

**Online Appendix B: Detailed results of quality assessment of qualitative studies**

Author, year, reference	Quality assessment criteria										Total number of:			Overall grading
	Research aim	Study design			Data collection methods		Ethics	Analyses	Findings		Yes	No	Can't tell	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
Cajdric-Vrhovac et al, 2009 <sup>30</sup>	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	2	1	Moderate
Giuliani et al, 2008 <sup>38</sup>	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	6	3	1	Moderate
Kopinak, 1999 <sup>46</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	2	0	Weak
Makhoul et al, 2009 <sup>50</sup>	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1	1	Weak
Stoll, 2008 <sup>63</sup>	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	2	1	Moderate

Assessment used the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) tool.<sup>26</sup> Each section is related to different components of the study: 1=Research aim; 2=research method; 3=research design; 4=recruitment; 5=data collection; 6=researcher/participant relations; 7=ethical consideration; 8=analysis; 9=statement of findings; 10=research value, with each 'Yes' translated to a score of 1. The scores of 8 to 10 categorised as 'strong'; 5 to 7 as 'moderate'; and 1 to 4 as 'weak'.