

Supplementary material: Summary of CCAT Review

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category	CCAT 1: Preliminaries	CCAT 2: Introduction	CCAT 3: Design	CCAT 4: Sampling	CCAT 5: Data collection	CCAT 6: Ethical matters	CCAT 7: Results	CCAT 8: Discussion	CCAT 9: Total Score	Final Total Score (out of 40)	CCAT 9: Total as %						
Baker 2018a	Score Comment	5	3	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	32	29	31	78%				
			More detail re: problem addressing needed	not concise would have liked more detail regarding what the problem is and how this work will address it	Potential bias: same person delivered intervention and interviewed. Doesn't really say what the control group did. It says "standard care" but it's not clear.	potential bias not discussed	Self-selected to control. Small numbers of participants for quant measures.	sampling discussed however the why's were not answered ie. Sampling method chosen but why this method?	This is very brief but appears to be appropriate for the study conducted	missing dates			No detail about how participants privacy was maintained or potential conflict of interest. Researchers not blind, and participants self-selected to condition	written consent given however, no equity discussed nor privacy and confidentiality, no conflict of interest discussed.	Didn't state which A.I.I. methods or why	Needs a better concise summary of results. Flow of participants not discussed nor demographic data	Didn't highlight particular strengths	
Baker 2018b	Score Comment	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	31	30	31	78%				
		Brief but succinct. Seems to cover all key points.			Potential bias. Justification as to why IPA was chosen. Very detailed project process.	outcomes nor bias not discussed	Small sample, and all different. Researchers not blind, not sure this bias was accounted for.	more detail needed ie suitability of sample size	The authors were the facilitators of the group as well as the ones doing the follow-up leading to potential bias.	dates of collection not included. Quality instruments only touched on briefly			Potential conflict of interested noted in limitations of study rather than as a direct conflict of interest.		IPA was selected to elicit rich descriptions of carers' experiences of participation	further essential analysis required as well as interpretation of results		
Burnside 2017	Score Comment	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	4	26	25	26	65%				
			not enough info to reproduce further discussion re: design	Limited, relevance of example given?	brief summary of current knowledge that does not address a specific problem or no stated reason for addressing	Limited as the program is an existing and ongoing program within the museum. Different activities not compared	no discussion around why research design chosen, bias only discussed briefly	only mild PWD. Participants were existing in the program and were approached to see if they'd be happy to be involved in the research side as well.	Phone interview challenging for PWD	method to ensure/enhance quality of measurement ie. What was survey and was it appropriate for this cohort of people?	ethics for PWD?	can not find much mention of ethics and ethical related matters	Results show clear themes with quotes from care partners and from person with dementia. Themes are not separated between the two groups though.	Only one intervention, develop theory?	Results show clear themes with quotes from care partners and from person with dementia. Themes are not separated between the two groups though.	Also how the interviews are conducted for dementia pts with communication difficulties. I would have liked to read more results from survey responses.	further discussion needed re: considerations of harm versus benefits for this population. Also how the interviews are conducted for dementia pts with communication difficulties. I would have liked to read more results from survey responses.	no real discussion of actual results
Camic 2014	Score Comment	3	4	4	5	3	3	5	4	4	28	30	29	73%				
		insufficient detail for others to reproduce	limited design in title		no control group	no description of how study was conducted with other researchers. not clear outcomes. Bias?	Small sample. Unclear how participants were approached or how they were selected.		information re non participant not clear			only states after gaining ethics approval but does not elaborate	one table not set out well					
Camic 2016	Score Comment	4	2	3	5	3	2	3	3	4	24	25	25	63%				
			design in title not included. Intro not thorough enough	not thorough		no description of how study was conducted with other researchers. not clear outcomes. Bias?	convenience sampling, small sample	needs more detail ie. Sample suitability	information re non participant not clear			only states after gaining ethics approval but does not elaborate						

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category	CCAT 1: Preliminaries		CCAT 2: Introduction		CCAT 3: Design		CCAT 4: Sampling		CCAT 5: Data collection		CCAT 6: Ethical matters		CCAT 7: Results		CCAT 8: Discussion		CCAT 9: Total Score	Final Total Score (out of 40)	CCAT 9: Total as %	
Clark 2018	Score Comment	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	5	3	3	4	5	4	5	31	34	33	83%
Clark 2020	Score Comment	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	35	38	37	93%
Fancourt 2016	Score Comment	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	5	4	4	5	29	30	30	75%
Fancourt 2019	Score Comment	5	5	4	5	3	4	2	3	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	30	32	31	78%
García-Valverde 2020	Score Comment	4	5	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	4	26	28	27	68%
Hendriks 2019	Score Comment	3	3	4	4	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	3	3	24	25	25	63%
Jicha 2019	Score Comment	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	5	29	28	29	73%

