Appendix 9: MMAT Spreadsheet

Ref ID	Author	S1. Are there clear research questions?	S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?	1.1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	1.2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	1.3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	1.4. Is the interpreting of results sufficiently supported by data?	1.5. Is there coherence between qual data sources, collection, analysis + interpretation?	Notes	3.1. Are the p's representative of target population?	3.2. Are measures appropriate regarding both the outcome + intervention (or exposure)?	3.3. Are there complete outcome data?	3.4. Are the confounder accounted for in the design + analysis?	3.5. During the study period, is the intervention delivered (or exposure occurred) as intended?	Notes	Quantitative comparative descriptive study OR Quantitative non comparative descriptive study	4.1. Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?	4.2. Is the sample representative of the target population?	4.3. Are the measures appropriate?	4.4. Is the risk of non response bias low?	4.5. Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question?	Notes	5.1. Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods to address the research question?	5.2. Are the different parts of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	5.3. Are the outputs of integrated qual + quant components adequately interpreted?	5.4. Are divergences between quant + qual results adequately addressed?	5.5. Do the different parts of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?	Notes	MMAT SCORE (& %)
1001	Demb & Pincus, 1993	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Case study, series qualitative description of case 'history/presentation' explanation of a 'selection criteria'																				4/4 = 100%
1002	Schottle et al., 2017	Yes	Yes													Quantitative comparative descriptive study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes								4/5 = 80%
1003	Shier, 2015	Yes	Yes													Quantitative non comparative descriptive study	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Yes	Yes	n=227/263 completed survey = low non-response bias / 2/5 domains had low reliability identified in limitations - author claims aim to further test reliability & validity using this study.							3/5 = 60%
1004	Stokes & Kaur, 2005	Yes	Yes													Quantitative comparative descriptive study	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	4.4. approx. 30% response rate // 4.2 although there is a high non response bias, sample is representative of characteristics.. no indication that certain eligible p's did not participate //4.3 novel tool has low validity							3/5 = 60%
1005	Silva et al., 2003	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 unclear why this case was selected or what the case criteria was																				3/4 = 75%

ID	Author								Notes		Study type						Notes						Notes	Score
1006	White et al., 2017	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 author selects individual cases to exemplify points but doesn't specify why cases were selected from others. Consistent level of information provided for each															3/4 = 75%
1007	Albertini et al., 2006	N/A	N/A									Quantitative non comparative descriptive study	Can't Tell	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	Quantitative case report // 4.2 only one case // 4.3 the validity + reliability of the measures has not been considered // 4.5 statistical analysis not used but descriptive stats appear sufficient						1/3 = 33%
1008	Allely, 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.2 - doesn't specify why case selected over other / questionnaire delivered to client for the discussion however unclear how particular findings derived from data - analysis unclear.															0/4 = 0%
1009	Allely et al., 2019	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 selection criteria + sufficient description provided. // reports used to derive data + interpretation but doesn't define 'empirical approach' used to analyse															4/4 = 100%
1010	Allen et al., 2008	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Difficult to establish coherence as analysis process is not defined for the qualitative data. Qualitative findings are merely presented.		Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Yes	4.3 measures used were not piloted are tested for validity // the sampling technique involved selection through numerous groups hence reducing bias - variance of presentations	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	unclear how qualitative interviews were analysed. No formal analysis process is identified // 5.5. the qualitative approach was of less quality than the quantitative approach	4/7 = 57%

ID	Study												Study type										Score
1011	Anckarsä ter et alk., 2008	Yes	Yes										Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	quantitative account of 47 case series			4/5 = 80%
1012	Aral et al., 2018	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes														4/4 = 100%
1013	Ayaydin & Ulgar, 2018	N/A	N/A										Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	4.3 - The reliability+ validity of measures not specified // 4.5 numerical frequency sufficient to answer question // This study considered quantitative rather than qualitative due the quantified measuremen ts			2/3 = 66%
1014	Ballan, 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes														5/5 = 100%
1015	Van Bourgon dienet al., 1997	Yes	Yes										Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	4.4 Although the response rate is supported as being high 66% of 35 homes + 36% of 107 homes (-21) is far below the 70% nonresponse bias threshold set in mmat			4/5 = 80%
1016	Cambrid ge, 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Although largely descriptive, + less 'interpretatio n' the conclusions drawn are clearly related to case description. Argument revealing some of the associated dilemmas.													3/4 = 100%

