

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', <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i> , 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 <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i> on 5 September 2019, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09638288.2019.1655803
Download date	2024-04-22 05:58:44
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/8529

Supplementary Table 1																						
Summary of MMAT scores																						
Screening																						
Qualitative																						
Quantitative randomised controlled (trials)																						
Quantitative non randomised																						
Quantitative descriptive																						
Mixed Methods																						
Author	Do the collected data allow address the research question (objective)?	1.1. Are the sources of qualitative data (archives, documents, informants, observations) relevant to address the research question (objective)?	1.2. Is the process for analyzing qualitative data relevant to address the research question (objective)?	1.3. Is appropriate consideration given to how findings relate to researchers' influence, e.g., to the context, in which the data were collected?	1.4. Is appropriate consideration given to how findings relate to researchers' 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 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 outcomes?	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 for cohort studies (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 (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 methods research design relevant to address the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the mixed methods research question (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	
Albright and Purves [28]	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	can't tell	***
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	yes	no	*
Caute et al. [25]	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes								yes	can't tell	yes	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	yes	can't tell	*
Cherney et al. [36]	yes	yes	yes	can't tell	can't tell	yes																***
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	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	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																***
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	*