

	E	Literature	Discussion	D manage	Ethics	Literature
	percent agree	40%	0	split 40% / 40%	60%	60%

D = data

Figure 3: Frequency of ratings of 14 information categories in five studies (n=5)

Rankings	1	2	3	12	13	14
<u>Categories</u>						
Problem	1	1	2	0	1	0
Purpose	1	4	3	1	0	1
Literature	0	0	3	1	1	3
Target	0	3	6	1	0	0
Method	5	2	1	1	0	0
Sampling	0	0	1	4	1	0
Sample	1	2	0	0	2	0
D collect	1	1	2	3	1	0
D manage	3	5	1	4	1	3
Validity	0	1	4	0	4	0
Findings	13	3	0	0	0	0
Discussion	0	2	1	5	3	6
Ethics	0	0	0	2	6	10
Form	1	1	0	3	5	2

A guide for Reading Qualitative Studies

<b>Face page</b>
Create an inventory of the demographic features of and reading context for the article. This will help you identify the manifest features and historical context of a report, and the purpose for which you are reading this report at this time. For example, is it to prepare a research proposal, to chart the state of the science in a field, to identify methodological approaches

used in a field, or to conduct a metasynthesis study? Dating the study will also help you evaluate the clinical relevance of findings.

#### Demographic Features

Complete citation

Author affiliations, including discipline and institution

Funding source

Acknowledgment

Period of data collection

Dates of submission and acceptance of work

Publication type (e.g. authored/edited book, journal, dissertation, thesis, conference proceeding)

Mode of retrieval (e.g. computer database, citation list, personal communication)

Key words (in article and by reviewer)

Abstract

#### Reading Context

Date of reading

Purpose of reading

Reader

Reader affiliations

### **Problem**

Look for information concerning what is wrong, or missing, or needed that requires fixing, finding, or satisfying. The research problem is usually a clinical problem in the practice disciplines, and a theoretical or disciplinary problem in the social science disciplines. An example of a clinical problem is:

Many women with HIV wait too long to obtain treatment. Delays in obtaining HIV-related treatment have been linked to shorter survival for women after diagnosis. These delays must be stopped, but we do not know enough about why they occur.

An example of a theoretical problem is:

Stigma has generally been conceived as a negative event. But there are circumstances in which stigma has positive outcomes. Theories of stigma should be expanded to include these positive outcomes.

Generally appearing early in the experimental style research report, problem statements set the stage for the study that was conducted and typically establish the significance of and/or reason for the research purpose. Problems may be explicitly stated or they may be implied in the research purpose and/or the literature review.

Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
1. There is a discernible problem that led to the study. 2. The problem is accurately depicted. 3. The problem is related to the research purpose and/or the literature review. 4. The problem establishes the significance of the research purpose, or why the researcher wanted to conduct the study, beyond simply stating that "no one has studied this (qualitatively) before."		

<b>Purpose(s)/question(s)</b>		
Look for statements concerning one or more goals, objectives, or aims of the study, and/or a list of one or more questions the study findings will answer. Research purposes may be explicitly stated, or they may be apparent in statements such as "I intend/hope to show..." or "I will argue/suggest..." In more ethnographically styled reports, implied statements of purpose may be found in the foreshadowing or summarizing of the findings early in the report that will be described in more detail later in the report. For example:  In this article, I will show how white and middle-class women with HIV/AIDS morally manage a stigmatized identity. I suggest that the reclamation of a coherent and safe moral identity is an integral part of how they cope with seropositivity and manage stigma...(Stanley, 1999, p. 104)		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
1. There is a discernible set of research purposes and/or questions. 2. Research purposes or questions are linked to the problem and/or to the review of the literature. 3. Research questions are amenable to qualitative study.		

<b>Literature review</b>
Look for information concerning what is believed, known, and not known about a problem. Sometimes the literature reviewed is combined with information about the problem, while other times, it is set off in a separate section and labeled as a literature review or with the actual topics contained in the review. In addition, reviews of literature may relate to the findings researchers will feature in the report, as opposed to the problem that originally led to

the study.

