 statement, however.
- B. Again, based on the acknowledgements section, there appears to be contributors from health, welfare, family support, international development, youth advocacy and other disciplines, however, more detail would be needed to confidently state that the development team was truly multi-disciplinary.
- C. The acknowledgements section contains enough information for the assessor to reasonably conclude that multi-sectoral contribution to the development of the guidance.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency, with the exception of transparency about the funding agency.

Rating:**4**

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The methods are not described.
- B. It is not possible to tell from the information available if the best available evidence was considered, however, contextually relevant literature is referenced in both documents in the reference and resource lists.
- C. The literature and resources referenced are mostly current.
- D. While several strategies and recommendations are described as 'effective', supporting evidence is generally not provided.
- E. While there are some references to cost, evidence of costs and cost-effectiveness of potential options are not discussed.
- F. The weighting of benefits and harms (or strengths and weaknesses) of potential options is not discussed.
- G. Case studies of good practice and additional resources are provided in the 2022 guidance document, however, the robustness of the evidence is difficult to assess.
- H. The guidance document describes a clear rationale for each checklist item.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:**3**

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The benefits and outcomes of participation are described, however indicators are more geared towards measuring inputs and outputs rather than outcomes.
- B. The recommendations are comprehensive regarding the topics covered and do provide guidance for some specific stakeholders, however, government agencies (particularly in the child and family welfare sector) are not one of those specific stakeholders.
- C. Guiding principles are described on page 2 of the 2022 document.
- D. Equity is an underlying theme of the 2020 and 2022 documents, and is discussed explicitly on page 4 of the 2022 document.
- E. Insofar as possible, the 2022 document in particular makes a good attempt at discussing alignment with sociocultural and political interests, but given the document is intended to have global applicability it is challenging to do in detail for all various interests. Child-rights instruments are references frequently.
- F. Recommendations and specific guidance is clearly labelled and easy to find in both documents.
- G. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**5**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- J. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. There is discussion of barriers and enablers throughout the 2022 document (though not using those terms and not in any one specific section). However, the guidance document itself could potentially be interpreted as a plan for optimising enablers.
- B. There is discussion of resource considerations, but the guidance is too high-level to adequately guide implementation efforts.
- C. The assessor could not find any discussion in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. Checklist item 5 focuses on sustained engagements.
- F. The assessor could not identify discussion on the flexibility of recommendations.
- G. The recommendations are intended to have broad applicability, with some discussion of transferability around specific sectors in the 2022 document, however, additional discussion for government child and family welfare agencies would be helpful for the purpose of this review.
- H. Dissemination strategies are briefly mentioned on pg. 2.
- I. The checklist items in the 2022 document can be helpful to assess progress towards implementation and meeting targets, however, the 2022 document also states “while this guidance will point stakeholders and signatories in the same direction of good practices, there are no standardised targets and indicators that would allow PMNCH and partners to track successful MAYE implementation thoroughly and consistently” (pg. vi).

Rating:

3

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 5
- Item 2 rating: 4
- Item 3 rating: 3
- Item 4 rating: 5
- Item 5 rating: 3

Rating:**4.0****= Low quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Save the Children (2018)

Citation: (Save the Children, 2018)	
Title: General children's participation criteria: Sectoral guideline and instruments for ensuring children's meaningful participation	
Items	
1. Topic	
This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.	
Criteria:	
A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
A. Yes, the system challenge is described in the Introduction.	
B. The causes of poor or unmeaningful child participation do not appear to be discussed.	
C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of child participation, though extensive discussion of participation as a child's right could be interpreted as implying high priority.	

- D. Certain aspects of the guidance are more directly relevant to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest than others, so some caution may be needed in assessing the relevance and appropriateness of the guidance for the specific PICO of interest.

Rating:

3

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Save the Children Albania employees from various roles are described as contributing to the guidance.
- B. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- C. The team appears to be of a single sector; however, children and civil society representatives were said to be consulted as part of the guidance development process. Could be interpreted, to some extent, as implying broader sectoral involvement.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency, with the exception of an acknowledgement about who the funding agency is.

Rating:

3

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | |
|---|---|
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. Methods are only very briefly alluded to in the acknowledgements section but are reported in too little detail to assess this criteria.
- B. Cannot tell because the methods and data sources are reported in too little detail.
- C. As above.
- D. The assessor could not find a presentation of evidence on effectiveness.
- E. As above.
- F. Benefits are discussed. Harms are not discussed specifically but could potentially be implied from a discussion on whether children's participation is always appropriate.
- G. As with item B.
- H. There is an overall rationale for the guidelines, linked to international children's rights conventions and the benefits of participation, but the rationale for specific recommendations is not always discussed.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:

2

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The benefits of participation as a whole are described and indicators are provided for good practice criteria.
- B. The recommendations cover a wide-range of topics though not all are directly relevant to the phenomena of interest. There is discussion of how the guidelines apply to specific sectors, though the discussion is relatively high-level, and it is not always clear why certain recommendations are made for one sector but not others.
- C. Recommendations related to ethics are made, though how ethical considerations explicitly influenced the formulation and development of recommendations is not described.
- D. The recommendations encourage the reader to consider various characteristics during the selection process (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity, etc.) but the way or purpose for which they should be considered is too vague to promote equity, and in fact could plausibly be used as a way to hinder equity if combined with some of the questions posed in the section on 'Is children's participation always appropriate?'.
- E. This is done to a certain extent through a discussion of international children's rights instruments, but a more nuanced discussion of interests beyond this would be helpful.
- F. Recommendations are not always clearly labelled as such and at times are contained within a broader narrative discussion that can make them hard to identify.
- G. Many recommendations are, but some are not. The language can sometimes be difficult to follow and confusing.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**3**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- K. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. The assessor could not find specific discussion of barriers and enablers to implementation.
- B. Limited to several brief, high-level references to 'resources'. Discussion to limited to guide implementation.
- C. As with item A, but in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, but in regard to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. There is section that focuses on guidance for specific sectors, however the guidance is quite high-level and limited in scope.
- G. As above.
- H. As with item A, but in regard to the dissemination of the guidance.
- I. Progress checklists are provided to assess participation processes, however, it may not be clear to some readers how to actually assess or answer the questions in a reliable way.

Rating:

2

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline

Comments:

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 3
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 3
- Item 5 rating: 2

Rating:

2.6= Low quality

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for Steinitz (2009)

Citation: (Steinitz, 2009)

Title: Guidelines for promoting child participation

Items

1. Topic

This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.

Criteria:

A. The **system challenge** is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).

Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

B. The **causes** of the system challenge are clearly described.

Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

- C. The system challenge is described in terms of its **level of priority** in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- D. The guidance is **relevant** to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and **appropriate** for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. Reference to Article 12 of the UNCRC is made, but the challenge is poorly described as it is only briefly described at a very basic level.
- B. The causes of poor or unmeaningful child participation do not appear to be discussed.
- C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of child participation.
- D. Certain aspects of the guidance are more directly relevant to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest than others, so some caution may be needed in assessing the relevance and appropriateness of the guidance for the specific PICO of interest.

Rating:

2

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The guidelines appear to have been developed by a single individual (albeit based on other guidelines by a wider team but the backgrounds/stakes/interests of this team are not stated).
- B. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- C. Cannot tell the sectoral backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency.

Rating:

1

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. For items A-F, the methods and evidence-base on which the recommendations and guidelines are rarely described, if described at all. The short bibliography and scant referencing throughout do not indicate a systematic and transparent methodology or a reliance on the best available and most current evidence-base. There is also an absence of discussion on effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, benefits and harms.
- B. As above.
- C. As above.
- D. As above.
- E. As above.
- F. As above.
- G. The link is scant. The extent of the use of empirical research evidence appears is difficult to determine due to poor reporting. The use of quotes in certain parts of the report potentially suggest the guidelines incorporate practice wisdom, but even this is not entirely clear.
- H. There is an overall rationale for the guidelines, linked to international children's rights conventions and the benefits of participation, but the rationale for specific recommendations is not always discussed.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:**1**

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The benefits of participation as a whole are described.
- B. The recommendations cover certain key questions but it is not usually clear the system-level or context the guidelines or recommendations are intended for.
- C. Recommendations related to ethics are made, though how ethical considerations explicitly influenced the formulation and development of recommendations is not described
- D. Some brief high-level guidance is given to encourage “maximum representation and participation” of the children selected to be involved. However, its not clear whether equity is the rationale for this.
- E. The guidelines were written for application in Namibia but there is no contextualisation of the recommendations or discussion of socio-political interests.
- F. Recommendations are not clearly labelled as such and are contained within a broader narrative discussion that can make them hard to identify.
- G. Some recommendations may be, but many would likely require additional detail to operationalise.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**3**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- L. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. There is no discussion of barriers and enablers specifically, though potentially the section on 'What preparation is required?' could be interpreted as giving direction on some potential barriers and enablers.
- B. Limited to several brief, high-level references to resources. Discussion too limited to guide implementation.
- C. The assessor could not find any discussion in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, but in regard to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. As above, but in regard to the flexibility of the recommendations.
- G. As above, but in regard to the transferability of the recommendations.
- H. As above, but in regard to the dissemination of the guidance.
- I. There is a section on 'How do you evaluate children's participation?' however the guidance needs more detail to operationalise adequately.