ID	Study																	Score
1017	Celikkol & Bilgic, 2018	N/A	N/A					Quantitative non comparative study	Can't Tell	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	N/A	4.1 why was case selected other than successful nature. // 'quantifiable information'. Also considered a case report because it is describing a response to treatment with an outcome measure. --> questions difficult to apply as limited info		0/2 = 0%
1018	Cervantes & Matson, 2015	Yes	Yes			Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes						3/5 = 60%
1019	Chen et al., 2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	No	1.2 - Case selection presented describing treatment of ISB, doesn't specify why / 1.3 behaviours + change described + discussed appropriately. 1.4 whether interpretations are substantiated by data 1.5 some conclusions seem over generalised						1/4 = 25%
1020	Clionsky & Nzi, 2019	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 unclear why this case was selected or what the case criteria was // 1.3/1.4 findings + interpretation of case study are sufficient + sound based on data // 1.5 conclusions are drawn based on the case study + lit discussion are sound						3/4 = 75%

ID	Study								Notes							Score
1021	Coshway et al, 2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.2 author is describing case due to the ethical dilemma raised on the basis of the medication request // form of a discussion/opinion paper following a description of the case + therefore 1.3 to 1.5 are N/A							0/0 = 0
1022	Coskun & Mukaddes, 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 identified as the first case in literature where mirtazapine is used for fetishist behaviour in asd presenting clear justification for it being chosen for reporting							4/4 = 100%
1023	Coskun et al., 2009	Yes	Yes							Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	before + after/ 3.1 no clear criteria for recruitment 3.2 appropriateness, reliability or validity of scales not presented. some description around frequency monitoring / 3.2 90% complete outcome data (1 drop out). / 3.4 were p's undergoing any other treatment/interventions at the time confounding bias may be low	2/4 40%
1024	Creaby-attwood & Allely, 2017	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								4/4 = 100%
1025	De Tilio, 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.2 data collection + recruitment changes described 1.3 process of analysis not described in detail - difficult to establish. 1.4 quotes are provided to substantiate the interpretation but unclear how quotes + themes established							3/5 = 60%

ID	Study																	Notes	Study type						Notes						Score
1026	Deepmala & Agrawal, 2014	N/A	N/A																	Quantitative non comparison study	Yes	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	4.1 1st case success 4.3 measurement involved charting frequency is sufficient to underst+ effectiveness of drug however you cant establish whether this was conducted reliably, i.e. who conducted it, when, what circumstances. are figures reliable? charting/recording information in home setting not						2/3 = 66%
1027	Dozier et al., 2011	Yes	Yes							N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					before + after = comparison of outcome between intervention but only 1 account - most suitable quality appraisal questions 3.3 graphs presented no missing data													4/4 = 100%
1028	Eyuboglu et al., 2018	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							1.3 case selection justified as other treatments have not been successful + the client presented with risk. - significance of case justification provided															4/4 = 100%
1029	Fern+es et al., 2016	Yes	Yes						Yes	No	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	N/A					Cohort study 3.2 measures explained + although most of the criteria is sufficiently met, SexQ not tested for reliability + validity but was measured. Details of interview not provided. DISCO large discrepancy in interrate reliability from low - excellent. Unclear why measures still													1/4 = 25%

ID	Study																														Score
1030	Fisher et al., 2000	Yes	Yes						No	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	3.1 inclusion exclusion is not clearly stated + therefore difficult to establish target population/representation also.																	3/5 = 60%
1031	Gkogkos et al., 2021	Yes	Yes						Quantitative non comparative study	Can't Tell	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	4.3 Variables defined + justification as to why measures used however reliability + validity measures not presented + therefore unable to make the judgment															1/3 = 33%
1032	Gougeon, 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	4.3 variables are explained + described however the reliability + validity of adapted measures is not clear despite piloting. 4.4 unable to determined how many individuals/carers may have seen the advertisement for the study but chosen not to participate.	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	5.4 'divergence' between different types of data does not need to be considered as the data was gathering different things. types of data/methods was aimed at different aims of the project 5.5. 3 or more criteria's met for both methodologies	6/7 = 85%
1033	Griffin-Shelley, 2010	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes															3/4 = 75%

