

eMERGE Main Checklist

No.	Criteria Headings	Reporting Criteria	Location reported
Phase 1—Selecting meta-ethnography and getting started			—
<i>Introduction</i>			—
1	Rationale and context for the meta-ethnography	Describe the gap in research or knowledge to be filled by the meta-ethnography, and the wider context of the meta-ethnography	Section 2.2.3., Pages 13-14
2	Aim(s) of the meta-ethnography	Describe the meta-ethnography aim(s)	Section 2.2.3., Pages 13-14
3	Focus of the meta-ethnography	Describe the meta-ethnography review question(s) (or objectives)	Section 2.2.3., Pages 13-14
4	Rationale for using meta-ethnography	Explain why meta-ethnography was considered the most appropriate qualitative synthesis methodology	Section 2.2.3., Pages 13-14
Phase 2—Deciding what is relevant			—
<i>Methods</i>			—
5	Search strategy	Describe the rationale for the literature search strategy	Section 2.1.3., Pages 5-7
6	Search processes	Describe how the literature searching was carried out and by whom	Section 2.1.3., Pages 5-7
7	Selecting primary studies	Describe the process of study screening and selection, and who was involved	Section 2.1.2., Pages 4-5; Section 2.1.4., Pages 7-8
<i>Findings</i>			—

8	Outcome of study selection	Describe the results of study searches and screening	Section 3.1.2., Pages 14-15
Phase 3—Reading included studies			
<i>Methods</i>			—
9	Reading and data extraction approach	Describe the reading and data extraction method and processes	Section 2.1.5., Pages 8-9; Section 2.2.3., Pages 13-14
<i>Findings</i>			—
10	Presenting characteristics of included studies	Describe characteristics of the included studies	Section 3.1.3., Page 16; Table 2.1, Pages 66-70
Phase 4—Determining how studies are related			—
<i>Methods</i>			—
11	Process for determining how studies are related	Describe the methods and processes for determining how the included studies are related: - Which aspects of studies were compared AND - How the studies were compared	Section 2.2.3., Page 13; Section 3.1.9., Page 27
<i>Findings</i>			—
12	Outcome of relating studies	Describe how studies relate to each other	Section 3.1.9., Page 27; Tables 4.1-4.4, Pages 78-80

Phase 5—Translating studies into one another			—
<i>Methods</i>			—
13	Process of translating studies	Describe the methods of translation: - Describe steps taken to preserve the context and meaning of the relationships between concepts within and across studies- Describe how the reciprocal and refutational translations were conducted- Describe how potential alternative interpretations or explanations were considered in the translations	Section 2.2.3., Pages 13-14
<i>Findings</i>			—
14	Outcome of translation	Describe the interpretive findings of the translation.	Section 3.1.9., Page 27
Phase 6—Synthesizing translations			—
<i>Methods</i>			—
15	Synthesis process	Describe the methods used to develop overarching concepts (“synthesised translations”)Describe how potential alternative interpretations or explanations were considered in the synthesis	Section 3.2.1., Pages 27-33
<i>Findings</i>			—
16	Outcome of synthesis process	Describe the new theory, conceptual framework, model, configuration, or interpretation of data developed from the synthesis	Section 3.2.1., Pages 27-33
Phase 7—Expressing the synthesis			—
<i>Discussion</i>			—
17	Summary of findings	Summarize the main interpretive findings of the translation and synthesis and compare them to existing literature	Section 4.1.1., Pages 37-40

18	Strengths, limitations, and reflexivity	<p>Reflect on and describe the strengths and limitations of the synthesis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodological aspects—for example, describe how the synthesis findings were influenced by the nature of the included studies and how the meta-ethnography was conducted. - Reflexivity—for example, the impact of the research team on the synthesis findings 	Section 4.1.1., Page 40
19	Recommendations and conclusions	Describe the implications of the synthesis	Section 4.1.1., Page 40

From: France, E. F., Cunningham, M., Ring, N., Uny, I., Duncan, E. A. S., Jepson, R. G., Maxwell, M., Roberts, R. J., Turley, R. L., Booth, A., Britten, N., Flemming, K., Gallagher, I., Garside, R., Hannes, K., Lewin, S., Noblit, G. W., Pope, C., Thomas, J., & Vanstone, M. (2019). Improving reporting of meta-ethnography: The eMERGe reporting guidance. *Psycho-Oncology*, 28(3), 447–458. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.4915>