Rating:

2

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 2
- Item 2 rating: 1
- Item 3 rating: 1
- Item 4 rating: 3
- Item 5 rating: 2

Rating:**1.8****= Critically low quality**

Quality Assessments of Standards

System-level standards

4 sets of system-level standards were assessed with the AGREE-HS quality assessment tool. An overview of the results are shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4: AGREE-HS quality assessment results of system-level standards

Citation	Quality Assessment Domains					Overall Quality Rating
	Topic Description	Participants	Methods	Recommendations	Implementability	
Department of Health and Children (2003)	3	3	2	5	2	3.0
Health Information and Quality Authority (2012)	4	3	2	5	1	3.0
Health Information and Quality Authority (2014)	4	3	2	5	2	3.2
Health Information and Quality Authority (2018b)	4	4	4	5	1	3.6
Keys:						
	Critically Low 1.0 - 2.5	Low 2.6 - 4.0	Moderate 4.1 - 5.5	High 5.6 - 7.0		

The detailed assessments are presented below.

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment for the Department of Health and Children (2003)

Citation: (Department of Health and Children, 2003)*

**For item 3, these standards have been considered in conjunction with the 'Report of the Working Group on Foster Care: Foster Care - A Child-Centred Partnership' (Department of Health and Children, 2001) which informed the development of the standards.*

Title: National standards for foster care

Items

1. Topic

This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The system challenge is briefly described in the Foreword.
- B. The causes of the system challenge do not appear to be discussed.
- C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of the standards, though they could arguably be implied from the discussion in the foreword of the role the standards will play.
- D. The guidance is appropriate in that provides some information directly relevant to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest in this review, however, the timeliness is questionable. While these standards are still used today by the Health Information and Quality Authority, they are 20 years old and could arguably be in need of updating.

Rating:**3**

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|--|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The standards development group contained a range of interest and stakeholder groups.
- B. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- C. A range of relevant sectors are represented, including the government and non-government sectors. Social work, civil service, inspectorate, foster care associations, etc., are all represented.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency.

Rating:

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The methodology and approach to identify evidence are described in the 2001 Working Group report and alluded to in the foreword of the standards. While the working group attempted to review the relevant research, the methodology is not described in sufficient detail to assess if it is systematic. From a reading of the report, it is more likely that some form of non-systematic narrative review may have been attempted.
- B. The 2021 working group report highlights the limited research on foster care in an Irish context, limiting them mainly to considering international research of relevance. Without a more detailed description of the methodology and literature included in the report, it is difficult to assess whether it is the best available evidence. The foreword of the standards also suggest consultations with relevant stakeholders contributed to the development of the standards, however, little detail is provided making it very difficult to assess with confidence.
- C. The evidence base is likely to be current at the time the standards were published. However, the standards are now 20 years old, with 2001 working group report published 22 years ago.
- D. For items D and E, the assessor could not find discussion of the evidence on the effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of the potential options related to the standards of most relevance to this review (i.e. standards 25, 17 and 19).
- E. As above.
- F. There is some evidence of the weighting of benefits and harms of potential options in relation to standard 25 (see Appendix 3), but not of the other relevant standards.
- G. There are some links between the standards and the recommendations in the working group report, but this link is not clearly made. It requires lengthy and detailed reading, and at times the link still may not be entirely clear.
- H. The rationale for each set of standards is clearly described.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:**2**

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The outcomes are sometimes implied in the rationale for each set of standards, but this is not always the case. Indicators or standards for measurement are also not described.
- B. The standards cover a wide range of aspects of foster care and provide guidance to different system-levels.
- C. How ethical considerations explicitly influenced the formulation and development of the standards is not described.
- D. Standard 4 'valuing diversity' could be interpreted as promoting equity among the target population.
- E. Some of the discussion in the foreword could be interpreted as briefly considering socio-cultural and political interests, but not in sufficient detail to assign a 'yes' judgement.
- F. The standards and their related criteria are clearly labelled, succinct and easy to find.
- G. Particularly for Standard 25, the criteria are actionable and sufficiently detailed for operationalisation.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**5**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. There is no discussion of barriers and enablers specifically, though potentially Appendix 2 could be interpreted as giving direction on some potential barriers and enablers to some of the standards of relevance.
- B. The assessor could not find only extremely brief references to cost or resources. Typically, costs and resources are not considered.
- C. The assessor could not find any discussion in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, but in regard to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. As above, but in regard to the flexibility of the recommendations.
- G. As above, but in regard to the transferability of the recommendations.
- H. As above, but in regard to the dissemination of the guidance.
- I. Each standard has a set of criteria that could be used to help assess adherence to the standards, but particular strategies for assessing these are not described.

Rating:

2

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 3
- Item 2 rating: 3
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 5
- Item 5 rating: 2

Rating:**3****= Low quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2012)

Citation: (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2012)	
Title: National standards for the protection and welfare of children: For Health Service Executive Children and Family Services	
Items	
1. Topic	
This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.	
Criteria:	
A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
A. The system challenge is described at relative length, including the nature of the challenge and populations affected. The magnitude or frequency of the challenge is not discussed however.	
B. Causes of the system challenge could be interpreted as implied in certain places but do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	
C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of the standards, though they could arguably be implied from the discussion in sections 1-3.	

- D. The guidance is appropriate in that provides some information directly relevant to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest in this review, however, the timeliness is questionable as the standards are over 10 years and to the best of the assessor's knowledge, HIQA are currently working on updating or replacing the standards.

Rating:

4

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The standards development group contained a range of interest and stakeholder groups. The views of the general public, including children and young people, to inform the development of the standards were also sought via consultations.
- B. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- C. A range of relevant sectors are represented, including the government and non-government sectors.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency.

Rating:

3

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | |
|---|---|
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The standards are said to “have been developed through a structured process aimed at reflecting best practice in social care regulation”, and that “A review of international and national literature was undertaken and used to inform the drafting of the Standards” (pg. 9). However, the actual review methods are not described and could not be found by the assessor on the HIQA website.
- B. It is difficult to assess whether the best available evidence informed the standards without more detail on the methodology, however, it is likely that contextually relevant evidence was gathered through expert opinion and public consultations at the least.
- C. The evidence base is likely to be current at the time the standards were published. However, the standards are now over 10 years old.
- D. For items D and E, the assessor could not find discussion related to the items D-F.
- E. As above.
- F. As above.
- G. Cannot tell without further information of the evidence underpinning the standards.
- H. The rationale for each set of standards is clearly described.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:
2

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The outcomes can generally be implied from the phrasing of the standards and theme they fall within. Features required to meet the standards are described, but additional detail is likely needed to operationalise these as indicators or standards for measurement.
- B. The standards cover a wide range of aspects of child protection and welfare and provide guidance to different system-levels.
- C. The principles underpinning the development of the standards are clearly described, some of which could reasonably be interpreted as ethical principles.
- D. Standard 1.1. could be interpreted as promoting equity among the target population.
- E. Some of the discussion in early sections before the standards could potentially be interpreted as an implicit consideration of socio-cultural and political interests. Similarly, acceptability of the standards could potentially be inferred from the wide range of stakeholders on the advisory group. However, neither considerations are discussed explicitly, so a 'yes' judgement is not considered appropriate.
- F. The standards and their related requirements are clearly labelled, succinct and easy to find.
- G. The criteria are actionable and sufficiently detailed for operationalisation.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**5**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. There is no discussion of barriers and enablers.
- B. The assessor could not find only extremely brief references to cost or resources. Typically, costs and resources are not considered.
- C. The assessor could not find any discussion in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, but in regard to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. As above, but in regard to the flexibility of the recommendations.
- G. As above, but in regard to the transferability of the recommendations.
- H. As above, but in regard to the dissemination of the guidance.
- I. There is a short statement noting HIQA monitors compliance with the standards, but specific strategies for monitoring compliance are not described.

Rating:

1

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 4
- Item 2 rating: 3
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 5
- Item 5 rating: 1

Rating:**3.0****= Low quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2014)

Citation: (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2014)

Title: National standards for special care units

Items

1. Topic

This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The system challenge is described at relative length, including the nature of the challenge and populations affected. The magnitude or frequency of the challenge is not discussed, however.
- B. The causes of the system challenge could be interpreted as implied in certain places but do not appear to be explicitly discussed.
- C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of the standards, though they could arguably be implied from the discussion in section 1.
- D. The guidance is appropriate in that provides some information directly relevant to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest in this review, however, the timeliness is questionable as the standards are almost 10 years old.

Rating:

4

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- D. **Competing interests** of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the **influence of a funding agency**. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
-

Comments:

- F. The standards development group contained a range of interest and stakeholder groups, including a young persons representative with care experience.
- G. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of the development team from the information available.
- H. A range of relevant sectors are represented, including the government, non-government organisations, advocacy agencies and service users.
- I. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- J. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency.

Rating:

3

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. There is a link between the recommendations and evidence. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. The rationale behind the recommendations is clear. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. Systematic and transparent methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The methodology for developing the standards is not reported. From information available on HIQA's website, a period of public consultation was held on a draft version of the standards, but the assessor could not find information about the who made submissions or how these influenced the standards.
- B. It is difficult to assess whether the best available evidence informed the standards without more detail on the methodology, however, it is possible that contextually relevant evidence was gathered through expert opinion on the advisory group and public consultations.
- C. It is not possible to tell from the information available whether the evidence base was current. In addition, the standards are now close to 10 years old at the time of assessment.
- D. For items D - G, the assessor could not find information relating to these items.
- E. As above.
- F. As above.
- G. As above.
- H. The rationale for each set of standards is clearly described.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.