ID	Author	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Qual notes									Study type							Quant notes						Overall notes	Score
1034	Hannah & Stagg, 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.3 detailed thematic analysis + explanation of themes provided in the appendix.									Quantitative Comparative study	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	4.1 unclear sample recruitment 4.2 unable to establish representation of samples as target population + recruitment population not identified + who didn't participate. . 4.3 measures + variables described including validity + reliability	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	5.5 due to the lack of details around sample + recruitment the quantitative aspect lacks rigour + does not meet the 3 x 'yes' criteria. 5.4 adequate hypotheses around why individuals with asd have considered they don't need further sex ed training but scored lower on sexual awareness	4/5 = 78%
1035	Hansen, 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.1. phenomenological approach to establish commonality of experience																							5/5 = 100%
1036	Hartman et al., 2019	Yes	Yes		3/5														Quantitative Comparative Study	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Yes	4.2 reasoning behind those who were not part of study considered in limitations 4.3 measures + variables described in detail however several measures had alpha coefficient below fairy low below 0.6							3/5 = 60%
1037	Hellemans et al., 2007	Yes	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.1 no, survey seems more appropriate given use of dichotomous + Likert scales + minimal use of qualitative info in results 1.2 unclear how data is recorded from interviews + converted to Likert scales. 1.3 qualitative info brief. .1.3 Details regarding qual process + analysis seem unclear									Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4.1 strategy desicrbed eligible p's. 4.2 identified clearly. 4.4 30% of eligible individuals chose not to participate however caregivers claimed 4.3 no evidence of semi structured interview being piloted etc	No	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	N/A	No	5.2 qualitative component not clearly defined in how it informed the quant information or interpretations	2/5 = 40%

ID	Study								Notes							Study type						Notes						Score
1038	Hellemans et al., 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.2 how was data recorded - i.e. notes, scales completed whilst conducting, recordings. 1.3 analysis for qual descriptions not clear however quantifiable information is clearly explained.							Quantitative comparative study	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	4.3 the measure was revised, no justification + explanation, no pilot or testing of measure 4.4 35 caregivers for 39 clients, numbers not explained? possible non response? same clients?	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	N/A	No	1/3 = 35%
1039	Herguner et al., 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 Case selection criteria not present, just highlights a successful case.																			3/4 = 75%
1040	Hodges et al., 2020	Yes	Yes		4/4 =100%						N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	before + after testing outcomes between two treatments. Could be considered a case report however the comparison of intervention would be a before + after test. 3.1 only one participant.												4/4 =100%
1041	Holmes et al., 2020	Yes	Yes													Quantitative non comparative study	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	4.1 does not specify sample strategy however details regarding sample pool. 4.2 does not consider those who chose not to participant however those recruited details present inc inclusion exclusion criteria. 4.3 novel survey measure described + measure piloted + amended accordingly, SRS good reliability						2/5 = 40%

ID	Study																									Score
1042	Huwaidi & Daghustani, 2013	Yes	Yes												Yes	No	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	4.2 targeted population initially included women also, however as only 6 women consented they were then excluded. . 4.3 measures + variables explained in details.average/ good/high reliability of measures. 4.4. not clearly specified 4.5 relevant statistical tests for the different aims applied						3/5 = 60%
1043	Kelbrick & Radley, 2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 Unclear why his case was selected																	3/4 = 75%
1044	Kohn et al., 1998	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 there is no specification as to why this case was chosen or the selection criteria. 1.3 interpretation is in line with he details of the case presented																	3/4 = 75%
1045	Chan & Saluja, 2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.4. limited discussion + interpretation of what this case study demonstrates in relation to brain injury + autism																	1/4 = 25%
1046	Mann, 2021	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.1 qual aspect involved summaries/descriptions of the quant + qual information provided from files/data base information. Narrative based summaries for each of the case.						Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	4.1 data collection protocol + reliability of data extraction tested. 95% reliability 4.5 descriptive stats sufficiently described.	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	8/9 = 95%

