

Appendix 3- Systematic Review Quality Tables

0= poor (e.g. not included or addressed or significant limitations)

1= acceptable (e.g. addressed but inadequate detail/ some elements lacking/ lack of clarity/ some limitations)

2= Good (e.g. robust, adequately addressed and clearly explained)

Authors	Aims/ purposes	Lit review	Study design	Sampling	Sample size and attrition	Validity and reliability	Data Collection	Analysis	Limitations	Conclusions and recommendations
Jahoda, Pert & Trower (2006)	2- Rationale and purpose for study of the study identified. Aims stated and reflect lit review	2-Title and abstract clear and informative about what was done and found. Scientific background and rationale outlined what is known and gaps using up to date studies. A critical analysis of work to date.	2- Key elements of design presented. No control task employed however rationale for this provided. Variables were defined.	2- Target population identified. Samples drawn from day services and recruitment and selection procedures described. Matched on BPVS, IQ, gender and age.	1- Strong sample size. Reasons for non-participation outlined. No power calculation.	1-Some data on validity of Ekman and Friesen's photographs. Limited information regarding previous studies employing the same assessment in the same population.	2-Clear outline of assessments used and scoring. Open ended questions used.	2- Descriptive statistics provided. Met the assumptions for parametric analysis. Statistical analysis clearly described. P values provided.	2- Consideration of confounding variables. Limitations discussed.	2- Results interpreted and compared to previous studies. Appropriate conclusions drawn. Clinical implications and future research possibilities outlined. 18/20

Matheson & Jahoda (2005)	2-Clear aims and hypotheses set out. Rationale for study provided.	2-Title and abstract indicate design and summarise what was done and found. Thorough review of literature to date, identifying gaps. Critical analysis done.	1-Design not specifically mentioned within methodology. Control task employed. Variables measured were defined.	2-Clear recruitment procedure and inclusion and exclusion criteria outlined. Types of behaviour clearly described. Similar numbers of men and women included. There were no significant differences between the groups on age, IQ and verbal comprehension as measured by	1-19 frequently aggressive people vs 15 people with no significant problems with aggression. No power calculation. Sample size = sufficient	2- Some information provided on validity and reliability of instruments used and process of validating the tools developed.	2-Clear outline of assessments used and scoring. Random presentation between emotion and control tests. All used picture formats so accessible for people with a learning disability. Open ended questions or multiple choice formats used	2- Tests of skewness done and non-parametric tests employed descriptive statistics provided for each variable.	2-Good and clear outline of study limitations	2-Interpretation of results provided and previous studies referred to. Ideas for future research and clinical implications identified. 18/20
--------------------------	--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	---	--

				BPVS. People with Autism excluded						
McKenzie, Hamilton, Matheson, McKaskie & Murray (2000)	2-Linked to lit review, aim outlined. Purpose of study identified.	1- Title and abstract do not relate to design and abstract offers no insight into what was done or found. Errors in referencing/ quoting work- Relevance of communication refs to this study unclear. Some up to date studies but not thorough literature review and very limited critical analysis.	0- Some information on study design but not clearly outlined. No Control task used. Definition of challenging behaviour but not clear definitions of variables being measured in the 3 types of assessment	1-no information about where sample was drawn from. Sample were identified as CB or not CB by staff who had known them for 1 year or more. Non – CB group matched for age, gender and level if LD. More men than women- ? gender bias(22/10) No inclusion or exclusion	1-16- cb vs 16 non cb— small sample- ? power? Sufficie nt sample size but borderli ne. No power calculati on. When uses aggress ive sub- group, n=14-	0- no information on the validity and reliability of assessmen ts. CB not measured.	2- good description of assessments completed and scoring. Multiple choice and open ended questions used.	1- Descriptive s for each variable provided. No information about distribution of scores, parametric tests used and unclear if these are appropriat e. Results described and P values reported.	0- no discussion of study limitations	1-Overall description of the results and referred to previous research. No real conclusions drawn, some ideas about future work and the mediating effect of staff beliefs. No discussion of clinical implications. 9/20

				criteria or selection method. Overall description of age, level of LD, gender- not broken down into groups	weak in terms of power No attrition information.					
Moffatt, Hanley- Maxwell & Donnellan (1995)	2- Rationale and purpose for study clearly outlined. Aims stated. They reflect lit review	1- Review includes relevant studies up to that point. Confusing a number of concepts however- social skills, empathy, emotional recognition Clear title and abstract. Abstract indicates significant differences found but no such tests	0- Some information on study design but not clearly outlined. No Control task. Variables not well defined	1- Stratified sampling procedure utilised to select 40 participants from a potential 250. Inclusion and exclusion criteria outlined. No control group used.	0- 40 participants-10 per group. No evidence of power calculation. 10 per group unlikely to be enough	1- Some Information about the validity and reliability of test instruments provided. Some evidence validated in LD population Outcome of reliability comparison	2- good description of assessment completed and scoring. Open ended questions used.	0- No tests were done to identify if significant differences existed between the groups. Descriptives were the only analyses done. No assessment of	0- No outline of study limitations.	1-Results summarised and related to previous research. Conclusions drawn that community adjustment problems were due to interpersonal skills – not enough evidence to support this. Also support staff have little understanding of the social skill level of service users. As no tests of