Rating:**2**

4. Recommendations

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The outcomes can generally be implied from the phrasing of the standards and theme they fall within. Features required to meet the standards are described, but additional detail is likely needed to operationalise these as indicators or standards for measurement.
- B. The standards cover a wide range of aspects of special care units and provide guidance to different system-levels.
- C. How ethical considerations explicitly influenced the formulation and development of the standards is not described.
- D. Standard 4 'valuing diversity' could be interpreted as promoting equity among the target population.
- E. Some of the discussion in early sections before the standards could potentially be interpreted as an implicit consideration of socio-cultural and political interests. Similarly, acceptability of the standards could potentially be inferred from the wide range of stakeholders on the advisory group. However, neither considerations are discussed explicitly, so a 'yes' judgement is not considered appropriate.
- F. The standards and their related criteria are clearly labelled, succinct and easy to find.
- G. The criteria are actionable and sufficiently detailed for operationalisation.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**5**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. There is no discussion of barriers and enablers.
- B. The assessor could not find only extremely brief references to cost or resources. Typically, costs and resources are not considered.
- C. The assessor could not find any discussion in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, but in regard to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. As above, but in regard to the flexibility of the recommendations.
- G. As above, but in regard to the transferability of the recommendations.
- H. As above, but in regard to the dissemination of the guidance.
- I. Specific monitoring activities and strategies for adherence to the strategies are mentioned on page 9.

Rating:

2

Overall Assessment**1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline****Comments:**

- Item 1 rating: 4
- Item 2 rating: 3
- Item 3 rating: 2
- Item 4 rating: 5
- Item 5 rating: 2

Rating:**3.2****= Low quality**

Detailed AGREE-HS assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2018)

Citation: (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2018b)	
Title: National standards for children's residential centres	
Items	
1. Topic	
This item addresses the description of the system challenge, the causes of the challenge and the priority accorded to it, and relevance of the guidance.	
Criteria:	
A. The system challenge is clearly described (i.e., the nature of the challenge; the magnitude, frequency or intensity of the challenge; the populations affected).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
B. The causes of the system challenge are clearly described.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The system challenge is described in terms of its level of priority in the targeted system and the affected population; arguments to support the priority classification are provided.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The guidance is relevant to (i.e., timely in relation to when decisions will be made), and appropriate for, the system challenge, the system or sub-system needs, the target population(s), and the setting(s) in which they will operate.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
A. The system challenge is described at relative length, including the nature of the challenge and populations affected. The magnitude or frequency of the challenge is not discussed, however.	
B. The causes of the system challenge could be interpreted as implied in certain places but do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	
C. The assessor could find specific discussion of the level of priority of the standards, though they could arguably be implied from the discussion in section 1 and 2.	

- D. The guidance is appropriate in that provides some information directly relevant to the phenomena of interest and contexts of interest in this review. The standards are still in use in HIQA and were published 5 years ago, so are likely still timely.

Rating:

4

2. Participants

This item addresses the composition of the systems guidance development team and the management of competing interests and funder influence.

Criteria:

- | | |
|--|--|
| A. The systems guidance development team includes members who have an interest or stake in the recommendations (e.g., decision makers, program managers, operational leaders, consumers and members of the public). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The systems guidance development team is multidisciplinary (e.g., political scientists, economists, epidemiologists, methodologists). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The systems guidance development team is multi-sectoral (e.g., primary care, public health and, if appropriate to the challenge, finance and housing). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Competing interests of the systems guidance development team members (e.g., financial, professional), and the strategies used to identify and manage them, are clearly described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Precautions have been taken to avoid or minimise the influence of a funding agency . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The standards development group contained a range of interest and stakeholder groups, with public submissions from frontline organisations and children in care also informing the development of the guidelines.
- B. Cannot tell the disciplinary backgrounds of most of the development team from the information available, the there is enough information to suggest that researchers, social work/care professionals were involved.

- C. A range of relevant sectors are represented, including the government and non-government sectors. Social work, social care, mental health, advocacy organisations, academia, and more are represented.
- D. The assessor could not find reference to competing interests or their management.
- E. The assessor could not find reference to minimise the influence of the funding agency.

Rating:

4

3. Methods

This item addresses the use of systematic methods and transparency in reporting; the use of the best available and up-to-date evidence; the consideration of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the potential options; and the weighting of benefits and harms in the guidance document.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Systematic and transparent methods were used to identify and review the evidence (e.g., integrated review, scoping review, review of the grey literature, systematic review) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The best available and most contextually relevant evidence was considered. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The evidence base is current . | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Evidence of effectiveness of the potential options is clearly described, including descriptions of the contexts in which the options were tested. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Evidence of cost and cost-effectiveness of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The weighting of the benefits and harms of the potential options is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- G. There is a **link** between the recommendations and evidence. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- H. The **rationale** behind the recommendations is clear. Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐
- I. **Systematic** and **transparent** methods were used to agree upon the final recommendations (e.g., informal or formal consensus, Delphi method, nominal group methods). Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. An evidence review of national and international literature was undertaken to inform the development of these standards (see (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2017)). This evidence review was also included in this integrative review, on its own merits, and quality assessed as an 'Overview of Reviews' using the adapted AMSTAR-2 tool. It was assessed as 'critically low' quality, however, and was not reported in sufficient detail to be considered fully transparent and reproducible. Nevertheless, in comparison to most other guidelines and standards included in this review, the HIQA evidence review appeared more systematic and transparent than the evidence synthesis methods of others.
- B. Although the evidence review received a 'critically low' rating, the comprehensive of the literature search was adequate and likely to find much of the best available and contextually relevant literature. Public submissions also informed the standards, potentially increasing the contextual relevance of the evidence.
- C. The evidence base is likely to be current at the time the standards were published. However, the standards and evidence underpinning them are now 5-6 years old. Several more recent evidence syntheses of relevance have been conducted since this time.
- D. The assessor could not find discussion of the evidence on the effectiveness in the standards, though the supporting evidence review does make reference to effectiveness and good practice.
- E. The assessor could not find discussion of cost-effectiveness or costs..
- F. As for item D, except in relation to benefits and harms.
- G. It is possible to make links if the standards are considered in conjunction with the evidence review, but the links are not usually clear if the standards are considered in isolation.
- H. The rationale for each set of standards is clearly described.
- I. The assessor could not find a description of the methods used to agree upon the final recommendations.
-

Rating:**4****4. Recommendations**

This item addresses the outcomes orientation and comprehensiveness of the guidance; the ethical and equity considerations drawn upon in its development; the details for its operationalisation; the sociocultural and political alignment of the guidance; and the updating plan.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. The anticipated outcomes of implementing the recommendations are clearly described (including indicators, performance thresholds or targets, and standards to measure them) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. The recommendations are comprehensive and provide direction to all relevant system levels (e.g., national, provincial/state), subsystems (e.g., cancer, mental health) and sectors (e.g., primary care, public health). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The ethical principles used to develop the recommendations are described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The recommendations promote equity among the target population (e.g., in terms of age, sex, gender, culture, religion, race, sexual orientation). | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The recommendations' acceptability to, and alignment with, sociocultural and political interests were considered. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are easily identifiable, clear, and succinct . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. The recommendations are actionable and are sufficiently detailed to be operationalised . | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| H. A plan for updating the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

- A. The outcomes can generally be implied from the phrasing of the standards and theme they fall within. Features required to meet the standards are described, but additional detail is likely needed to operationalise these as indicators or standards for measurement.
- B. The standards cover a wide range of aspects of children's residential care and provide guidance to different system-levels.
- C. How ethical considerations explicitly influenced the formulation and development of the standards is not described.
- D. Standard 1.1. could be interpreted as promoting equity among the target population.
- E. Some of the discussion in early sections before the standards could potentially be interpreted as an implicit consideration of socio-cultural and political interests. Similarly, acceptability of the standards could potentially be inferred from the wide range of stakeholders on the advisory group. However, neither considerations are discussed explicitly, so a 'yes' judgement is not considered appropriate.
- F. The standards and their related criteria are clearly labelled, succinct and easy to find.
- G. The standards are actionable and sufficiently detailed for operationalisation.
- H. The assessor could not find reference to a plan for updating the recommendations.

Rating:**5**

5. Implementability

This item addresses the barriers and enablers to implementing the recommendations; the cost and resource considerations in implementing the recommendations; the affordability of implementation and anticipated sustainability of outcomes; the flexibility and transferability of the guidance; and the strategies for disseminating the guidance, monitoring its implementation and evaluating its impact.

