

Utilité et utilisabilité d'un outil d'évaluation de la qualité des études quantitatives, qualitatives et mixtes dans le cadre de revues systématiques mixtes

Quan Nha Hong, Araceli Gonzalez-Reyes, Pierre Pluye
Département de médecine de famille, Université McGill

Introduction

- ❖ Revues systématiques mixtes: revues de littérature qui combinent des études qualitatives, quantitatives et/ou mixtes (1).
- ❖ *Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool* (MMAT): outil pour évaluer la qualité méthodologique des études qualitatives, quantitatives et mixtes (2).

Objectif

- ❖ Explorer l'expérience de chercheurs ayant utilisé le MMAT.

Méthode

- ❖ Étude descriptive qualitative.
- ❖ Entrevues semi-structurées.
- ❖ Analyse thématique inductive.

Types of mixed methods study components or primary studies	Methodological quality criteria (see tutorial for definitions and examples)	Responses			
		Yes	No	Can't tell	Comments
Screening questions (for all types)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there clear qualitative and quantitative research questions (or objectives*), or a clear mixed methods question (or objective*)? • Do the collected data allow address the research question (objective)? E.g., consider whether the follow-up period is long enough for the outcome to occur (for longitudinal studies or study components). <p><i>Further appraisal may be not feasible or appropriate when the answer is 'No' or 'Can't tell' to one or both screening questions.</i></p>				
1. Qualitative	1.1. Are the sources of qualitative data (archives, documents, informants, observations) relevant to address the research question (objective)? 1.2. Is the process for analyzing qualitative data relevant to address the research question (objective)? 1.3. Is appropriate consideration given to how findings relate to the context, e.g., the setting, in which the data were collected? 1.4. Is appropriate consideration given to how findings relate to researchers' influence, e.g., through their interactions with participants?				
2. Quantitative randomized controlled (trials)	2.1. Is there a clear description of the randomization (or an appropriate sequence generation)? 2.2. Is there a clear description of the allocation concealment (or blinding when applicable)? 2.3. Are there complete outcome data (80% or above)? 2.4. Is there low withdrawal/drop-out (below 20%)?				
3. Quantitative non-randomized	3.1. Are participants (organizations) recruited in a way that minimizes selection bias? 3.2. Are measurements appropriate (clear origin, or validity known, or standard instrument; and absence of contamination between groups when appropriate) regarding the exposure/intervention and outcomes? 3.3. In the groups being compared (exposed vs. non-exposed; with intervention vs. without; cases vs. controls), are the participants comparable, or do researchers take into account (control for) the difference between these groups? 3.4. Are there complete outcome data (80% or above), and, when applicable, an acceptable response rate (60% or above), or an acceptable follow-up rate for cohort studies (depending on the duration of follow-up)?				
4. Quantitative descriptive	4.1. Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the quantitative research question (quantitative aspect of the mixed methods question)? 4.2. Is the sample representative of the population understudy? 4.3. Are measurements appropriate (clear origin, or validity known, or standard instrument)? 4.4. Is there an acceptable response rate (60% or above)?				
5. Mixed methods	5.1. Is the mixed methods research design relevant to address the qualitative and quantitative research questions (or objectives), or the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the mixed methods question (or objective)? 5.2. Is the integration of qualitative and quantitative data (or results*) relevant to address the research question (objective)? 5.3. Is appropriate consideration given to the limitations associated with this integration, e.g., the divergence of qualitative and quantitative data (or results*) in a triangulation design?				

Criteria for the qualitative component (1.1 to 1.4), and appropriate criteria for the quantitative component (2.1 to 2.4, or 3.1 to 3.4, or 4.1 to 4.4), must be also applied.

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)

<http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com/>

Résultats

- ❖ 20 entrevues auprès d'utilisateurs provenant de 8 pays différents.
- ❖ Participants: étudiants au doctorat, professeurs, stagiaires postdoctoraux, bibliothécaires, professionnels de recherche.
- ❖ 13 thèmes groupés dans les dimensions d'utilité et d'utilisabilité (3).

Discussion

- ❖ Étude permet d'identifier plusieurs améliorations à apporter au MMAT.
- ❖ Prochain étape: clarifier et identifier les items les plus pertinents à évaluer.

Références

1. Hong QN, Pluye P, Bujold M, Wassef M. Convergent and sequential synthesis designs: Implications for conducting and reporting systematic reviews of qualitative and quantitative evidence. *Syst Rev.* 2017;6(1):61.
2. Pluye P, Gagnon MP, Griffiths F, Johnson-Lafleur J. A scoring system for appraising mixed methods research, and concomitantly appraising qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods primary studies in mixed studies reviews. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2009;46(4):529-46.
3. Nielsen J. Usability engineering. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann; 1994.

Dimensions	Attributs	Thèmes
Utilité	Couverture	1 – Plusieurs devis d'études couverts 2 – Devis d'études ne pouvant pas être évalués avec l'outil
	Exhaustivité	3 – Préoccupation concernant l'exhaustivité de l'outil
	Flexibilité	4 – Besoin d'adapter l'outil au sujet de la revue
	Autre utilité	5 – Outil éducatif
	Utilisabilité	6 – Facile à utiliser
Utilisabilité	Facilité d'apprentissage	7 – Améliorations requises dans le manuel d'instruction
	Efficience	8 – Court et rapide
	Erreurs	9 – Items pas clairs ou difficiles à juger
		9.1 – Items sur les études qualitatives et méthodes mixtes plus sujets à interprétation
		9.2 – Plusieurs concepts dans un item
		9.3 – Information manquante dans les études
	9.4 – Distinction pas claire entre certains items	
	10 – Difficulté à choisir les items à évaluer	
	Satisfaction	11 – Accessible en ligne
		12 – Site internet non convivial
13 – Fiche de cotation manquante		