

Supplemental file 2 Quality appraisal of the included studies^{a,b}

		CASP - Qualitative Studies Checklist									
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	Overall
Primary study	Amann, 2018	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Anderson, 2021	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Armstrong, 2017	✗	+	+	+	+	✗	✗	+	+	✗
	Carlsson, 2007	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	de Souza, 2017	+	+	+	+	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Daouk-Oyry, 2018	✗	+	+	+	+	✗	+	✗	✗	✗
	Dayekh, 2022	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Fudge, 2008	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	✗	+	-
	Gagliardi, 2008	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	✗	+	-
	Galvin, 2020	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Goodman, 2017	+	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+
	Gurung, 2017	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Hashem, 2018	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Lindblom, 2021	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	McKevitt, 2018	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+
	Neech, 2018	+	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+
	O'Donnell, 2019	+	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	+	✗	✗	✗
	Rise, 2014	+	+	+	✗	+	✗	+	✗	+	✗
	Rise, 2013	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Samudre, 2016	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+
	Sharma, 2018	+	+	+	+	+	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Steffensen, 2022	+	+	+	+	+	✗	✗	+	+	-
	van der Meide, 2015	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Weiste, 2021	+	+	+	+	+	✗	+	+	✗	-	
Whiston, 2019	✗	+	+	✗	+	+	+	+	✗	✗	
Woelders, 2019	+	+	+	+	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	

D1: Aim
 D2: Method
 D3: Design
 D4: Recruitment
 D5: Data collection
 D6: Relationship researcher-participant
 D7: Ethics
 D8: Analysis rigour
 D9: Clear findings



Judgement
 ✗ Poor quality
 - Fair quality
 + Good quality

^aThe response categories C= Can't tell and N=No were collapsed to no, < two "no" = good quality, < three "no" = fair quality and ≤ three "no" = poor quality. ^bRobvis²³ was used to create visual quality assessment tables.

CASP - Randomised Controlled Trial Checklist

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	Overall
Primary study Armstrong, 2018	+	+	+	X	X	+	+	X	+	X
Boivin, 2014	+	+	+	X	+	+	X	+	X	X
Dickinson, 20220	X	+	X	X	X	X	+	+	X	X

D1: Aim
D2: Random
D3: All accounted for?
D4: methods
D5: Groups similar?
D6: level of care?
D7: Effects
D8: Precision
D9: Harms




Judgement
 Poor quality
 Good quality

^aThe response categories C= Can't tell and N=No were collapsed to no, < two "no" = good quality, < three "no" = fair quality and ≤ three "no" = poor quality. ^bRobvis²³ was used to create visual quality assessment tables.

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018, category 5, Mixed methods

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Overall
Primary study Brouwers, 2017	+	+	+	X	X	+	+	-
Greene, 2018	+	+	X	X	X	+	+	X
Livingston, 2013	+	+	+	X	X	+	+	-
Omeni, 2014	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+

D1: Aim
D2: Data
D3: Adequate rationale
D4: Effectively integrated
D5: Outputs
D6: Divergences and inconsistencies
D7: Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria

Judgement
 Poor quality
 Fair quality
 Good quality

^aThe response categories C= Can't tell and N=No were collapsed to no, < two "no" = good quality, < three "no" = fair quality and ≤ three "no" = poor quality. ^bRobvis²³ was used to create visual quality assessment tables.

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018, category 4, Quantitative descriptive

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Overall	
Primary study	Fraenkel, 2016 (Case report)	+	+	×	+	+	×	+	-
	Gremyr, 2018 (Cross-sectional)	×	×	×	×	+	+	×	×
	Scholtes, 2021 (Cross-sectional)	+	+	+	×	+	×	+	-
	Hwang, (Cross-sectional)	+	+	+	×	+	×	+	-

D1: Aim
 D2: Data
 D3: Sampling strategy relevant
 D4: Representative
 D5: Appropriate measurements
 D6: Low risk of nonresponse bias
 D7: Appropriate statistical analysis

Judgement
 × Poor quality
 - Fair quality
 + Good quality

^aThe response categories C= Can't tell and N=No were collapsed to no, < two "no" = good quality, < three "no" = fair quality and ≤ three "no" = poor quality. ^bRobvis²³ was used to create visual quality assessment tables.