

Quality of Research Review Documentation Guidelines

To address the QOR criteria, program developers should consider the information in the following table and ensure that the appropriate documentation is available for review by NREPP. This documentation is not requested at the time of submission.

QOR Criterion	Factors Contributing to Reviewer Ratings	Examples of Documentation
<i>Reliability of measures</i>	<p>Whether or not the measures used to evaluate the outcomes were developed and tested for use with the targeted population or setting</p> <p>Instrument test-retest, internal item consistency, and/or interrater reliability of acceptable level</p> <p>Note: Reliability that has been documented by independent investigators will rate higher on this criterion.</p>	<p>The psychometric properties of each measure used, as noted in study articles and/or additional supporting documentation</p> <p>For measures that were adapted in any way, additional information showing the reliability and validity of acceptable levels for those adaptations</p>
<i>Validity of measures</i>	<p>Whether or not the measures used to evaluate the outcome have been developed and tested for use with the targeted population or setting</p> <p>Instrument face, construct, content, convergent, discriminant, criterion, concurrent, and predictive validity of acceptable level</p>	
<i>Intervention fidelity</i>	<p>Level of documentation on efforts to maintain intervention fidelity at acceptable levels</p>	<p>Study articles and/or supporting documentation that explains the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementer training for the target intervention group - Ongoing supervision with corrective action during the study to prevent drift (e.g., audiotaping sessions for supervisor review) - Any fidelity tools or quality assurance checklists used to measure adherence to the intervention manual and to measure intervention exposure and dosage, with data from use of tools reported - Reliability and validity information for any fidelity tools used

QOR Criterion	Factors Contributing to Reviewer Ratings	Examples of Documentation
<i>Missing data and attrition</i>	Level of sophistication in the explanation and management of missing data and/or attrition	Study articles and/or supporting documentation that explains the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent of missing data - Statistical management of missing data - Extent of attrition - Comparison of study dropouts with those completing the study in demographics and other variables related to outcomes - Statistical management of attrition
<i>Potential confounding variables</i>	Depth of exploration of potential confounding variables Level of impact of confounding variables on outcome data	Study articles and/or supporting documentation that explains potential confounding variables and their potential impact on outcome data (e.g., statistical modeling of variables mediating or moderating outcomes, study design limitations that impact outcome interpretation)
<i>Appropriateness of analysis</i>	Sample size and statistical power to detect group difference Appropriate correction of the alpha level for a Type I error Appropriate statistical modeling of the generated dataset to allow a clear interpretation of a relationship between the intervention and outcome Note: Overly simple analyses may translate to lower scores on this criterion, as may lack of control for demographic- and/or outcome-related differences measured at pretest.	Documentation of statistical tests and sample size in study articles Supporting documentation accounting for the analysis selection

For the purposes of NREPP, a study is defined as any evaluation completed on the same dataset or its subset. Program developers can submit up to three studies described in up to seven documents. This document limit includes all articles, reports, and supporting materials to be viewed by QOR reviewers.

Supplemental materials are documents that typically contain psychometric support for the measures used to evaluate outcomes, information on intervention fidelity associated with submitted studies, or any additional information contributing to the QOR rating of the submitted outcomes. Documents containing only background information, theoretical foundations of the intervention, or history on the development of intervention materials are rarely relevant for the QOR review.