Reviews of literature may show one or a combination of the following logics:

1. A deficit/gap logic where writers emphasize what is not known about a problem and point to a purpose that will offset this knowledge deficit
2. An error logic where writers emphasize what is mistaken about what is "known" and point to a purpose that will correct this error
3. A contradiction logic where writers emphasize the inconsistencies in knowledge and point to a purpose that will help to resolve this contradiction and/or
4. A synthesis logic where writers emphasize the common areas in two or more seemingly disparate bodies of empirical, theoretical, or other literature and point to a purpose that will illuminate this overlap.

Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Key studies and other relevant literatures addressing the research problem are included.</li> <li>2. The review is related to the research problem.</li> <li>3. The review clarifies whether it reflects what researchers know and believed going into the field of study — before any data were collected — or came to know and believe while in the field coming out of it, after data analysis began or was completed.</li> <li>4. The review shows a critical attitude, as opposed to simply and/or indiscriminately summarizing studies.</li> <li>5. The review shows a discernible logic that points toward the research purpose.</li> </ol>		

**Mindset toward target phenomenon**

Look for indications of the perspectives, assumptions, conceptual/theoretical frameworks, philosophies and/or other frames of reference, mindsets, or "theoretical sensitivities" guiding or informing researchers concerning the target phenomenon or subject matter of a study: i.e., the people, events, or things to be studied. For example, Goffman's theory of stigma is used to frame a study of HIV+ women's social interactions. Such frames of reference may be explicitly stated, as in the Goffman example. Or, they may be implied in the language used to

describe the target phenomenon, and/or in the literature reviewed about it, and/or in the problem identified concerning it, or the questions asked about it, as when HIV+ women's responses to infection are discussed in terms of "self-care" or "coping," and studies in self-care or coping are reviewed. Such frames of reference may be clearly distinguishable from the methodological location of a study, or overlap with it. For example, feminism may be presented as the framework for the study of women's responses to HIV diagnosis in particular, and/or as the framework for any study of women and/or for inquiry in general. A frame of reference may have influenced a study from its conception through the interpretation of findings. In contrast, a frame of reference may not have entered the study until after some or all of the data were collected and analyzed. For example, Goffman's ideas about stigma may have been the a priori or sensitizing framework for a study of women with HIV. That is, these women are seen from the beginning through to the end of the study as living with and responding to a culturally stigmatizing condition. In contrast, Goffman's ideas might have entered a study only after researchers had begun to analyze their data and recognized that women's responses fit and/or were illuminated by these ideas.

Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. There is an explicitly stated or implied frame of reference.</p> <p>2. If explicitly stated, the frame of reference is accurately rendered.</p> <p>3. Whether stated or implied, the frame of reference fits the target phenomenon. That is, it is not forced onto the target phenomenon, as when a theory emphasizing other people's knowledge of a stigmatizing condition as critical to the way the person having the condition experiences it is used to frame the experiences of a group of HIV+ women who never disclosed their condition to others.</p> <p>4. If explicitly stated as the guiding frame of reference for a study, it played a discernible role in the way the study was conducted and/or the way the findings were treated. This is in contrast to a frame of reference that is evidently operating in a study, but which is not demonstrably recognized by the researcher as when HIV+ women are consistently referred to as being "in denial," but denial as a concept is never discussed nor recognized for its interpretive impact. Or, the researcher does not recognize that s/he is viewing self-care as activities health care providers view as positive and not as encompassing such activities as smoking and drug abuse, which can also be construed as self-care.</p> <p>5. The presentation of the mindset for the study clarifies whether it influenced researchers going into the field of study — before any data were collected — or while in the field or coming out of it, after data analysis began or was completed.</p>		