ID	Study																							Study type						Notes						Score
1047	Ruble & Dalrymple, 1993	Yes	Yes																					Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	4.2 only a 3rd responded to survey + comparison of drop out group could not be performed, 3rd is not deemed sufficient to represent the larger group 4.4 non response bias is high.. 4.3 measure was piloted prior to use + .86 coefficient						3/5 = 60%
1048	Fourie et al., 2017	Yes	Yes																					Quantitative non comparative study	Yes	No	Can't Tell	No	Can't Tell	4.2 only mothers or gr+mothers who responded therefore not representative of parent category 4.3 unclear how / why questions were used from those two measures + any piloting of questionnaires 4.4 non response bias is high as only 31/100 responded + only 24 agreed to participate. 4.5 statistical analysis not clearly						1/3 = 20%
1049	Stokes et al., 2007	Yes	Yes																					Quantitative comparative study	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	4.3 variables for subscales clearly explained, measure was created based on past lit + reliability testing completed 4.4 non response bias is not low but authors claim that is representative of general response when related to asd populations						4/5 = 80%
1050	Nguyen & Murphy, 2001	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes																											3/4 = 75%

ID	Study								Notes							Type							Notes					Notes	Score
1051	Melvin et al., 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	ADOS-2 to confirm some diagnosis + Semi structured interview - data collection procedure escribed in detail 1.4 quotes provided + explanations in line with data presented																				5/5 = 100%
1052	Miyahara et al., 2008	Yes	Yes		3/5 40%												Quantitative comparative study	Yes	No	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	4.2 71/172 responses used in the study based on 'previous' study + 'preliminary study' . may exclude important information from those excluded. not representative. 4.3 no pilot or tested measure or variable defined.					2/3 = 40%
1053	Ch+rasa & Champika, 2017	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 presented due to the uniqueness + cultural aspects of the case. Clear justification for case selection + presentation.																				4/4 = 100%
1054	Mogavero & Hsu, 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.1 questionnaires include open ended questions 1.3 unclear how the findings were derived from the data + what analysis process took place to synthesise this information.								Quantitative comparative study	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	4.1 convenience /snowball sampling 4.2 diverse characteristics representative target populations 4.3 reliability + validity of CBS unclear. 4.4 study invitation not sent to others	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Yes	No	5.3 cant be sure that interpretation is sufficient as the data analysis process for qualitative aspects are unclear. 5.5 qual doesn't meet 3 or more criteria's	4/7 = 57%
1055	Muller, 2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	No	1.3 some findings not grounded in the case description 1.4 some conclusions/statements made within the discussion section seem generalised.																				0/5 = 0%

	Study								Comment							Type						Comment					Score
1056	Murphy et al., 2007	Yes	Yes							Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	3.3. all 8 out of 10 p's who were able to complete study completed data contributing to all measures. however cant tell if any data was missing out of these.												3/5 = 60%
1057	Palermo & Bogaerts, 2017	Yes	Yes													Quantitative non comparative study	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	N/A	Yes	4.1. / 4.2 unclear whether cases were unique or whether selected from a larger pool of studies. this refers to the measurement scales used + quantifiable information used.					1/2 = 50%
1058	Payne et al., 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes																			5/5 = 100%
1059	Peixoto et al., 2017	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 clearly justified that case presented as no other cases addressing this issue along with clear description of where the information was gathered from for write up of case study																		4/5 = 80%
1060	Prasher & Clarke, 1996	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 no clear identification of why this case was selected other than a comorbidity 1.3/1.4 reasonable inferences are made based on the case study at h+.																		3/4 = 75%
1061	Pritchard et al., 2016	N/A	N/A													Quantitative non comparative	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	4.1 as this is a case report, there is no 'sample strategy'. 4.1 can not claim that a sample is representative given that it is a case report of 1 individual					2/3 = 66%

ID	Study								Comment				Study type						Comment			Score
1062	Pryde & Jahoda, 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes															5/5 = 100%
1063	Ray, Marks & Bray-Garretson, 2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 unclear why cases were selected + inconsistent level of inf provided. Why was treatment discussed for the remainder cases? 1.5 Discussion sufficient + reasonable interpretations + recommendations made.														3/4 = 75%
1064	Realmuto & Ruble, 1999	N/A	N/A											Quantitative Comparative study	Yes	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	4.1 case selected as previous treatments were unsuccessful. 4.3 how was frequency of masturbation monitored/recorded.			2/3 = 66%
1065	Moskowitz, 2009	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	A clear description is provided of the case + no inferences are made which are inconsistent or inadequately generalised														3/5 = 75%
1066	Shahani, 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.2 unclear why case selected. an assumption may be unsuccessful nature of past treatments but not clearly justified by author. 1.3-1.5 author claims that a significant improvement was made but evident in explanation (Data) of observation														0/4 = 0%