Criteria:

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of the recommendations are described, including factors that are internal (e.g., resources, incentives, administrative structure) and external (e.g., legal system, social system, state of the economy, corruption, beliefs) to the system. A plan to mitigate barriers and optimize enablers is included. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Cost and resource considerations for the recommended actions are described (e.g., money, time, infrastructure, equipment, administrative capacity, supplies, staffing, and training). | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. The stakeholders' acceptability of the recommendations is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. The affordability of the recommendations, in the context where implementation will take place, is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. The anticipated sustainability and requirements to maintain long-term outcomes is described. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. The recommendations are flexible and there is a description of how they can be adapted or tailored for specific contexts in which they will be implemented. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| G. A description of the degree to which the recommendations are transferable to other similar or different contexts is provided. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No/Can't Tell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |

- H. Strategies for **disseminating** the systems guidance are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No/Can't Tell ☒ Not Applicable ☐
- I. Strategies for **assessing** the implementation process and the impact of the recommendations are described. Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No/Can't Tell ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Comments:

- A. There is no discussion of barriers and enablers specifically, though potentially Appendix 2 could be interpreted as giving direction on some potential barriers and enablers to some of the standards of relevance.
- B. The assessor could not find only extremely brief references to cost or resources. Typically, costs and resources are not considered, particularly in relation to the standards and requirements most relevant to this review.
- C. The assessor could not find any discussion in regard to stakeholders acceptability of recommendations.
- D. As above, but in regard to affordability of the recommendations.
- E. As above, but in regard to the sustainability of the recommendations.
- F. As above, but in regard to the flexibility of the recommendations.
- G. As above, but in regard to the transferability of the recommendations.
- H. As above, but in regard to the dissemination of the guidance.
- I. Each standard has a set of criteria that could be used to help assess adherence to the standards, but particular strategies for assessing these are not described or only very briefly alluded to.

Rating:

1

Overall Assessment

1. Rate the overall quality of this guideline
--

<u>Comments:</u>

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 1 rating: 4 • Item 2 rating: 4 • Item 3 rating: 4 • Item 4 rating: 5 • Item 5 rating: 1 |
|--|

<u>Rating:</u>

3.6.

= Low quality

Quality Assessments of Evidence Syntheses

The adapted AMSTAR-2 is intended to accommodate the quality assessment of systematic reviews (quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods), scoping reviews, overviews of reviews, integrative reviews, and rapid reviews based on each of those evidence synthesis methodologies.

Table 5 below shows, for each type of evidence synthesis, which items from the original AMSTAR-2 tool are applicable, which have been added or adapted, and which are not applicable.

Table 5: Application and adaptation of AMSTAR-2 items by evidence synthesis type

AMSTAR-2 Items	Evidence Synthesis Types				
	Quantitative Systematic Reviews	Qualitative Systematic Reviews	Scoping Reviews	Overviews of Reviews	Integrative Reviews
1. Review questions					
2. Review protocol	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	
3. Study designs					
4. Literature search	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>
5. Study selection					
6. Data extraction					
7. Excluded studies	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>
8. Included studies					
9. Risk-of-bias assessment	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>		<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>
9a. Primary study overlap					
9b. Discrepant data					
10. Funding source (studies)					
11. Meta-analysis methods	<i>Critical Item</i>			<i>Critical Item</i>	
11a. Analytic overreach			<i>Critical Item</i>		
12. Impact of RoB results (1)					
13. Impact of RoB results (2)	<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>		<i>Critical Item</i>	<i>Critical Item</i>
14. Heterogeneity					
15. Publication bias	<i>Critical Item</i>			<i>Critical Item</i>	
16. Funding source (review)					
	Original Item	Adapted Item	New Item	Non-Applicable Item	

A challenge in applying the adapted AMSTAR-2 was in deciding which set of items were appropriate for evidence syntheses that are either inaccurately or vaguely labelled. For example, when an article labels itself as an 'evidence review' -- which isn't an actual evidence synthesis methodology in and of itself because it could refer to several different kinds of evidence synthesis methodologies -- it wasn't always immediately clear which type of evidence synthesis it should be quality assessed as. When the review team deemed an evidence synthesis to be mislabelled or vaguely labelled, the review team relabelled it based on the evidence synthesis type it most resembled, to help decide which criteria should be used to assess quality. The reviews for which this was done are listed below with rationale for why the new label was assigned.

Table 6: Relabelled evidence syntheses

Citation	Type of Evidence Synthesis Given by the Article Author	Type of Evidence Synthesis Assessed As	Rationale
(Larkins et al., 2021)	Rapid Evidence Review	Rapid Integrative Review	'Evidence reviews' are not a type of evidence synthesis in their own right and provide a vague description of the approach taken for an evidence synthesis. The methodology is deemed to most closely resemble that of an integrative review because it systematically searches for and selects a diverse range of empirical and non-empirical literature.
(Waddington et al., 2019)	Mixed-Methods Systematic Review	Mixed-Methods Systematic Review and Realist Review	Review questions 1-3 are answered using standard mixed-method systematic review techniques. Review question 4 incorporates a "realist-informed" analytic framework.
(ten Brummelaar et al., 2018)	Narrative Review	Mixed-Methods Systematic Review	The review meets all the eligibility criteria of an 'evidence synthesis' for this review, includes empirical quantitative and qualitative literature, and conducts a formal quality assessment of included articles, all

			of which are features of a mixed-methods systematic review.
(Bradbury-Jones et al., 2018)	Qualitative Systematic Review	Scoping Review	The review does not quality assess its included articles (which is a feature of scoping reviews, not qualitative systematic reviews). The questions addressed and methodology followed are also appropriate for a scoping review.
(Kennan et al., 2016)	Systematic Literature Review	Mixed-Methods Systematic Review	'Systematic literature review' provides a vague description of the approach taken for an evidence synthesis. Review includes both quantitative and qualitative primary research, which most resembles a mixed-methods literature review.
(Health Information and Quality Authority, 2017)	Systematic Literature Review	Overview of Reviews	'Systematic literature review' provides a vague description of the approach taken for an evidence synthesis. The review included primary and secondary research based on qualitative and quantitative data, which most resembles an overview of reviews.
(Health Information and Quality Authority, 2020)	Evidence Synthesis	Integrative Review	'Evidence synthesis' is not a specific type of evidence synthesis in its own right and provides a vague description of the approach taken. The review included various forms of literature, including empirical and non-empirical literature, which most resembles an integrative review.

(Health Information and Quality Authority, 2021)	Evidence Synthesis	Integrative Review	'Evidence synthesis' is not a specific type of evidence synthesis in its own right and provides a vague description of the approach taken. The review included various forms of literature, including empirical and non-empirical literature, which most resembles an integrative review.
Kelly et al. (2023)	Systematic Review	Mixed-Methods Systematic Review	The review included empirical primary research based on data derived from qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods research.
Zuchowski et al. (2019)	Systematic Literature Review	Mixed-Methods Systematic Review	The review was a systematic review that included quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods peer reviewed articles.

15 evidence syntheses were assessed with the adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment tool.²

² Not included in this list is Waddington et al. (2019) which was also assessed but then excluded from the review because it became clear to the assessor that it did not meet other eligibility criteria (ineligible contexts) and should have been excluded at the full-text screening stage.

Table 7: Number and type of evidence syntheses quality assessed with the adapted AMSTAR-2

Evidence Synthesis Type	Amount	Citations
Integrative Reviews*	4	(Health Information and Quality Authority, 2020, 2021; Larkins et al., 2021; Shamrova & Cummings, 2017)
Scoping Reviews	4	(Bovarnick et al., 2018; Bradbury-Jones et al., 2018; Brodie et al., 2016; Gathen et al., 2022)
Mixed-Method Systematic Reviews	3	(Kennan et al., 2016; ten Brummelaar et al., 2018; Zuchowski et al., 2019)
Overview of Reviews	1	(Health Information and Quality Authority, 2017)
Qualitative Systematic Review	1	(Baran & Sawrikar, 2022)
Quantitative Systematic Review	1	(Ayala-Nunes et al., 2014)

*Including a rapid integrative review (Larkins et al., 2021)

An overview of the results are shown in Table 8 below:

Table 8: Adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment results of evidence syntheses

Citation	Evidence Synthesis Type	Items Used to Assess Quality																Quality Rating			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	9a	9b	10	11	11a	12	13		14	15	16
HIQA (2020)*	Integrative Review				C			C		C											Critically Low
HIQA (2021)*	Integrative Review				C			C		C											Critically Low
Larkins et al. (2021)	Rapid Integrative Review				C					C											Critically Low
Shamrova & Cummings (2017)	Integrative Review				C			C													Critically Low
Kennan et al. (2016)	Mixed-Method Systematic Review		C		C																Critically Low
ten Brummelaar et al. (2018)	Mixed-Method Systematic Review		C		C																Critically Low
Zuchowski et al. (2019)	Mixed-Method Systematic Review		C		C			C		C							C				Critically Low
Bovarnick et al. (2018)	Scoping Review		C		C			C							C						Critically Low
Bradbury-Jones et al. (2018)	Scoping Review		C		C			C													Critically Low
Brodie et al. (2016)	Scoping Review		C		C			C													Critically Low
Gathen et al. (2022)	Scoping Review		C		C																Critically Low
HIQA (2017)*	Overview of Reviews		C		C																Critically Low
Baran & Sawrikar (2022)	Qualitative Systematic Review		C		C																Critically Low
Ayala-Nunes et al. (2014)	Quantitative Systematic Review		C		C			C													Critically Low

Item Questions (short versions): (1) Did review questions and inclusion criteria include PICO components?; (2) Were review methods established prior to conducting the review and were deviations justified?; (3) Were the study designs selected for inclusion justified?; (4) Was a comprehensive search strategy used?; (5) Was study selection performed in duplicate?; (6) Was data extraction performed in duplicate?; (7) Were excluded studies listed and justified?; (8) Were included studies adequately described?; (9) Was a satisfactory quality/risk-of-bias assessment technique used on included studies?; (9a) Was primary study overlap identified and accounted for?; (9b) Were discrepancies/discordances managed and accounted for?; (10) Were sources of funding reported for included studies?; (11) Were appropriate statistical meta-analysis methods used?; (11a) Is the analytic method appropriate for a scoping review?; (12) Was potential impact of risk of bias on meta-analysis results assessed?; (13) Was quality/risk of bias accounted for when interpreting the review's results?; (14) Was a satisfactory explanation of heterogeneity observed?; (15) Was an adequate investigation of publication bias and its impact on the results observed?; (16) Were any potential sources of conflict of interest reported?

