

Scoping review of guidance on cessation interventions for electronic cigarettes and dual electronic and combustible cigarettes use.

Appendix 3. Quality assessment of included studies using JBI critical appraisal tools

	Critical appraisal tools	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2020 ⁵⁰	American Academy of Pediatrics, 2019 ⁵²	Gonzalvo et al., 2016 ⁵⁵	Berg et al, 2021 ⁵⁶	Sahr et al, 2020 ⁵⁸	Silver et al, 2016 ⁵⁹	Hadland & Chadi, 2020 ⁵³	Graham et al, 2020 ⁴⁸	Graham et al., 2021 ⁴⁹	Sikka et al., 2021 ⁵⁷	Chadi et al., 2021 ⁵⁴	Health Canada, 2021 ⁶⁰
JBI CA tool for text and opinion													
1.	Is the source of the opinion clearly identified?	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	
2.	Does the source of opinion have standing in the field of expertise?	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	
3.	Are the interests of the relevant population the central focus of the opinion?	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				Y	
4.	Is the stated position the result of an analytical process, and is there logic in the opinion expressed?	Y	Y	UC	Y			Y				Y	
5.	Is there reference to the extant literature?	Y	N	N	Y			Y				Y	
6.	Is any incongruence with the literature/sources logically defended?	Y	Y	N	Y			N				N	
JBI CA tool for case reports													
1.	Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?					Y	Y						
2.	Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?					Y	Y						
3.	Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?					Y	Y						
4.	Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?					Y	UC						

Scoping review of guidance on cessation interventions for electronic cigarettes and dual electronic and combustible cigarettes use.

5.	Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?					Y	UC						
6.	Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?					Y	Y						
7.	Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?					Y	N						
8.	Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?					Y	Y						
JBI CA tool for quasi-experimental study													
1.	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?								Y				
2.	Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?								Y				
3.	Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?								UC				
4.	Was there a control group?								N				
5.	Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?								Y				
6.	Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?								N				
7.	Were the outcomes of participants included in any								Y				

Scoping review of guidance on cessation interventions for electronic cigarettes and dual electronic and combustible cigarettes use.

	comparisons measured in the same way?												
8.	Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?								UC				
9.	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?								Y				
JBI CA tool for RCTs													
1.	Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?									Y			
2.	Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?									Y			
3.	Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?									Y			
4.	Were participants blind to treatment assignment?									Y			
5.	Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?									Y			
6.	Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?									Y			
7.	Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?									UC			
8.	Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?									Y			
9.	Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?									Y			
10.	Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?									Y			
11.	Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?									NA			

Scoping review of guidance on cessation interventions for electronic cigarettes and dual electronic and combustible cigarettes use.

12.	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?									Y			
13.	Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial?									Y			
JBI CA tool for case series													
1.	Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?										Y		
2.	Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?										Y		
3.	Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?										N		
4.	Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?										Y		
5.	Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?										Y		
6.	Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?										Y		
7.	Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?										Y		
8.	Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?										Y		
9.	Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?										Y		

Scoping review of guidance on cessation interventions for electronic cigarettes and dual electronic and combustible cigarettes use.

10.	Was statistical analysis appropriate?											NA		
JMI CA tool for qualitative research														
1.	Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?													Y
2.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?													Y
3.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?													Y
4.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?													Y
5.	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?													Y
6.	Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?													N
7.	Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?													Y
8.	Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?													Y
9.	Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?													UC

Scoping review of guidance on cessation interventions for electronic cigarettes and dual electronic and combustible cigarettes use.

10.	Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?												Y
Total (obtained score/total score)		6/6	5/6	3/6	6/6	8/8	5/8	5/6	5/9	11/13	8/10	5/6	8/10
Percentage (%)		100	83	50	100	100	62	83	55	85	80	83	80

Abbreviations: JBI, Joana Briggs Institute; N, No; NA, Not applicable; UC, Unclear; Y, Yes.