

Title	Self-reported feedback in ICT-delivered aphasia rehabilitation: a literature review
Authors	Kearns, Áine; Kelly, Helen; Pitt, Ian
Publication date	2019-09-05
Original Citation	Kearns, Á., Kelly, H. and Pitt, I. (2019) 'Self-reported feedback in ICT-delivered aphasia rehabilitation: a literature review', Disability and Rehabilitation, pp. 1-15. doi: 10.1080/09638288.2019.1655803
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1080/09638288.2019.1655803
Rights	© 2019, Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Disability and Rehabilitation on 5 September 2019, available online: <a href="http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09638288.2019.1655803">http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09638288.2019.1655803</a>
Download date	2025-04-12 16:36:14
Item downloaded from	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/10468/8529">https://hdl.handle.net/10468/8529</a>

Supplementary Table 1	Summary of MMAT scores																									
	Screening		Qualitative				Quantitative randomised controlled (trials)				Quantitative non randomised				Quantitative descriptive				Mixed Methods							
		Do the collected data allow address the research question (objective)?	1.1. Are the sources of qualitative data	1.2. Is the process for analyzing qualitative data	1.3. Is appropriate consideration given to how findings relate to the context, e.g., the setting, in which the data were collected?	1.4. Is appropriate consideration given to how findings relate to researchers' influence, e.g., through their interactions with participants?	2.1. Is there a clear description of the randomization (or an appropriate sequence generation)?	2.2. Is there a clear description of the allocation concealment (or blinding when applicable)?	2.3. Are there complete outcome data (80% or above)?	2.4. Is there low withdrawal/drop-out (below 20%)?	3.1. Are participants (organizations) recruited in a way that minimizes selection bias?	3.2. Are measurements appropriate (clear origin, or validity known, or standard instrument; and absence of contamination between groups when appropriate) regarding the exposure/intervention and difference between these groups?	3.3. In the groups being compared (exposed vs. non-exposed; with intervention vs. without; cases vs. controls), are the participants comparable, or do researchers take into account (control for) the difference (depending on the duration of follow-up)?	3.4. Are there complete outcome data (80% or above), and, when applicable, an acceptable response rate (60% or above), or an acceptable follow-up rate for cohort studies (depending on the duration of follow-up)?	4.1. Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the quantitative research question (quantitative aspect of the mixed methods question)?	4.2. Is the sample representative of the population under study?	4.3. Are measurements appropriate (clear origin, or validity known, or standard instrument)?	4.4. Is there an acceptable response rate (60% or above)?	5.1. Is the mixed research design relevant to address the qualitative and quantitative questions (or objectives), or the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the mixed methods question (or objective)?	5.2. Is the integration of qualitative and quantitative data (or results*) relevant to address the research question (objective)?	5.3. Is appropriate consideration given to the limitations associated with this integration, e.g., the divergence of qualitative and quantitative data (or results*) in a triangulation design?	MMAT Score				
Author	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	yes	can't tell									can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	**				
Albright and Purves [28]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes																****				
Amaya et al. [40]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes																****				
Brandenburg et al. [38]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	can't tell																***				
Bruce et al. [29]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	can't tell									can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes	can't tell	yes	no	*				
Caute et al. [25]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes									yes	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	***				
Cherney et al. [26]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	can't tell									can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	**				
Cherney et al. [36]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell		yes									can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	*				
Choi et al. [33]	yes	yes													can't tell	yes	yes	yes				***				
Galliers et al. [39]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no									can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	**				
Hill and Breslin [35]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes									yes	yes	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	yes	***				
Mallet et al. [34]	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no									yes	yes	can't tell	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	*				
Marshall et al. [31]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	yes									can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	**				
Marshall et al. [30]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	can't tell									yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	*				
Palmer et al. [24]	yes	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	yes									yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	***				
Routhier et al. [27]	yes	yes													can't tell	can't tell	yes	yes				**				
Wade et al. [37]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes																****				
Wenke et al. [32]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	can't tell					can't tell	yes	no	yes					yes	yes	can't tell	*				