The detailed assessments are presented below.

Integrative reviews

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2020)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2020)*								
<i>*This review is considered in conjunction with HIQA’s ‘Evidence synthesis process’ document (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2018a) which is implied to add further detail on the methodology followed.</i>								
Title: Evidence review to inform the development of National Standards for Children’s Social Services								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Qualitative systematic review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes:		Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context		
2	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</div> <div><div>For Partial Yes: The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)</div><div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified: <input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol</div></div>		No	A 'search protocol' may have been developed but no evidence the eligibility criteria and quality assessment were developed in an a priori protocol.
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div><div>For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div></div>		Yes	Appears suggestions were made to include a broad range of empirical and non-

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
						empirical literature during a scoping consideration.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Partial Yes	
				<div> <div> For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: </div> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language) </div> </div> <div> For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review </div>		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	Yes	
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-IRs	<input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	No	
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study	No	
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	No	The results are described

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
			-OoRs -RRs -IRs	For Partial Yes: All of the following:	For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		narratively, however, neither data extraction tables nor a list of the included studies were provided, making it difficult to tell if all studies included in the review actually contributed to the findings. Assessment ended as 1 critical item and 4 non-critical items received a 'no' response.
				Quantitative Reviews			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up		
				Qualitative Reviews			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?		Yes	3 assessment tools used.. Unclear if the AACODS is validated.
				For Yes:			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		Justification for AACODS was not explicit but could be reasonably inferred.
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review? For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings	No	This item is considered applicable because reviews were eligible for inclusion. Primary study overlap is not reported.
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review? For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p><i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable</p> <p><i>For RCTs:</i></p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis</p>	<p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs</p>	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<p>AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present</p> <p>AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity</p> <hr/> <p>For NRSIs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis</p> <p>AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present</p> <p>AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available</p> <p>AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review</p>		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<p>Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.</p>		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs	<p>individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect</p>		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs	<p>publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest</p>		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 1 critical item and 4 non-critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2021)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2021)*							
<i>*This review is considered in conjunction with HIQA’s ‘Evidence synthesis process’ document (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2018a) which is implied to add further detail on the methodology followed.</i>							
Title: Evidence review to inform the development of National Standards for the Care and Support of Children using Health and Social Care Services							
Evidence Synthesis Type: Integrative review							
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?		Yes	
				For Yes:			
				Optional (recommended):			
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	Population		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context		
2	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?		No	A ‘search protocol’ may have been developed but no evidence the eligibility criteria and
				For Partial Yes:			
				For Yes:			
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:			
				As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
					registered and should also have specified:		quality assessment were developed in an a priori protocol.
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		Yes	Appears suggestions were made to include a broad range of empirical and non-empirical literature during a scoping consideration.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following:	Partial Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review</div></div>		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div><div>Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</div><div>For Yes: Either ONE of the following:</div><div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include</div><div>OR</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer</div></div></div>	Yes	
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs	<div><div>Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</div><div>For Yes: Either ONE of the following:</div></div>	No	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
			-IRs	<input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.			
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review		No	
				For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study			
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? For Partial Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		No	The results are described narratively, however, neither data extraction tables nor a list of the included studies were provided, making it difficult to tell
				For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following: Quantitative Reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up		if all studies included in the review actually contributed to the findings. Assessment ended as 1 critical item and 4 non-critical items received a 'no' response.
				Qualitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.</p>	Yes	3 assessment tools used.. Unclear if the AACODS is validated. Justification for AACODS was not explicit but could be reasonably inferred.

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?	No	This item is considered applicable because reviews were eligible for inclusion. Primary study overlap is not reported.
				For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?		
				For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
<i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>						
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?		
				For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)		
				<i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i>	<i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i>	
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs	
				<input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable		
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	For RCTs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
				AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present		
				AND		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
				AND		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<p>Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-IRs	<input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 1 critical item and 4 non-critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Larkins et al. (2021)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments			
Citation: (Larkins et al., 2021)											
Title: Peer research by children and young people and their allies: Rapid evidence review of best practices in health and social science literature											
Evidence Synthesis Type: Rapid integrative review											
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	The PICO elements are not explicitly stated as such, but can be discerned from the questions and eligibility criteria.			
				For Yes:							
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Optional (recommended): Quantitative Reviews					
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up					
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)						
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context						
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome							
2	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No				
				For Partial Yes:							
				For Yes:							
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:					As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s)					<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy							

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol</div>		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div>For Yes: The review should:</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div>	Yes	
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</div> <div>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:</div> <div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</div></div> <div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following:</div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only)</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review</div></div>	Partial Yes	Some publication restrictions were justified, but not all.

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	No	Not reported.
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	No	Not reported.
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No	
				For Partial Yes: For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study		
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Yes	Between the data extractions tables contained in the appendices and the description of results, there is a detailed description of PICO components and research designs.
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:		
				For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		
				Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up		
				Qualitative Reviews		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?	No	Assessment ended. Two critical items not achieved.
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?		
				For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?		
				For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? <i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i> <i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <i>For RCTs:</i>	<i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				<i>For NRSIs:</i>		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
				Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?		
				For Yes:		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis of other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect</p>		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs	Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs	<p>bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest</p>		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Shamrova and Cummings (2017)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Shamrova & Cummings, 2017)							
Title: Participatory action research (PAR) with children and youth: An integrative review of methodology and PAR outcomes for participants, organizations, and communities							
Evidence Synthesis Type: Integrative review							
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?		Yes	
				For Yes:			
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up			
2	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?		No	
				For Partial Yes:			
				For Yes:			
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:	As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (<i>except for ScRs</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		Yes	
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature	No	No justification provided for language and year restrictions

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer	No	Cannot tell from the information available.
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	No	As above.
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: For Yes:	No	Assessment ended. 2 critical

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs -IRs	As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review		items received a 'no'
				Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?		
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:	For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:	
				Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up	
				Qualitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services)	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail	
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<p>included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p><i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable</p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">For RCTs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">For NRSIs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review <hr/>		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<p>Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest</p>		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Scoping reviews

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Bovarnick et al. (2018)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Bovarnick et al., 2018)								
Title: Being heard: Promoting children and young people’s involvement in participatory research on sexual violence								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Scoping review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes:		Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome				
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			Yes	The search strategy is not fully articulated in the protocol but search terms and databases
				For Partial Yes:		For Yes:		
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:		As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)		are provided.
				<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?	Yes	Implicit justification of the broad range of literature types is provided on page 11.
				For Yes: The review should:		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Partial Yes	
				For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only)		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	Yes	
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	No	Not reported.
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review	No	
				For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study		
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? For Partial Yes: All of the following:	No	
				For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		
				Quantitative Reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up		
				Qualitative Reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.	N/A.	
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?	N/A.	
				For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?	No	
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	N/A.	
				For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs) <div> If statistical meta-analysis was performed: <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable </div> <div> If statistical meta-analysis was not performed: <input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs </div>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable		
				<i>For RCTs:</i>		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				<i>For NRSIs:</i>		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?	Yes	The review is borderline for analytic over-reach in several passages but in the main the findings are clearly descriptive and appropriate for the method.
				For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis of other evidence synthesis?	N/A.	
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>	N/A.	
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>	N/A.	
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	No.	
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 1 critical and 4 non-critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Bradbury-Jones et al. (2018)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Bradbury-Jones et al., 2018)								
Title: The complexities and contradictions in participatory research with vulnerable children and young people: A qualitative systematic review								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Scoping review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes:		Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome				
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No	
				For Partial Yes:		For Yes:		
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:		As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div>For Yes: The review should: <input type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div>		No	
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</div> <div>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</div>	<div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature</div>	Partial Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				☑ Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer	Yes	Not 100% clear from the reporting that the reviewers worked independently but have given benefit of the doubt.
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	No	
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: For Yes:	No	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs -IRs	As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study		
				Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? For Partial Yes: All of the following: For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		
				Quantitative Reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up		
				Qualitative Reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services)		
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.	N/A.	
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings	N/A.	
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<p>included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>	No.	
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p><i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable</p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs</p>	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>For RCTs:</i></p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>For NRSIs:</i></p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review? For Yes:	No.	Thematic analysis used in line with a

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		qualitative systematic review, but this is inappropriate due to the absence of a quality assessment, meaning the review should more appropriately have restricted itself to a more descriptive analysis. Assessment ended due to critically low rating.
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Brodie et al. (2016)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Brodie et al., 2016)						
Title: The participation of young people in child sexual exploitation services: A scoping review of the literature						
Evidence Synthesis Type: Scoping review						
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO? For Yes: <i>Quantitative Reviews</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome	Yes	
				<i>Qualitative Reviews</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context Optional (recommended): <i>Quantitative Reviews</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? For Partial Yes: The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy	No	
				For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified: <input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol</div>		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div>For Yes: The review should:</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div>	Yes	
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</div> <div>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:</div> <div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</div></div> <div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following:</div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review</div></div>	Yes	Search terms provided in an appendix.

