Supplementary material: Summary of CCAT Review

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category	CCAT 1: F	reliminaries	CCAT 2:	Introduction	CCAT 3	: Design	CCAT 4:	Sampling	CCAT 5: Da	ta collection	CCAT 6: Et	hical matters	CCAT	: Results	CCAT 8:	Discussion	CCAT Total S	core T		CAT 9: otal as %
Baker 2018a	Score Comment	5	More detail re: problem addressing needed	5	not concise would have liked more detail regarding what the problem is and how this work will address it	care" but it's	4  potential bias not discussed	Self-selected to control. Small numbers of participants for quant measures.	sampling discussed however the why's were no answered ie. Sampling method chosen but why this method?		4 missing dates	4  No detail about how participants privacy was maintained or potential conflict of interest. Researchers not blind, and participants self-selected to condition	however. no equity discussed nor privacy and	. Didn't state	Needs a better concise summary of results. Flow of participants not discussed nor demographic data	4  Didn't highligh particular strengths	4 t	32	29	31	78%
Baker 2018b	Score Comment	Brief but succinct. Seems to cover all key points.	5	5	5	Potential bias. Justification as to why IPA was chosen. Very detailed project process.		3 Small sample, and all different. Researchers not blind, not sure this bias was accounted for.	more detail needed ie.suitability o sample size	The authors were the facilitators of the group as well as the ones doing the follow-up f leading to potential bias.	dates of collection not included. Quality instruments only touched on briefly 4	Potential conflict of interested noted in limitations of study rather than as a direct conflict of interest.	5	IPA was selected to elicit rich descriptions o carers' experiences o participation	well as	4	3	31	25	31	78% 65%
	Comment		not enough info to reproduce needing further dicussion 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 apporached to see if they'd be happy to be involved in the research side as well.		Phone interview challenging for PWD	method to ensure/enhan ce 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	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	further discussion needed reconsiderations of harm vesrus 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	insufficient detail for others to reproduce	4  limited design in title	4	5	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.	5	4	information re non participant not clear	t	only states after gaining ethics approval but does not elaborate	one table not set out well	4	4	4	28	30	29	73%
Camic 2016	Score Comment	4	design in title not included. Intro not thorough enough	3 not thorough	5	3	no description of how study was conducted with other researchers.n ot clear outcomes. Bias?	convenience sampling, small sample	needs more detail ie. Sample suitability	3 potential bias	information re non participant not clear		only states after gaining ethics approval but does not elaborate	3	4	3	4	24	25	25	63%

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category		reliminaries	CCAT 2: Ir	ntroduction	CCAT	3: Design	CCAT 4:	Sampling	CCAT 5: D	ata collection	CCAT 6: Et	hical matters	CCAT 7	: Results	CCAT8:	Discussion	CCAT Total S	core 1 S		CCAT 9: Total as %
Clark 2018	Score Comment	few tables/figures	abstract not divided into sub headings making it more difficult to follow	5	4	3 Potential bias Justification as to why IPA was chosen. Very detailed project process.	S	4	5	4	5	deliver and interview	3	Results aren't separated for PWD and their caregiver		4	5	31	34	33	83%
Clark 2020	Score Comment	5	5	5	5	A  No control group.	4	3 Small sample. Voluntary registration indicating potential bias towards song writing.	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	35	38	37	93%
Fancourt 2016	Score Comment	insufficient detail for others to reproduce	abstract not divided into sub headings making it more difficult to follow	e Is it four groups or three?	4	3	why chose design not discussed. Outcomes not clearly defined	3		4	no dates for data collection withdraw from study or incomplete data not discussed		no mention of privacy/confid entiality		4	4	5	29	30	30	75%
Fancourt 2019 García-Valverde	Score Comment Score	5	5	4	5	not randomised	why chose design not discussed nor potential bias	2	sample: how and why chosen not discussed, not randomised	no dates, locations, settings, personnel.	4	5 5	no mention of privacy/confid entiality		4	4	4 better linking to current literature needed. No account for bias	30	32	31	78%
2020	Comment	4	5	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	4	26	28	27	68%
Hendriks 2019	Score	3	3	not very broad	4	no control group, not randomised 2	why chosen design not discussed. Bias nor output/outcom e 2	Small sample. Inclusion and exclusion criteria not explicitly detailed. 2	why chosen sampling method not discussed. No discussion around suitability of study numbers.	self administered 3	self admin 4	4	no mention of privacy/confid entiality 2	minimal	no real analysis of mental heath scores, more indepth analysis required- seems results are more talked about in the discussion	The discussion is quite detailed however it reads a little like another background / literature review 3		24	25	25	63%
Jicha 2019	Comment Score	4	title does not tell design. No enough detail to reproduce 4		reason for addressing?	no control group 4	poor discussion re: design. Outcomes or outputs not even alluded to. No mention of bias 3	self-selected to control.	why method chosen? No population description 4	self administered not all background questionnaire: were completed.		3	only stated had ethics needed more around confidentiality 3	Tables/graphs needed for clarity 4	primary outcome chosen? Why? 3	4	further interpretation of results needed. More consideration of alternative explanation for results 5	29	28	29	73%
	Comment		balanced however subheadings would have made it read more clearly		greater knowledge needed as to what current literature exists.		no real discussion surrounding design and why chosen	Minimal information about recruitement	why method chosen?		collection chosen why? Dates?	No mention of ethical approval	only informed consnet and ethics approval no confidentiality mentioned		more All needed. More results needed to be unpacked from data collected						