ID	Study								Notes		Study type						Notes	Score
1067	Shenk & Brown, 2007	Yes	Yes								Quantitative non comparative studies	Can't Tell	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	4.3 Juvenile Sexual offender Assessment author has not specified reliability or validity of this nor of other assessments used. No psychometric properties mentioned	1/3 = 33%
1068	Singh & Coffey, 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes										3/4 = 75%
1069	Teti et al., 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.1 Qual approach to explore + compare perspective 1.2 measures were piloted + adapted based on a previous model. 1.5 similarities + differences identified in line with data. Coherent between data + interpretations									5/5 = 100%
1070	Thompson & Beail, 2002	Yes	Yes								Quantitative comparative study	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	4.3 measures how they are recorded + assessed is clearly explained. Measures are clearly operationalized + clarified.	2/3 = 66%
1071	Tissot, 2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.1 adequate method however quantitative measures of progress could have been valuable. 1.2 data was gathered using numerous means, clear reasoning behind these cases selected.									5/5 = 100%

ID	Study	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	Comment A	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	Study type	C13	C14	C15	C16	C17	Comment B	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	Comment C	Score
1072	Van Son-Schoones & Van Bilsen, 1995	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.1 qual approach of interviews in addition + questionnaires 1.2 details regarding data collection in questionnaires + interviews seems insufficient. 1.5 no identification of analysis.						Quantitative non comparative study	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	Yes	sample strategy not specified 4.4 half of the group contacted returned initial questionnaire + even less agreed to be interviewed. 4.5 frequency of behaviours recorded based on disclosure.	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	No	Author has not specified a mixed methods approach. Unclear whethe questionnaire was quant or qual. Qual summary of questions + with some frequency data therefore considered mixed methods 5.2. difficult to determine how data was combined	1/7 = 13%
1073	Katz & Zemishlany, 2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 cases selected due to the significant of being determined as lacking criminal liability due to their aspergers. Case information is presented consistently																		4/4 = 100%
1074	Cividini-Motta et al, 2020	Yes	Yes							Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	Yes	3.1 unclear sample strategy. Were other p's referred to study? 3.2 details regarding measure of behaviour defined + attempts to ensure reliability utilised. 3.4 discussion of confounders not presented however conditions consistent													2/5 = 40%
1075	Jones & Okere, 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	1.4 the author claims a significant reduction was presented however does not provide 'data' or evidence as to what this looks like.																		1/4 = 25%
1076	Milton et al., 2002	N/A	N/A												Quantitative non comparative study	Can't Tell	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes								1/5 =25%

ID	Study	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	Notes	Type	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Notes 2	Score
1077	Murrie et al., 2002	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.2 unclear why specific cases were selected 1.4 conclusions mindfully drawn with emphasis on extent of these findings + generalisation. Reasonable interpretation made.								3/4 = 75%
1078	Ormerod, 2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	discussion mainly around factual processes involved in this case + decisions made but interpretations provided seem reasonable + supported								3/4 = 75%
1079	Burns et al., 2021	N/A	N/A							Quantitive non comparative	Can't Tell	N/A	Can't Tell	N/A	Yes		1/3 = 33%
1080	Ferahkaya & Bilgic, 2021	N/A	N/A							Quantitive non comparative	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes		3/3 = 100%
1081	Sablaban & Sivanthan, 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Although the data here provided + evidence is limited as it is a brief letter, the small claims + conclusions are reasonable in line with the information provided.								3/4 = 75%
1082	Larson et al., 2021	Yes	Yes		3/5 = 60%					Quantitative non comparative	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Yes	Sample representation acknowledged // survey, pilot, established psychometrics? internal consistency reliability reportedly high for some questions only // >11% of individuals responded = significantly <70%	3/5 = 60%

ID	Author																													Score
1083	Higham et al., 2021	Yes	Yes		4/4 =												Quantitative non comparative	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	4.3. validated + reliable measures - data gathered retrospectively + interpreted. Cyber offending measures possibly valuable but measures would cover internet offending behaviour if concern for team.						4/4 = 100%
1084	Holloway, 2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Can't Tell	Can't Tell	The case study only considers the evidence from psychoanalytical perspective + subsequently the interpretation could be considered as largely skewed or biased																					1/2 = 50%
1085	Subhi, 2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can't Tell	Yes	Yes	Yes																						3/4 = 75%