<b>Method</b>		
<p>Look for indications of the perspectives, assumptions, philosophies and/or other frames of reference guiding or informing researchers concerning the conduct of a study. For example, grounded theory is presented as the method and as deriving from tenets of symbolic interactionism and pragmatism. Semiotics is presented as the analytic frame of reference for the study of a document or artifact. Such frames of reference may be explicitly stated, or implied in the method language and/or citations used. For example, no method may ever be named per se, but phrases such as "lived experience," suggesting phenomenology, and "theoretical sampling," suggesting grounded theory, are used; and/or there are citations to Van Manen's work on phenomenology or Strauss &amp; Corbin's work on grounded theory. The method location of a study may be clearly distinguishable from the conceptualization of the target phenomenon of a study, or it may overlap with it. For example, social constructionism may be presented as the framework for any study of women and/or for inquiry in general, and for a study of women's responses to HIV diagnosis in particular.</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a stated or implied method.</li> <li>2. The method fits the research purpose.</li> <li>3. The method is accurately rendered.</li> <li>4. The uses of method-linked techniques for other than method-linked purposes are explained as when theoretical sampling is used in a qualitative descriptive study, or phenomenological techniques are used to create items for an instruments.</li> </ol>		

<b>Sampling strategy &amp; techniques</b>		
<p>Look for information about researchers' sampling intentions going into a study and evolving sampling decisions in the course of the study, including planned recruitment sites.</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sampling plan fits the purpose and method.</li> <li>2. The sampling plan is purposeful.</li> <li>3. The sampling plan described is accurately rendered, as opposed to being inaccurately rendered or misrepresented as when maximum variation sampling is presented as having equal</li> </ol>		

numbers of men and women, or percents of African Americans or Hispanic Americans equal to their presence in the population.		
4. Sites of recruitment fit the purpose and sampling strategy.		

<b>Sample</b>		
<p>Look for a description of the people (including the configuration of focus groups), places, events, documents, and/or artifacts comprising the actual sources of information for the study, and the actual sites from which people were recruited. Because ethnographic studies are typically site/place-bound, the site is actually a component of the sample. Site—as sample—is contrasted with site of data collection. That is, a study may involve one organization (site as sample), and interviews may be conducted in conference rooms on site (site of data collection).</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. Sample size and configuration fit the purpose and sampling strategy.</p> <p>2. Sample size and configuration can support claims to informational redundancy, or theoretical or scene saturation.</p> <p>3. Sample size and configuration can support claims to intensive, comprehensive, or holistic studies in particular.</p> <p>4. Sample size and configuration can support the findings.</p> <p>5. The sample is presented in a case-oriented way, as opposed to a variable-oriented was as when, in the report of a study of mothering in 20 HIV+ women, menas and ranges are given for the numbers of pregnancies and children who were also HIV+, but the unique combination of these variables in each mother-child dyad is not shown or addressed anywhere in the report.</p> <p>6. Features of the sample critical to the understading of findings are described, as opposed to not describes as when, in a study of HIV+ women's reproductive decision-making, no information is offered on women's use of contraceptives, obstetrics histories, no on severity of disease.</p> <p>7. Sites of recruitment fit the evolving needs of the study.</p>		

<b>Data collection techniques &amp; sources</b>		
<p>Look for a description of the techniques and procedures used to obtain information for a study in one or more of the following categories: interviews (including focus groups), observations, documents, and artifacts. Look for descriptions of the purpose and place of interviews or observations, the type of, orientation to, and/or manner of conducting interviewing, observation, document review, or artifact study, and of the timing and sequencing of data collection. Look also for information about alterations in techniques and procedures made in the course of the study.</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. Data collection techniques and sources fit the purpose and mindsets of the study, as opposed to not fitting them as when the purpose of a study is to ascertain structural barriers to health care utilization, but the only source of data is women's perceptions of their health care providers. Or, researchers conflate the longitudinal with the validation purpose for conducting more than one interview with the same participants or more than one observation of the same event.</p> <p>2. Specific data collection techniques are tailored to the reported study, as opposed to the presentation of textbook or rote descriptions of data collection with no application shown to the study reported.</p> <p>3. Data collection techniques are accurately rendered, as opposed to inaccurately rendered as when the observation process that occurs during interviews and focus groups is presented as participant observation.</p> <p>4. The sources of data presented are demonstrably the basis of the findings, as opposed to not being their basis as when document study is presented as a data collection strategy, but there is no evidence of its use.</p> <p>5. Data collection techniques are correctly used, as opposed to misused as when focus groups are conducted by asking each participant in turn to answer the same question, instead of posing a question to the group to stimulate group interaction.</p> <p>6. The sequence and timing of data collection strategies vis-à-vis each other fit the purpose and mindsets of the study.</p> <p>7. Sites are conducive to data collection.</p>		