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category	CCAT 1: Preliminaries		CCAT 2: Introduction		CCAT 3: Design		CCAT 4: Sampling		CCAT 5: Data collection		CCAT 6: Ethical matters		CCAT 7: Results		CCAT 8: Discussion		CCAT 9: Total Score		Final Total Score (out of 40)	CCAT 9: Total as %
Johnson 2017	Score Comment	4	5	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	2	4	4	4	4	30	29	30	75%
Lee 2020	Score Comment	3	3	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	31	34	33	83%
Leung 2019	Score Comment	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	5	5	3	4	4	3	29	27	28	70%
Mittelman 2018	Score Comment	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	0	3	3	4	4	22	23	23	58%
Mondro 2020	Score Comment	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	26	26	26	65%
Osman 2016	Score Comment	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	3	25	27	26	65%

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category	CCAT 1: Preliminaries		CCAT 2: Introduction		CCAT 3: Design		CCAT 4: Sampling		CCAT 5: Data collection		CCAT 6: Ethical matters		CCAT 7: Results		CCAT 8: Discussion		CCAT 9: Total Score		Final Total Score (out of 40)	CCAT 9: Total as %	
Pienaar 2015	Score Comment	4	3	4	5	3	2	3	3	4	3	5	5	3	4	4	4	30	29	30	75%	
			not enough detail of actual intervention nor information to reproduce			no control group, minimal description	no control group, minimal description of intervention	small sample, exclusion criteria not explained looks like self-selection	small sample size, no inclusion/exclusion criteria	Dates, locations, settings not described	minimal detail of collection protocol		minimal demographics, themes could have been made more clear			not in context with objectives						
Roberts 2011	Score Comment	3	3	4	5	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	2	5	3	3	4	27	27	27	68%	
		study/design not in title, not enough differentiation between art and podcasts etc	design not in title. More detail needed			blurs art-making with podcasts and art-viewing, but results just from art-making.		small sample size, convenience sampling from existing art groups	?convenience sampling.	did not reach saturation			only touches on ethics slightly but does not state if ethics approval was gained		limited analysis	didn't do limitations or future research						
Skingley 2020	Score Comment	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	4	28	26	27	68%	
					aim only touched on without dialodge around specific problems	why chosen design not discussed.	why chosen design not discussed. Bias nor output/outcome	Convenience sampling, self-selecting	why was sample chosen size, population? etc. not enough detail re: sample			why collection method chosen. date?		more All needed. More results needed to be unpacked from data collected								
Tamplin 2018	Score Comment	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	34	33	34	85%	
		design not in title, not sufficient detail to reproduce	design not in title. More detail needed		more detail on specific problem required	no control group				potential bias, some tools too complex for PWD	why collection method chosen. date?			not clear on flow of participants								
Tamplin 2020	Score Comment	4	4	5	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	5	4	33	28	31	78%	
		study aim not clearly in title				not randomised, lack of assessor blinding	why chosen design not discussed. ?suitability, selection bias	participants self-selected to group	more detail needed ie suitability of sample size			dates? Location? Management of non participant										
Unadkat 2017	Score Comment	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	5	3	2	4	4	5	4	29	30	30	75%	
			no mention of design in title.		current knowledge not detailed enough			self-selected to control, no exclusion criteria		Dates, locations, settings not described		no conflict of interest statement	not really discussed		different facilitators							
Wharton 2019	Score Comment	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	4	25	25	25	63%	
		design not in title	no mention of design in title. More of a statement in title and not study aims	summary of current knowledge insufficient, primary objective not worded clearly.	would have liked more detail regarding what the problem is and how this work will address it	reason why design chosen not explained, outcome measures not valid or reliable	existing choir	self-selected to control, no exclusion criteria	small sample size, not returned questionnaires by participants,	lost data, incomplete pre-post	?pre post measures and facilitators reported on what they thought	ethics not stated clearly	couldn't find much outlaying ethical consideration		didn't suggest further studies	? Consideration of overall practical usefulness of the study.						