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category	CCAT 1: P	Preliminaries	CCAT 2: I	ntroduction	CCAT	3: Design	CCAT 4: Sampling		CCAT 5: Data collection		CCAT 6: I	Ethical matters	CCAT 7: Results		CCAT8:	Discussion	CCAT 9: Total Score			CCAT 9: Total as %
Johnson 2017	Score Comment	4	5	4	5	One-off	why chosen design not discussed. Bias nor output/outcom		3 how chosen	Tool not very	dates?	5	only states ethics	Difficult to understand results. Presented in very statistical format with less		4	4	30	29	30	75%
Lee 2020	Score Comment	3	3 not enough detail of actual	4	4	session only?	е 5	bias. 3	and why? 4	informative. 4	Location? 5	5	approval valid	d discussion 5	4	4	5	31	34	33	83%
Leung 2019	Score Comment	4	intervention nor information to reproduce 3	3	4	no control group 3	2	convenience sampling, small sample 3	small sample size 3	4	3	5	consent? 5	minimal demographics 3	s 4	4	3 needed more	29	27	28	70%
Mittelman 2018	Score	2	no mention of design in title. Needs more key information. Not enough detail for others to reproduce	Aim not well articulated.	needs more exploration of current literature 3	no control group 2	poor discussion re: design. Outcomes or outputs not even alluded to. No mention of bias	self-selected to control, small sample 3	why sampling method chosen not discussed. Unpacking of data such as samppe size etc limited 3	3	needs more detail. Why chosen collection method?	2	0	3	3	4	interpretation of results.bias? Practical usefullness not discssed apart from saying could be good 4	22	23	23	58%
Mondro 2020	Comment	not logically organised 3	no mention of design in title. Needs more key information. Not enough detail for others to reproduce study and not very well written 2	aim for intervention, not a research question. Some refs not current.	informative but	no control group, measures don't align with aim. 3	not discussed.	small sample, inclusion and exclusion for the study seem to only be whether the person qualified for the choir.	limited discussion about participants ie sample size etc 4	suitability of data collection? 3	4	no ethics	no mention o ethics at all 3	sample size too low for quant 4	precision for each outcome/outpu t not discussed 3		3	26	26	26	65%
Osman 2016	Comment  Score Comment	3	no mention of design in title. No method discussed therefore Insufficient information to reproduce study 3	3	good summary of current knowledge 4	interventio n chosen 3	nor	high sample	only states eligibility criteria established but does not elaborate and tell what.	Just one post- intervention questionnaire with qualitative questions.	3	4	only stated approval give but not clear they mean ethical or some other type of approval 5	n minimal f demographics brief compared to the detail of the rest of the article.	interpretation methods. Mainly	Discussion were fairly brief compared to the detail of the rest of the article.	interpretation of results not expanded upon. Discussion simply considered overall practical usefullness but not much more 3	25	27	26	65%
		not enough detail to reproduce	states qual in title but nothing morere: design.ie what type of qual research?			no control group, no mention of potential for bias despite intervention and interview same personnel		small sample, minimal info recruitment	minimal information discussed	don't know when the interviews happened in an 8 week window	interviews only- location setting brief			minimal demographics	how where themes found? What method? No real s analysis	short discussion	limitred description of generalisabilit y				

Study ID Title	Score and comments for each CCAT Category		reliminaries	CCAT 2: Introduction		CCAT 3: Design		CCAT 4: Sampling		CCAT 5: Data collection		CCAT 6: Et	CCAT 6: Ethical matters		7: Results	CCAT 8: Discussion		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	3	0 75%
		insufficient detail for others to reproduce	not enough detail of actual intervention nor information to reproduce				no control I group, minimal description of intervention		small sample size, no inclusion/exclu sion 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	3	3	4	5	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	2	5	3	3	4	27	27	2	7 68%
	Comment	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	?convienence 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 aim only touched on	3	3 why chosen	2	2 why was sample	4	3	4	5	4	3 more All	4	4	28	26	2	7 68%
		design not in title, not sufficient detail to reproduce	design not in I title. More detail needed		without dialodge around specific problems	details of intervention in a secondary source.	design not discussed.	Convenience sampling, self- selecting	chosen size, population? etc. not		why collection method chosen, date?				needed. More results needed to be unpacked from data collected						
Tamplin 2018	Score	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	34	33	3-	4 85%
	Comment		study aim not		more detail on specific problem	no control				potential bias, some tools too complex for PWD	why collection method			not clear on flow of							
Tamplin 2020	Score	4	clearly in title	5	required 4	group 3	2	4	3	3	chosen. date?	5	4	participants 4	4	5	4	33	28	3	1 78%
	Comment	·	no mention of	J	·	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	Ü	dates? Location? Management of non	Ü	·	·	different facilitators	ŭ	·		20	ū	
Unadkat 2017	Score	4	design in title. 3	4	3	4	4	io group	4	3	participant 5	3	2	4	4	4	5	29	30	3	0 75%
	Comment	design not in title	no mention of design in title.		current knowledge not detailed enough		existing choir	self-selected to control, no exclusion criteria		Dates, locations, settings not described		no conflict of interest statement	not really discussed		demographics not discussed in results, non participant data not included						
Wharton 2019	Score Comment	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	3	4	25	25	2	5 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		small sample size	small sample size, not returned questionaires 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 sugges further studies					