8. Alterations in techniques fit the evolving needs of the study.		
9. The time period for data collection is explicitly stated.		

<b>Data management techniques</b>		
<p>Look for a description of techniques used to 1) create data; 2) create an audit trail of data; 3) prepare data for analysis; 4) catalogue, file, or organize data sets; and 5) break up, (dis)play (with), or reconfigure data. Included here is information on whether and how transcripts of interviews and field notes were prepared, whether and which computerized text management systems were used, the specific analytic approaches employed (e.g., content, constant comparison, narrative, discourse, or other analysis), and whether and how data matrices and other visual displays of data were used. Information about these techniques may be explicitly stated, or shown or implied in the findings.</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. Data management techniques fit the purposes and data.</p> <p>2. Specific data management techniques are tailored to the reported study, as opposed to textbook or rote descriptions of data management being offered, with no application shown to the study reported.</p> <p>3. Data management techniques are accurately rendered.</p> <p>4. Data management techniques are correctly used.</p> <p>5. There is a clear plan for analytically linking interview, observation, document, and/or artifact data sets.</p>		

<b>Findings</b>		
<p>Look for what researchers "found" from the data they collected, or the results of their interpretation of these data. Findings are to be distinguished from data, or the case descriptions, field notes, or quotes that support an interpretation. Findings will show varying levels of complexity, from a basic descriptive summary to a highly interpreted conceptual rendering.</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence	Relevance

	Yes/No	Yes/No
<p>1. There is a discernable set of results distinguishable from the data researchers collected, as opposed to indistinguishable as when the researcher presents several case histories but offers no interpretation of them. This is an example of descriptive excess or heaped description, as opposed to thick description.</p> <p>2. The results of the study are distinguishable from the researcher's discussion of the results or from the results of other studies to which the researcher refers.</p> <p>3. Interpretations of data are demonstrably plausible and/or sufficiently substantiated with data, as opposed to implausible as when a mother is quoted as hitting her child and this quote is used to illustrate the "joys of motherhood".</p> <p>4. Data are sufficiently analyzed and interpreted.</p> <p>5. Findings address the research purpose, as opposed to not addressing them as when the stated purpose of a study was to describe structural barriers to health care utilization, but the findings focus on women's perceptions of their health care.</p> <p>6. Variations in sample and/or data are addressed.</p> <p>7. Analysis is largely case-oriented, or oriented to the study of particulars, as opposed to variable-oriented or quantitatively-informed.</p> <p>8. Concepts or ideas are well-developed and linked to each other.</p> <p>9. Concepts are used precisely, as opposed to imprecisely as when sources of social support are persistently conflated with perceptions of others as supportive.</p> <p>10. Analysis of data fits the data, as opposed to not fitting as when focus group data are analyzed at the individual level and the analysis takes no account of group interaction.</p> <p>11. The results offer new information about, insight into, or formulation of the target phenomenon.</p> <p>12. The findings are relevant for contemporary use, as opposed to being irrelevant as when data from HIV+ women were collected pre-HAART and when AIDS was considered a fatal as opposed to chronic disease.</p>		

