

Supplementary Table 2 Critical Appraisal of included studies using Waterman, et al.[16] Guidance for assessing action research proposals and projects.

Questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Locock [15, 19, 35]	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Write [16, 23, 36]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gustavsson ^a [20, 37, 38]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Gustavsson ^b [20, 38]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Larkin [39-41]	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Cooper [21]	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	?	✓
Fucile [42]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	?	?	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
Hackett [43]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kenyon [44]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	?	✗	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	✓
Weston [45]	✗	✓	✓	✓	?	?	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	?	✗	✗	✗	✗	?	?
Piper [25]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Cheshire [22, 46]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓	?	?	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	?	?
Tsianakas [24]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Springham [13]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	?	?	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗
van Deventer [17]	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cranwell [47-49]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	✗	✓	?	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Boyd [10]	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Knowles [18]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓
Bate [7]	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	?	✗	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
Bowen[50-52]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Abbreviations: N/A, not applicable; ?, unclear.

^aNeonatal study

^bJuvenile diabetes study

Critical appraisal questions:

1. Is there a clear statement of the aims and objectives of each stage of the research?
2. Was the action research relevant to practitioners and/or users?
3. Were the phases of the project clearly outlined?
4. Were the participants and stakeholders clearly described and justified?
5. Was consideration given to the local context while implementing change?
6. Was the relationship between researchers and participants adequately considered?
7. Was the project managed appropriately?

8. Were ethical issues encountered and how were they dealt with?
9. Was the study adequately funded/supported?
10. Was the length and timetable of the project realistic?
11. Were data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?
12. Were steps taken to promote the rigour of the findings?
13. Were data analyses sufficiently rigorous?
14. Was the study design flexible and responsive?
15. Are there clear statements of the findings and outcomes of each phase of the study?
16. Do the researchers link the data that are presented to their own commentary and interpretation?
17. Is the connection with an existing body of knowledge made clear?
18. Is there discussion of the extent to which aims and objectives were achieved at each stage?
19. Are the findings of the study transferable?
20. Have the authors articulated the criteria upon which their own work is to be read/judged?