

### Multimedia Appendix 3. Overall scores using the Standard Quality Assessment Criteria [53] for quantitative studies

<b>Study</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>Total</b>
Ammerlaan et al. 2014 [57]	2	1	1	2	NA	NA	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	<b>8/22</b> <b>0.36</b>
Ammerlaan et al. 2017 [55]	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	<b>23/28</b> <b>0.82</b>
Bell 2010 [68]	2	1	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	<b>18/22</b> <b>0.81</b>
Cantrell et al. 2010 [61]	1	1	1	0	NA	NA	NA	1	1	NA	NA	0	0	1	<b>6/18</b> <b>0.33</b>
Cohen & Light 2009 [65]	2	2	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	1	NA	NA	1	0	1	<b>12/18</b> <b>0.66</b>
Gorter et al. 2015 [56]	1	1	1	2	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	NA	2	2	<b>17/20</b> <b>0.85</b>
Gregg et al. 2016 [27]	2	1	1	1	NA	NA	NA	2	1	2	0	NA	2	2	<b>14/20</b> <b>0.70</b>
Kim & Choi 2017 [77]	2	1	2	2	NA	NA	NA	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	<b>18/22</b> <b>0.81</b>
Kim-Rupnow & Burgstahler 2004 [69]	2	1	1	1	NA	NA	NA	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	<b>15/22</b> <b>0.68</b>
Kohut et al. 2016 [73]	2	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	<b>23/24</b> <b>0.96</b>
Mastropieri et al. 2001 [67]	2	1	1	1	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	<b>11/22</b> <b>0.50</b>
Narad 2018 [60]	2	2	1	1	NA	NA	NA	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	<b>16/22</b> <b>0.73</b>
Stewart 2011 [59]	2	1	1	1	NA	NA	NA	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	<b>15/22</b> <b>0.68</b>
Stinson et al. 2016 [74]	2	1	2	1	2	2	NA	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	<b>23/26</b> <b>0.88</b>

<sup>a</sup> Scoring: 2= yes, 1= partial, 0=no, n/a= not applicable

<sup>b</sup> Note: checklist for assessing quality of qualitative studies see Kmet et al. [53] for full description of items.