		done. Some scientific background and rationale for study. Previous research not critically analysed, What is known is outlined but little attention to gaps in research.			- weak. No information regarding non-participation at each stage.	s not reported.		distribution . Appropriate tests not employed		difference done should not be reporting on significant differences. Recommendations made for future research and clinical implications identified. 8/20
Proctor & Beail (2007)	2-Clear hypotheses set out. They do reflect literature review. Research problem set out.	2 – Title and abstract clear, abstract outlines what was done and what was found. Thorough literature review including a good scientific background to the study, all relevant and up to date literature	1-No explicit outline of study design within methodology . All variables clearly defined. No control tasks	2- Information provided on age range. No significant differences in IQ across groups. Participants recruited from secure services for people with a learning	2- Power calculation completed and explained- 25 Participants within each group.	1-Some Reliability and validity information provided for all the questionnaires used including disclosure about when this information	2- A good description of each questionnaire and the procedure for delivering it. Questionnaires were presented in a random order. Open ended questions	2- justification for the tests used and explanation about data qualities (descriptives and parametric or not)	2-study limitations outlined. Consideration given to confounding variables-e.g. IQ	2-conclusions and clinical implications outlined and ideas for future research presented. Overall interpretation of results presented. Validity in relation to other studies discussed.

		and recognised gaps. Critical analysis of the literature.		<p>disability who offend and community day services/ psychology services.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria explicit- people with serious mental health problems and those on the autistic spectrum. All male- gender bias. No information on nature of offences.</p> <p>Would benefit from better description of control group- cb/ offending</p>	Sample size sufficient	was not available, not applicable due to alteration for use with LD etc. No reliability or validity for adapted questionnaires.	used.	provided. Good account of what was found and p values		18/20
--	--	---	--	--	------------------------	---	-------	---	--	--------------

Ralfs & Beail (2011)	2- exploratory study – no hypotheses about differences, relationships or directions data expected to take. Aims of the study set out which do reflect literature review.	2- Title and abstract clear, abstract sets out what was done and what was found. Thorough literature review and scientific background with up to date relevant papers and outcomes of previous research explored. Balanced critical review of papers done.	1- Design section clearly outlines the study design which is appropriate to the aims. Variables defined. No control task.	2- Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria. Participants recruited from secure and community services. Break down of offences, ages, IQ scores etc. No significant differences between the groups on age or IQ. All male as sex offender population usually are. Control group matched.	1- 19 participants in sex offender group and 20 in control. No reference to power calculations. Sufficient sample size and reasons for non-participation identified.	0- Only face validity referred to.	2- good description of questionnaire and procedure. Consent sought and those who did not have capacity were excluded. Open ended questions used.	2- Data did not meet criteria for parametric analyses so non-parametric tests employed (RANOVA)	2- Limitations of study and findings explored.	2-Results summarised and interpreted. Conclusions and clinical implications outlined and ideas for future research presented. 16/20
----------------------	--	--	---	--	--	------------------------------------	--	---	--	---

Walz & Benson (1996)	2-aims reflect literature review. Aims and objectives stated.	1-Study design not indicated in title or abstract. Abstract lacks information about what was done but findings clearly identified. Study does have overview of what is known and up to date pertinent studies and reviews. Critiques the evidence base and gaps in knowledge identified	2- Design not explicitly explained. Control task used – labelling activity from photo. Variables clearly defined.	1- Explained inclusion and exclusion criteria and recruitment and selection processes. Matched across groups re IQ. ASD not excluded	1- 39 men- 18 aggressive and 21 non-aggressive. No reference to power calculations. Information regarding attrition and how the final number of participants was	1- Some information on reliability and validity of measures but limited. All measures used had been used in previous studies with people with a learning disability populations bar one. Not adapted.	2- questionnaires described fully. Multiple choice and open ended question formats used.	1- No evidence of checking psychometric properties of data-parametric tests used- ? Appropriate. Some information regarding the tests used. No information regarding the missing data. Factual account of what is found	0- No discussion of study limitations	1-Conclusions relevant to findings and previous studies referred to. No information regarding recommendations for future research. No discussion of clinical implications. 12/20
----------------------	---	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

					reached			including significanc e. Descriptive stats provided.		
--	--	--	--	--	---------	--	--	---	--	--