<b>Discussion</b>		
Summary of and conclusions about the findings of the study, and a discussion of their clinical, theoretical, policy, disciplinary, or other significance.		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. Discussion of findings is based on the study findings previously described, as opposed to being contrary to the findings, or to introducing findings not previously described.</p> <p>2. The study findings are linked to findings in other studies, or to other relevant literatures either previously discussed or newly introduced.</p> <p>3. The clinical, policy, theoretical, disciplinary, and/or other significance of the findings is thoughtfully considered, as opposed to indiscriminately considered as when changes in practice are recommended that merely propose actions opposite to the findings (e.g., providers are found to be insensitive so the implication is that they must be educated to become sensitive), or when repeating a study with other populations and/or in other settings is recommended with no rationale.</p>		

<b>Validity</b>		
Look for discussions of techniques specifically intended to ensure that the study is scientifically and/or ethnographically valid or "good". Included is information about the strengths and limitations of a study, of specific topics such as reflexivity, reliability, rigor, credibility, and plausibility, and of specific procedures, such as member validation and peer review. Information about validity may be explicitly stated, or implied in discussions of sampling, the sample, data collection and analysis, and in the presentation of the findings. Researchers may emphasize, although not identify as such, different kinds of "validities" in their study: e.g., descriptive, interpretive, theoretical, and pragmatic validity.		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. Researchers show an awareness of their influence on the study and its participants.</p> <p>2. The distinctive limitations of the study are summarized: e.g., theoretical sampling could not be fully conducted in a grounded theory study. This is in contrast to summarizing and/or</p>		

<p>apologizing for the so-called limitations of qualitative research.</p> <p>3. Techniques for validation are used that fit the purpose, method, sample, data, and findings, as opposed to using techniques that do not fit as when reliability coding to ascertain consistency in interview data is used in a study emphasizing the revisionist nature of narratives.</p> <p>4. Techniques used are tailored to the reported study, as opposed to presentations of textbook or rote descriptions of validation techniques with no application shown to the study reported.</p> <p>5. Techniques for validation are accurately rendered, as opposed to misrepresented as when descriptive validity is confused with interpretive validity, and triangulation for convergent validity is confused with using different data sources for completeness.</p> <p>6. Techniques for validation are correctly used, as opposed to incorrectly used as when cases are kept in or dropped from consideration because they conform or do not conform to other cases.</p>		
--	--	--

<b>Ethics</b>		
<p>Look for descriptions of any issues and practices relating to the recruitment, retention, and well-being of human participants in a study. Included here is information concerning how participants were approached and enrolled for a study, the informed consent procedures used, the benefits and risks participants were subjected to by virtue of being in the study, the inducements and protections offered them, and the way they responded to participation in the study.</p>		
Appraisal parameters	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No
<p>1. Benefits and risks distinctive to the study are addressed, as opposed to textbook or rote descriptions of human subjects issues being offered with no description of their particular relevance to the reported study.</p> <p>2. Recruitment and consent techniques were tailored to fit the sensitivity of the subject matter and/or vulnerability of subjects.</p> <p>3. Data collection and management techniques were tailored to fit the sensitivity of the subject matter and/or vulnerability of subjects.</p>		

<p>4. Examples of data provided as evidence to support findings have analytical value and present subjects fairly, as opposed to having only sensational value or presenting subjects unfairly, as when extreme incidents of events are presented when others would do or when quotes are edited that emphasize the lack of education of subjects.</p>		
--	--	--