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	No	Can't tell from info provided.
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	No	Can't tell from info provided.
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No	Assessment ended, second critical item
				For Partial Yes: For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study</div>		to receive a no.
8	Yes	No	<div>-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs</div>	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?		
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:		
				For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		
				Quantitative Reviews		
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs</div>		
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up</div>		
				Qualitative Reviews		
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs</div>		
				<div><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail</div>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?		
				For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?		
				For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? <i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i> <i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <i>For RCTs:</i>	<i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND		
				<input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
				Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?		
				For Yes:		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect</p>		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs	Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs	<p>bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest</p>		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment for Gathen et al. (2022)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Gathen et al., 2022)						
Title: User participation among people in vulnerable situations at service level: A scoping review exploring impact for individual stakeholders and services						
Evidence Synthesis Type: Scoping review						
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?		Yes
				For Yes:Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)	
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context	
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome		
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?		No
				For Partial Yes:For Yes:		
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:	As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (<i>except for ScRs</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		Yes	Justification is not explicit but could be implied from the research aims and questions.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>)	No	No justification for restriction by year of publication. Key words used in searches are provided but not clear if all

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		key words or just a selection are provided. Assessment ended, second no on a critical item.
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</div> <div> For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review </div> <div> For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study </div>		
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</div> <div> For Partial Yes: All of the following: <div> Quantitative Reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs </div> </div> <div> For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up </div>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
Qualitative Reviews						
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail	
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review? For Yes: All of the following:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable</p> <hr/> <p><i>For RCTs:</i></p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity</p> <hr/> <p><i>For NRSIs:</i></p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<p>Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.</p>		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect</p>		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Mixed-method systematic reviews

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment for Kennan et al. (2016)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Kennan et al., 2016)								
Title: Exploring the effectiveness of structures and procedures intended to support children's participation in child welfare, child protection and alternative care services: a systematic literature review								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Mixed-method systematic review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes: Optional (recommended):				
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No	
				For Partial Yes: For Yes:				
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following: As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:				

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		Yes	
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature	No	Language restrictions not justified. Assessment ended as 'no' received for 2 critical items

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				☑Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?		
				For Partial Yes: For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs -IRs	As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study		
				Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?		
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:		
				For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		
				<i>Quantitative Reviews</i>		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up		
				<i>Qualitative Reviews</i>		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services)		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<p>included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p><i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable</p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">For RCTs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">For NRSIs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review <hr/>		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<p>Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest</p>		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of ten Brummelaar et al. (2018)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments		
Citation: (ten Brummelaar et al., 2018)								
Title: Participation of youth in decision-making procedures during residential care: A narrative review								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Mixed-methods systematic review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?		Yes	Although quantitative research is eligible and appropriate for this review, the aim of the research is better suited to a PICO type format of question and inclusion criteria. As such, PICO criteria are not considered relevant for this review.	
				For Yes:				Optional (recommended):
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews			Quantitative Reviews
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population			<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome				
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior		No		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</p> <p>For Partial Yes: The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)</p> <p>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol</p>		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</p> <p>For Yes: The review should:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</p>	No	No justifications found.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</p> <p>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question)</p> <p>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies</p>	No	No justification provided for year of publication restriction. Assessment ended as 2

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)	<input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review	critical items received a 'no'.
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</p> <p>For Partial Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review	<p>For Yes:</p> <p>As for partial yes, plus the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study	
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</p> <p>For Partial Yes:</p> <p>All of the following:</p> <p>Quantitative Reviews</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<p>For Yes:</p> <p>As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:</p> <p>Quantitative Reviews</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up	
				Qualitative Reviews		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail	
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review? For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i></p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs	
				For RCTs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?		
				For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Zuchowski et al. (2019)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Zuchowski et al., 2019)								
Title: Continuous quality improvement processes in child protection: A systematic literature review								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Mixed-methods systematic review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes:		Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome				
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No	The articles states that a protocol was developed but does not described what it contained or where to
				For Partial Yes:		For Yes:		
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:		As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (<i>except for ScRs</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol	<p>access it.</p> <p>The assessor emailed the lead author and asked for a copy, but received no response.</p> <p>While waiting to receive a copy of the protocol, the assessor treated this item as a 'yes' and continued the rest of the assessment.</p> <p>Having not received a copy of the protocol, it is not possible to confirm the presence</p>

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
						of the criteria for this item, and as such it has been appraised as a 'no'.
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div>For Yes: The review should:</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div>	Yes	Not explicitly but can be inferred between the research questions, objectives and eligibility criteria.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</div> <div><div>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:</div><div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following:</div><div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field</div></div></div>	Partial Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	Yes	
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	Yes	
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments		
8	Yes	No	-OoRs -RRs -IRs	For Partial Yes:	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following:	Yes			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review	<input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study				
			-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?					
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:	For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:				
				Quantitative Reviews					
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail				
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail				
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators	<input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail				
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail				
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting				
					<input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up				
				Qualitative Reviews					
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail				
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail				

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described research detail designs		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.	Yes	
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?	N/A.	
				For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?	No	
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	N/A.	
				For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs) <i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable		
				<i>For RCTs:</i>		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				<i>For NRSIs:</i>		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?	N/A.	
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	N/A.	
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	No.	The results of the quality assessment are described, but there is no discussion of how they influence the
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
						interpretation of the findings. Assessment ended as 2 critical items received a 'no' response
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Overview of reviews

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Health Information and Quality Authority (2017)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Health Information and Quality Authority, 2017)								
Title: Background document to support the development of National Standards for Children’s Residential Centres								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Overview of reviews								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes:				
				Optional (recommended):				
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No	
				For Partial Yes:				
				For Yes:				
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:			As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div>For Yes: The review should: <input type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div>		Yes	Not stated explicitly but can be inferred from a reading of the scope and objectives of the review.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</div> <div><div>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy</div><div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies</div></div>		No	Search terms not provided and limitations on year of publication not justified. Assessment ended as 2 critical

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language) <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		items received a 'no'.
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</p> <p>For Partial Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review	<p>For Yes:</p> <p>As for partial yes, plus the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study	
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</p> <p>For Partial Yes:</p> <p>All of the following:</p> <p>Quantitative Reviews</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<p>For Yes:</p> <p>As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:</p> <p>Quantitative Reviews</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up	
				Qualitative Reviews		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail	
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review? For Yes: All of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p><i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i></p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs	
				For RCTs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?		
				For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?		
				For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Qualitative systematic reviews

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Baran and Sawrikar (2022)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments	
Citation: (Baran & Sawrikar, 2022)									
Title: Service-level barriers and facilitators to father engagement in child and family services: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies									
Evidence Synthesis Type: Qualitative systematic review									
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes		
				For Yes:					
				Optional (recommended):					
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up			
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No		
				For Partial Yes:					
				For Yes:					
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:			As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (<i>except for ScRs</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		Yes	Possibly to imply the justification.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature	No	No justification provided for language restriction. Assessment ended, 2 critical items received a 'no'

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				☑Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?		
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?		
				For Partial Yes: For Yes:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
8	Yes	No	-RRs -IRs	As for partial yes, plus the following:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review	<input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study	
			-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?		
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:	For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:	
				Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up	
				Qualitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services)	<input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs <input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<p>included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review</p> <p><i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i></p>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</p> <p><i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i></p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable</p> <p><i>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">For RCTs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">For NRSIs:</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review <hr/>		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	<p>Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest</p>		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Quantitative systematic reviews

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Ayala-Nunes (2014)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Ayala-Nunes et al., 2014)								
Title: Family feedback in child welfare services: A systematic review of measures								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Systematic review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	
				For Yes:		Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena of Interest (Concept)			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context			
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcome				
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			No	
				For Partial Yes:		For Yes:		
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:		As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (except for ScRs)	<input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and <input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol		
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? For Yes: The review should: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion		Yes	Justification is implicit, but considered sufficient for a 'yes' for this item.
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? For Partial Yes: ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)		Partial Yes	
				For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only) <input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	No	
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	Yes	This item was tricky to assess against the criteria. One reviewer extracted, with a second reviewer checking for accuracy. A consensus
				For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
						process was in place when disagreements arose, whereby the 3 rd and 4 th authors were consulted to resolve disagreements. The assessor considers this process sufficient for meeting the first criteria, based on the AMSTAR-2 guidance.
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review	For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study	No.
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?		Assessment ended. 2 critical items received a 'no'.

