

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/127249/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Graham, Meghan R, Tierney, Stephanie, Chisholm, Amy and Fox, John R E 2020. The lived experience of working with people with eating disorders: A meta-ethnography. *International Journal of Eating Disorders* 53 (3) , pp. 422-441. 10.1002/eat.23215 filefilefilefilefilefile

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eat.23215>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eat.23215>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Table 1*Quality ratings using CASP (2010) checklist***Formatted: Font: Bold****Formatted: Font: Italic**

CASP criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1
3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims?	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1
4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims?	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1
5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
6. Was the researcher-participant relationship adequately considered?	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0
8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5
9. Is there a clear statement of findings?	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1
10. How valuable is the research?	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total score	5	5.5	8.5	9	8	9.5	8.5	8.5	7.5	7.5	8.5	7.5	7	7	7	7.5	7.5	7.5	8

CASP criterion	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims?	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5
4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims?	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	1	1
5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5
6. Was the researcher-participant relationship adequately considered?	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0
7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0	0.5	0.5	0.5
9. Is there a clear statement of findings?	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5
10. How valuable is the research?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5
Total score	9.5	9	9	8.5	6.5	8	9.5	6	6.5	8	7.5	7.5	6.5	10	7	7.5	8.5	6.5