## Standalone project documentation - Process evaluation report data extraction and quality assessment tools

This document reproduces material from using the EPPI-Centre tool<sup>150</sup>

## Data extraction tool – process evaluations

Consider if the study has reported the following. Provide justifications for your response wherever possible.

Intervention
Intervention location
Details (country; area(s) of country)
Not stated
Description of intervention
Details (overall aim(s) of the intervention; key components of the intervention; content and
activities; who delivered the intervention; deviations from original protocol; etc.)
Not stated
Timing and duration of the intervention
Details
Details
Not stated
Target population
Details (specific characteristics; how they were recruited)
Sections (Specific characteristics), now they were recruited)
Not stated
Technology
Details
Not stated
Provider organisation description
Details
Not stated
How intervention was developed
Details
Not stated
Intervention theory of change

Intervention theory of change Details

Not stated
Intervention offered to control group
Not applicable
Details
Details
Not stated
Evaluation
Research questions or hypotheses:
Details
Not stated
Evaluation examined (tick all which apply)
Feasibility
Fidelity
Quality
Coverage/reach/accessibility
Acceptability/satisfaction
Mechanism
Context
Not stated
Not stated
Overall design within which evaluation is part RCT
Quasi-experimental comparison
Uncontrolled before/after
Cross-sectional
Other (please state):
Other (please state).
Not stated
Timing of evaluation
Details
Details
Not stated
Not stated
Sampling methods
Details
Not stated
Sample size, response rates at baseline
Details
Details
1

Not stated

Sample size, response rates at follow-up Details
Not relevant
Not stated
Socio-demographic characteristics of participants at baseline/follow-up Details
Not stated
Methods of data collection
Details (including period of data collection; types of data; comments on quality of data, etc.)
Cotano (moratam giperios or sasta comoción, typos or sasta, commento on quanty or sasta, estal,
Not stated
Mathods of data analysis
Methods of data analysis
Details
Not stated
Findings
How processes of delivery/ receipt varied with characteristics of interventions, providers, participants or contexts  Details
Not stated
Quality assessment tool
Consider if the study has reported the following. Provide justifications for your response wherever possible.
Were steps taken to minimise bias and error/increase rigour in sampling? Yes
No
Plus free text explaining decision (for example: was the sampling strategy appropriate to the questions being asked?; were all stakeholders included?)
Were steps taken to minimise bias and error/increase rigour in data collection? Yes
No Plus free text explaining decision (for example: were data collection tools validated or piloted?; was data collection comprehensive, flexible and/or sensitive to provide a rich description of processes?)

Were steps taken to minimise bias and error/increase rigour in data analysis? Yes
No No
Plus free text explaining decision (for example: were analysis methods systematic?; was diversity in perspective explored?)
Many the findings of the extends presented in large standing and the
Were the findings of the study grounded in/supported by data? Yes
No
Plus free text explaining decision (for example: were enough data presented to show how the authors arrived at their findings?; do the data presented fit the interpretation provided?)
Was there good breadth and depth achieved in the findings? Yes
No
Plus free text explaining decision (for example: were a range of process issues covered in the evaluation?; were the perspectives of participants fully explored in terms of breadth—contrast of two or more perspectives—and depth—insight into a single perspective?)
Were the perspectives of young people privileged? Yes
No Plus free text explaining decision (for example: were young people included in the evaluation?; was there a balance between open-ended and fixed-response options?)
Overall judgement informed by the above criteria
How reliable or trustworthy overall are the findings? (i.e. the extent to which the methods employed were rigorous/could minimise bias and error in the findings)  Low
Medium
High
Plus free text explaining the decision
How useful, overall, were the findings for shedding light on factors relating to the research questions?
Low
Medium
High Plus free text explaining the decision
This free text explaining the decision