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>For Partial Yes: All of the following:</p> <p>For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:</p> <p>Quantitative Reviews</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up</p> <p>Qualitative Reviews</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail</p>		
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings		
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review?</div> <div>For Yes:</div> <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>		
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<div>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</div> <div>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</div> <div><div>If statistical meta-analysis was performed: <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable</div><div>If statistical meta-analysis was not performed: <input type="checkbox"/> Item is not applicable to OoRs</div></div> <div>For RCTs:</div> <div>For Yes:</div>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect</p>		
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>		
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results</p> <p>OR</p>		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results		
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Critically Low	No for 2 critical items

Other

Quality assessment of Waddington et al. (2019) had started but the article was excluded during the quality assessment process because it did not fully meet all other eligibility criteria. The review was relabelled as both a mixed-method evidence synthesis and realist review, as it combined elements of both review types, and as such two separately quality assessments were conducted: one with the adapted AMSTAR-2 for the mixed-methods systematic review, and one with the RAMESES quality assessment tool for the realist review. The adapted AMSTAR-2 assessment was completed but the RAMESES assessment was not as it was during this assessment that the assessor identified reasons for exclusion (see the 'List of Excluded Studies' in the full report for the rationale for exclusion).

Similarly, for Kelly et al. (2023) it was noticed during the assessment of primary study overlap -- which was conducted after the quality assessments -- that it did not fully meet all other eligibility criteria and was excluded as a result.

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Waddington et al. (2019)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments	
Citation: (Waddington et al., 2019)							
Title: Citizen engagement in public services in low- and middle-income countries: A mixed-methods systematic review of participation, inclusion, transparency and accountability (PITA) initiatives							
Evidence Synthesis Type: Mixed-methods systematic review and realist review*							
*This quality assessment is for the mixed-methods systematic review part of the article. The realist review part is assessed separately next, using the RAMESES quality assessment tool.							
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?		Yes	
				For Yes:Optional (recommended):			
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews		Quantitative Reviews
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timeframe for follow-up
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intervention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phenomena		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comparison			
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcome			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				of Interest (Concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context		
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</p> <p>For Partial Yes: The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review question(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (<i>except for ScRs</i>)</p> <p>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol</p>	Yes	
3	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</p> <p>For Yes: The review should:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</p>	Yes	
4	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</p> <p>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:</p> <p>For Yes:</p>	Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-IRs	As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer	Yes	
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	No	Outcome data to be

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
			-OoRs -RRs -IRs	For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.			used for calculating effect sizes were extracted in duplicate but all other data were extracted by a single author.
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review		No	The number of excluded studies was reported with justifications, but an actual list of the excluded studies was not provided.
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? For Partial Yes: All of the following: For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following: Quantitative Reviews <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described interventions		Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described comparators <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up	
				Qualitative Reviews		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described research designs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) in detail <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) in detail	
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review? For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g. qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the		Yes Literature related to the realist review aspect of the evidence synthesis evaluation were not quality assessed, however, this is not relevant to

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		this particular quality assessment which is focused on the traditional mixed-method systematic review aspects.
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings</p>	N/A.	
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p>	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review? For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>	Yes	
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs) <i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable For RCTs: For Yes:	Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review? For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect</p>	Yes	
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results</p>	Yes	
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>	Yes	
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs	Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication	Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs	bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias		
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review? For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR <input type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	Yes	
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Low	No for 1 critical and 1 non-critical item

Detailed RAMESES quality assessment of Waddington (2019)

Citation: (Waddington et al., 2019)

Title: Citizen engagement in public services in low- and middle-income countries: A mixed-methods systematic review of participation, inclusion, transparency and accountability (PITA) initiatives

Evidence Synthesis Type: Mixed-methods systematic review and realist review*

**This quality assessment is for the realist review part of the article. The mixed-method systematic review part is appraised separately in the quality assessment preceding this, using the adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment tool.*

Domain 1: The Research Problem

Items:

- a) The research topic is appropriate for a realist approach
- b) The research question is constructed in such a way as to be suitable for a realist synthesis.

Comments:

- a) The review clearly articulates why the research topic is appropriate for secondary research, and requires an understanding of how and why outcomes are generated and why they vary across contexts. The review team also clearly articulate an understanding of a realist philosophy of science. The only limitation preventing the assignment of an 'excellent' rating for this item is that the review does not articulate why a realist approach is more appropriate for the topic than other theory-based approaches. A rating of 'good' is appropriate for this criteria.
- b) The review has 5 questions, of which question 4 is most directly relevant to a realist synthesis. However, if questions 1-4 are considered together, the review meets the criteria for an 'adequate' rating of including a focus on all of the elements of a realist research question. However, while a "realist-informed synthesis" is used for question 4, the review also utilises more traditional systematic review methods (including statistical meta-analysis) for questions 1-3 and as such is not deemed to meet the criteria for a 'good' rating of a question with a narrow enough focus to be managed within a realist review.

Rating:

Item A: **Good (2)**

Item B: **Adequate (1)**

Domain 2: Understanding and Applying the Underpinning Principles of Realist Reviews**Item:**

a) The review demonstrates understanding and application of realist philosophy and realist logic which underpins a realist analysis.

Comments:

Rating:

3. Focussing the Review**Criteria:**

a) The review question is sufficiently and appropriately focussed.

Comments:

Rating:

4. Constructing and Refining a Realist Programme Theory

Criteria:

- a) An initial realist programme theory is identified and developed.

Comments:

Rating:

5. Developing a Search Strategy

Criteria:

- a) The search process is such that it would identify data to enable the review team to develop, refine and test programme theory of theories.

Comments:

Rating:

6. Selection and Appraisal of Documents

Criteria:

a) The selection and appraisal process ensures that sources relevant to the review containing material of sufficient rigour to be included are identified. In particular, the sources identified allow the reviewers to make sense of the topic area; to develop, refine and test theories; and to support inferences about mechanisms.

Comments:

Rating:

7. Data Extraction

Criteria:

a) The data extraction process captures the necessary data to enable a realist review.

Comments:

Rating:

Overall Quality Rating:		
--------------------------------	--	--

Detailed adapted AMSTAR-2 quality assessment of Kelly et al. (2023)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items			Appraisal	Comments
Citation: (Kelly et al., 2023)								
Title: Factors that influence the implementation of (inter)nationally endorsed health and social care standards: a systematic review and meta-summary								
Evidence Synthesis Type: Mixed-methods systematic review								
1	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review questions and inclusion criteria include the components of PICO or PICO?			Yes	SPICE framework (which does not include 'population' used to inform the questions and criteria. However, the relevant PICO components are defined in the protocol.
				For Yes:		Optional (recommended):		
				Quantitative Reviews	Qualitative Reviews	Quantitative Reviews		
				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
				Population	Population	Timeframe for follow-up		
				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Intervention	Phenomena of Interest (Concept)							
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Comparison	Context							
<input type="checkbox"/>								
Outcome								
2	Yes	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?			Partial Yes	No plan for investigating non-statistical causes of heterogeneity or justifying protocol deviations.
				For Partial Yes:		For Yes:		
				The authors state that they had a written protocol or		As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be		

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<div>guide that included ALL the following:</div> <div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review question(s)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Search strategy</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inclusion/Exclusion criteria</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk of bias assessment (<i>except for ScRs</i>)</div></div> <div><div>registered and should also have specified:</div><div><div><input type="checkbox"/> A meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i></div><div><input type="checkbox"/> A plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Justification for any deviations from the protocol</div></div></div>		
3	Yes	No	<div>-SRs</div> <div>-ScRs</div> <div>-OoRs</div> <div>-RRs</div> <div>-IRs</div>	<div>Q: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</div> <div>For Yes: The review should:</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain (explicitly or implicitly) its justification for the selection of study designs that are eligible for inclusion</div>	Yes	The protocol provides explicit justification.
4	Yes	Yes	<div>-SRs</div> <div>-ScRs</div> <div>-OoRs</div> <div>-RRs</div> <div>-IRs</div>	<div>Q: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</div> <div>For Partial Yes: ALL of the following:</div> <div>For Yes: As for partial yes, plus ALL of the following:</div>	Partial Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched at least 2 databases (relevant to the research question)</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided key word and/or search strategy</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</div></div> <div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Searched the reference lists/bibliographies of included studies</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Searched trial/study registries (<i>for SRs and RRs of intervention studies only</i>)</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Included/consulted content experts in the field</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Where relevant, searched for grey literature</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review</div></div>		
5	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs	<div>Q: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</div> <div>For Yes: Either ONE of the following:</div>	Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-IRs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder selected by one reviewer		
6	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? For Yes: Either ONE of the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies OR <input type="checkbox"/> Two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies <u>and</u> achieved good agreement (at least 80%), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	Yes	
7	No	Yes	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? For Partial Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Provided a list of potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text For Yes: As for partial yes, plus the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Justified the exclusion from the review of each	No	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items		Appraisal	Comments
				form but excluded from the review	potentially relevant study		
8	Yes	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?		Partial Yes	Although quantitative studies were included, the focus on descriptive quantitative research and qualitative research to identify barriers and enablers means the PICO items are more relevant than PICO items for this assessment. While all PICO components are described, the assessor is not certain that all components
				For Partial Yes: All of the following:	For Yes: As for Partial Yes, plus ALL of the following:		
				Quantitative Reviews <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described outcomes</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described research designs</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described populations in detail</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described interventions in detail</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described comparators in detail</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Described study's setting</div></div>			

