Study quality assessment of one sample design studies

Study	Analysis	Randomized	Report of statistics	Sample size	Sample type	Adaptation	Sum
Austin et al (2006)	2	2	2	1	2	0	9
Brock et al (2012)	2	0	2	2	1	0	7
Bush et al (2013)	1	2	2	2	2	0	9
Butler et al (1988)	1	2	1	2	0	1	7
Carlbring et al (2007)	2	2	2	2	2	0	10
Chan-Pensley (1999)	2	0	1	1	2	0	6
Coles et al (2007)	2	2	2	1	1	1	9
Cook et al (2007)	1	2	2	2	2	2	11
Fortson et al (2006)	2	1	2	2	1	0	8
George et al (1992)	2	2	2	1	1	1	9
Glaze & Cox (1991)	1	1	1	2	2	1	8
Herrero & Meneses (2006)	2	2	2	2	1	0	9
Hirai et al (2011)	2	2	2	2	0	0	8
Holländare et al (2008)	2	2	2	1	0	0	7
Holländare et al (2010)	2	2	2	1	2	1	10
Kurt et al 2004	1	0	2	2	2	2	9

Lankford et al (1994)	2	2	2	2	1	0	9
Lukin et al (1985)	2	2	2	1	1	1	9
Miller et al (2002)	2	2	2	2	1	0	9
Murelle et al (1992)	1	0	1	2	1	1	6
Ogles et al (1998)	1	0	2	2	1	2	8
Read et al (2008)	1	0	2	2	1	0	6
Schmitz et al (2000)	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
Schulenberg & Yutrzenka (2001)	2	2	2	2	1	0	9
Swartz et al (2007)	2	2	2	2	2	1	11
Thorén et al (2012)	2	2	2	1	2	0	9
Thorndike et al (2011)	2	2	2	1	2	0	9
Vallejo et al (2008)	2	2	2	1	1	2	10
Vallejo et al (2007)	2	0	2	1	1	0	6
Whitehead (2011)	2	2	2	2	1	1	10
Wijndaele et al (2007)	1	0	2	2	2	2	9
Zimmerman & Martinez (2012)	2	0	2	1	2	1	8
Yu & Yu	1	2	2	2	1	0	8

Study assessment criteria for scoring.

Aspect	**Scoring**
Analysis What type of analysis was used to asses inter format reliability?	2 = Comparison of mean difference (e.g., t-test, ANOVA), 1= Correlation or model test only, 0 = Unclear.
Randomized Were participants randomized to conditions (depending on design)?	2 = Yes, 0 = No.
Report of statistics Are relevant statistics reported?	2 = Mean and SD for scales, t-values and p-values for sig dif are reported, 1 = Is lacking any of these, 0 = Lack several of these.
Sample size Was the sample size adequate for the statistical analyses?	2 = Adequate sample size or above ($n>20$ for correlation ($\alpha=.05$, $\beta=.20$, $r=.6$) analysis, $n>128$ for t-tests and ANOVA ($\alpha=.05$, $\beta=.20$ and medium effect size) analysis), 1 = 51-99% of recommended, 0 = 0-50% of recommended.
Sample type Was the study group used for adequate psychometric evaluation of the particular instrument?	2 = Clinical instrument used in adequate clinical group or a screening instrument used in a clinical or non restricted sample, 1 = clinical instrument used in non-clinical sample or screening instrument used in restricted sample (e.g., student sample), 0 = clinical instrument used in non clinical restricted sample.
Adaptation Were the layout, text format, response options, presentation of items, and possibilities to interact in the digital format of the instrument described?	2 = >3 features described, 1 = 2-3 features described, 0 = 0-1 features described.

Note. If inadequate or no information is available for a certain aspect a score of 0 is given.