

Supplementary File 2: Quality assessments of qualitative and quantitative studies using JBI critical appraisal checklists

Supplementary Table 2a: Quality assessment of qualitative studies, using JBI critical appraisal checklists

	Qualitative										
	Dawes 2019	Grabbe 2013	Grimes 2020	Knestaut 2010	Malden 2019	Magee 2013	Parry 2021a	Parry 2021b	Sherry 2010	Sherry 2012	Welty 2013
Q1: Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Q2: Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Q3: Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Q4: Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Q5: Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Q6: Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Q7: Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Unclear
Q8: Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Q9: Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	No	No
Q10: Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dependability rating (Based on number of "yes" across Q2, 3, 4, 6 and 7)[1]	4/5 Unchanged	2/5 Downgrade one level	3/5 Downgrade one level	1/5 Downgrade two levels	5/5 Unchanged	5/5 Unchanged	3/5 Downgrade one level	5/5 Unchanged	2/5 Downgrade one level	3/5 Downgrade one level	3/5 Downgrade one level
Credibility rating (Based on review of findings)[1]	Unequivocal	Equivocal	Unequivocal	Equivocal	Unequivocal	Unequivocal	Unequivocal	Unequivocal	Equivocal	Equivocal	Unequivocal
High, mod, low, v low	High	Low	Moderate	Very Low	High	High	Moderate	High	Low	Low	Moderate

1. Munn, Z., et al., *Establishing confidence in the output of qualitative research synthesis: the ConQual approach*. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2014. **14**(1): p. 108.

Supplementary File 2: Quality assessments of qualitative and quantitative studies using JBI critical appraisal checklists

Supplementary Table 2b: Quality assessment of quantitative studies, using JBI critical appraisal checklists

	RCT	Quasi-experimental					Analytical Cross-sectional
	Kendzor 2017	Shors 2014	Helge 2014	Randers 2010	Randers 2012	Norton 2020	Randers 2018
Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?	Yes						
Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?	Unclear						
Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?	Yes						
Were participants blind to treatment assignment?	No						
Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?	No						
Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	Unclear						
Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	No						
Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	Yes	Unclear	No	No	No	No	
Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	Yes						
Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	Yes						
Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial?	Yes						
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)?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?		Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Was there a control group?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?		No	No	No	No	No	
Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?		Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?							Unclear
Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?							Yes
Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?							Yes
Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?							Yes
Were confounding factors identified?							No
Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?							No
Quantitative quality rating: [2] (High: >75%/ Mod: 50-75%/ Low: 25-50%/ v low: <25%)	8/13 = 61.5% Mod	3/9 = 33.3% Low	7/9 = 77.7% High	7/9 = 77.7% High	7/9 = 77.7% High	6/9 = 66.7% Mod	5/8 = 62.5% Mod

2. Munn, Zachary; Barker, Timothy Hugh; Moola, Sandeep; Tufanaru, Catalin; Stern, Cindy; McArthur, Alexa; Stephenson, Matthew; Aromataris, Edoardo. Methodological quality of case series studies: an introduction to the JBI critical appraisal tool. *JBI Evidence Synthesis* 18(10):p 2127-2133, October 2020. | DOI: 10.11124/JBISIR-D-19-00099