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> Described timeframe for follow-up <hr/> Qualitative Reviews <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described populations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described phenomenon of interest (concept) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described context (settings and services) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Described research designs		are described in sufficient detail for all users to assess relevance to their policy and practice.
9	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) or methodological quality in individual studies/evidence syntheses that were included in the review? For Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A systematic approach using a validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis was used OR <input type="checkbox"/> If there is no validated assessment instrument appropriate to the research designs included in the evidence synthesis (e.g.	Yes	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				qualitative systematic reviews), the review authors justified the assessment tool used <i>and</i> any adaptations made or not made to it to ensure its applicability.		
9a	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors identify primary study overlap in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors investigated and reported primary study overlap</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of overlap on the findings</p>	N/A.	
9b	Yes	No	-OoRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors specify methods to manage discrepancies/discordance in the evidence syntheses included in their Overview of Reviews, and account for it when interpreting the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes: All of the following:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly identified and had a procedure to manage the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR</p>	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors explicitly considered and discussed the potential biasing influence of discrepancies or discordance across the evidence syntheses included in the OoR		
10	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	Q: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for studies included in the review? For Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review <i>Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by the study author also qualifies</i>	No	
11	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? <i>For Overviews of Reviews (OoRs)</i> <i>If statistical meta-analysis was performed:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> RCT criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> NRSI criteria below are applicable <input type="checkbox"/> RCT and NRSI criteria below are both applicable <i>For RCTs:</i> For Yes:	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> Investigated the causes of heterogeneity		
				For NRSIs:		
				For Yes:		
				<input type="checkbox"/> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND <input type="checkbox"/> They used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present AND <input type="checkbox"/> They statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND <input type="checkbox"/> They reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
11a.	Yes	Yes	-ScRs	Q: Is the analytic method used appropriate for a scoping review? For Yes:	N/A.	

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input type="checkbox"/> The method of analysis is descriptive. That is, it aims to describe or map the available evidence while staying very close to the original interpretations or meanings of the evidence.		
12	No	No	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of risk of bias in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Included only low-risk of bias RCTs OR <input type="checkbox"/> If the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect	N/A.	
13	Yes	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors account for risk of bias/methodological quality in included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB or methodological quality (at both primary and secondary study level if an OoR) on the results	Yes	
14	Yes	No	-SRs -OoRs	Q: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion	Yes	Though the author does

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
			-RRs -IRs	<p>of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR <input type="checkbox"/> If heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results</p>		not provide a detailed discussion of heterogeneity, there does not appear to be significant heterogeneity in the results.
15	No	Yes	-SRs -OoRs -RRs	<p>Q: If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias</p>	N/A.	
16	No	No	-SRs -ScRs -OoRs -RRs -IRs	<p>Q: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</p> <p>For Yes:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The authors reported no competing interests OR</p>	No	The author described their funding source (Health Information and Quality Authority)

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		(HIQA)) and declared no competing interests. However, the assessor has judged the authors declaration of no competing interests as unsatisfactory, and as such appraised this item as deserving a 'no' response. This is because the funding authority (HIQA) -- and by extension 4 out of 5 authors -- could be considered to have competing

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
						<p>interests as HIQA has responsibility in Ireland for setting and enforcing health and social care standards, which is directly relevant to the topic/content of the review.</p> <p>As the guidance for assessing this item states, “When investigators have a career-long investment in a field of research, a review that conflicts with their long-held beliefs can be</p>

Item No.	New / Adapted Item?	Critical Item?	Applicable ES Types	Items	Appraisal	Comments
						confronting". While there is no evidence to suggest the findings of the review 'conflict with the long-held beliefs' of the authors, or HIQA as an organisation, the potential for such conflict remains and should be reported as a competing interest with appropriate steps taken to manage it.
Overall Confidence in the Results of the Review					Low	No for 1 critical items and 2 non-critical items

References

- Ayala-Nunes, L., Jiménez, L., Hidalgo, V., & Jesus, S. (2014). Family feedback in Child Welfare Services: A systematic review of measures. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *44*, 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.07.004>
- Baran, M., & Sawrikar, V. (2022). Service-level barriers and facilitators to father engagement in child and family services: A Systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/vm3bn>
- Bovarnick, S., Peace, D., Warrington, C., & Pearce, J. (2018). *Being Heard: Promoting Children and Young People's Involvement in Participatory Research on Sexual Violence: Findings from an international scoping review*.
- Bradbury-Jones, C., Isham, L., & Taylor, J. (2018). The complexities and contradictions in participatory research with vulnerable children and young people: A qualitative systematic review. *Social Science and Medicine*, *215*, 80–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.038>
- Brodie, I., D'Arcy, K., Harris, J., Roker, D., Shuker, L., & Pearce, J. (2016). *The participation of young people in child sexual exploitation services: a scoping review of the literature*.
- Care Inspectorate. (2012). *Practice Guide: Involving children and young people in improving children's services*.
- Commissioner for Children and Young People Western Australia. (2009). *Involving children and young people: Participation guidelines*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315883595-21>
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Council of Europe Recommendation on children's rights and social services friendly to children and families*.
- Council of Europe. (2012). *Council of Europe Recommendation on the participation of children and young people under the age of 18*.
- Council of Europe. (2016). *Child Participation Assessment Tool: Indicators for measuring progress in promoting the right of children and young people under the age of 18 to participate in matters of concern to them*.
- Department of Health and Children. (2001). *Report of the Working Group on Foster Care: Foster Care - A Child Centred Partnership*.
- Department of Health and Children. (2003). *National Standards for Foster Care*.
- Gathen, J. M., Slettebø, T., & Skjeggstad, E. (2022). User participation among people in vulnerable situations at service level: A

scoping review exploring impact for individual stakeholders and services. *Nordic Welfare Research*, 7(1), 52–67.
<https://doi.org/10.18261/nwr.7.1.4>

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2012). *National Standards for the Protection and Welfare of Children: for the Health Service Executive Children and Family Services*.

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2014). *National Standards for Special Care Units*.

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2017). *Background document to support the development of National Standards for Children's Residential Centres*.

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2018a). *Evidence Synthesis Process: Methods in the development of National Standards, Guidance and Recommendations for the Irish health and social care sector*.

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2018b). *National Standards for Children's Residential Centres*.

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2020). *Evidence review to inform the development of National Standards for Children's Social Services*.

Health Information and Quality Authority. (2021). *Evidence review to inform the development of Overarching National Standards for the Care and Support of Children using Health and Social Care Services*.

Kelly, Y., O'Rourke, N., Flynn, R., O'Connor, L., & Hegarty, J. (2023). Factors that influence the implementation of (inter)nationally endorsed health and social care standards: a systematic review and meta-summary. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, Epub ahead, 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2022-015287>

Kennan, D., Brady, B., & Forkan, C. (2016). *Exploring the Effectiveness of Structures and Procedures Intended to Support Children's Participation in Child Welfare, Child Protection and Alternative Care Services: A Systematic Literature Review*.

Larkins, C., Nowland, R., Robertson, L., Farrelly, N., Sharpe, D., Roy, A., Morocza, N., & Bernardo de Lemos, J. (2021). *Peer Research by Children and Young People and their allies: Rapid Evidence Review of best practices in health and social science literature*.

McAuley, K., & Brattman, M. (2002). *Hearing Young Voices: Consulting Children and Young People, including those experiencing Poverty or other forms of Social Exclusion, in relation to Public Policy Development in Ireland: Key Issues for Consideration*.

National Complaints Managers' Group (England). (2016). *Good Practice guidance for handling complaints concerning adults and*

children social care services (England).

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2021). *Looked-after children and young people: NICE guideline.*

Partnership for Maternal Newborn and Child Health. (2020). *Global Consensus Statement on Meaningful Adolescent and Youth Engagement.*

Partnership for Maternal Newborn and Child Health. (2022). *Practical guidance resource to operationalise the global consensus statement on meaningful adolescent and youth engagement (MAYE).* <https://doi.org/10.1109/icpr.2004.1333674>

Save the Children. (2018). *General Children's Participation Criteria: Sectoral Guideline and Instruments for Ensuring Children's Meaningful Participation.*

Shamrova, D. P., & Cummings, C. E. (2017). Participatory action research (PAR) with children and youth: An integrative review of methodology and PAR outcomes for participants, organizations, and communities. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 81, 400–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.08.022>

Steinitz, L. Y. (2009). *Guidelines for Promoting Child Participation.*

ten Brummelaar, M. D. C., Harder, A. T., Kalverboer, M. E., Post, W. J., & Knorth, E. J. (2018). Participation of youth in decision-making procedures during residential care: A narrative review. *Child and Family Social Work*, 23(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12381>

The National Children's Office, The Children's Rights Alliance, & The National Youth Council of Ireland. (2005). *Young Voices: guidelines on how to involve children and young people in your work.*

Waddington, H., Sonnenfeld, A., Finetti, J., Gaarder, M., John, D., & Stevenson, J. (2019). Citizen engagement in public services in low- and middle-income countries: A mixed-methods systematic review of participation, inclusion, transparency and accountability (PITA) initiatives. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(e1025). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1025>

Wells, K., & Sametz, L. (1985). Involvement of Institutionalized Children in Social Science Research: Some Issues and Proposed Guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 14(3), 245–251.

Zuchowski, I., Miles, D., Woods, C., & Tsey, K. (2019). Continuous Quality Improvement Processes in Child Protection: A Systematic Literature Review. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 29(4), 389–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731517743337>



TÚSLA

An Ghníomhaireacht um
Leanaí agus an Teaghlach
Child and Family Agency