<p><b>Form</b></p>		
<p>Look at the physical format of the entire report. Within the report, look for the literary style and devices used to present the study and its findings. Consider the reporting style (e.g., experimental, ethnographic), the uses of quotes, numbers, cases, and visual displays (e.g., tables, figures, diagrams, photos), the way findings are actually organized, sectioned, and titled, the title of the report, and the use of language, especially metaphor.</p>		
<p>The findings may be presented according to one or more of the following logics:</p>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. quantitatively and thematically, by most-to-least prevalent or most-to-least important theme</li> <li>2. temporally and thematically, with the clock time of the participants as the primary organizing principle and theme as the secondary organizing principle</li> <li>3. thematically and temporally, with theme as the primary organizing principle and the clock time of the participants as the secondary organizing principle</li> <li>4. narratively, as a day/week/month/year in the life of participants</li> <li>5. narratively, as an unfolding drama in the life of participants</li> <li>6. perspectively (Rashomon effect), by juxtaposing different points of view of participants and/or of researchers</li> <li>7. polyvocally, by juxtaposing different voices of participants and/or of researchers</li> <li>8. conceptually, by using sensitizing concepts from extant theory</li> <li>9. conceptually, by using a grounded theory template for analysis, such as the conditional matrix, typology, or transition format, or set of working hypotheses</li> <li>10. episodically, emphasizing key moments of an experience</li> <li>11. archaeologically, with the clock time of researchers as the primary organizing principle to show how the understanding of an event unfolded for them and/or</li> <li>12. via representative, exemplary, and/or composite cases or vignettes.</li> </ol>		
<p>Appraisal parameters</p>	<p>Presence Yes/No</p>	<p>Relevance Yes/No</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overall literary style of the study fits its purpose, method, and findings.</li> <li>2. Given the reporting style, elements of the research report are placed where readers are likely to find them.</li> </ol>		

<p>3. There is a coherent logic to the presentation of findings.</p> <p>4. Data were organized in ways that do analytic justice to them, as opposed to not doing them justice as when, in rendering of women's experiences with HIV as having physical, psychosocial, and spiritual aspects, highly disparate ideas are dumped into each section because, on the surface, they share physical, psychosocial, and spiritual features.</p> <p>5. Visual displays, quotes, cases, and numbers clarify, summarize, substantiate, or otherwise illuminate findings, as opposed to being at odds with them as when a quote has more ideas in it than featured by the researcher, or a path diagram shows a relationship between variables at odds with the relationship between them depicted in the text.</p> <p>6. The numerical meaning of such terms as "most", "some", "sometimes", and "commonly" is clear.</p> <p>7. The empirical referent for a theme or concept is clear, as opposed to theme being conflated with experience as when a researcher states that five themes emerged from the data instead of stating that women managed their symptoms in one of five ways; or the writer does not clarify whether the themes s/he is discussing are strategies to accomplish a goal, outcomes of having engaged in these strategies, typologies of behavior, or milestones and turning points in a transition.</p> <p>8. Themes or concepts are presented in a comparative and parallel fashion, as opposed to an unparallel manner as when, in a typology, some types are presented as behaviors, while others are presented as character traits, and each type is not compared to every other type.</p> <p>9. Titles of paper and section headers reflect the content in the paper and sections.</p> <p>10. The form fits the audience for whom the report was produced.</p>		
--	--	--

© Sandelowski and Barroso, 2001

Figure 4. Template of reading guide for on-screen work

<p><b>Face page</b></p> <p><u>Complete citation:</u></p> <p><u>Author affiliations, including discipline and institution:</u></p> <p><u>Funding source:</u></p>
---

<p><u>Acknowledgments:</u>  <u>Period of data collection:</u>  <u>Dates of submission and acceptance of work:</u>  <u>Publication type (e.g. authored/edited book, journal, dissertation, thesis, conference proceeding):</u>  <u>Mode of retrieval (e.g. computer database, citation list, personal communication):</u>  <u>Key words (in article and by reviewer):</u>  <u>Abstract:</u></p> <p><u>Date of reading:</u>  <u>Purpose of reading:</u>  <u>Reader:</u>  <u>Reader affiliations:</u></p>
---

Problem	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Purpose	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Literature	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Target	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Method	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a

		1. 2. 3. 4.	category)
Sampling	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Sample	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Data collection	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Data management	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)
Findings	(Relevant content to be copied or paraphrased)	Presence Yes/No  1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Relevance Yes/No (judge as a category)



		6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12.	
--	--	---	--