

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings			Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No
Aarts et al. (2004) [55]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Abraham et al. (2018) [95]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Abramson et al. (2012) [18]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Abramson et al. (2016) [81]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Ash et al. (1999) [24]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Ash et al. (2000) [48]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Ash et al. (2001a) [51]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Ash et al. (2001b) [57]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Ash et al. (2003a) [43]	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?	
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No	
Ash et al. (2003b) [42]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Ash et al. (2003c) [58]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Ash et al. (2005) [52]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Ash et al. (2012) [53]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Barber et al. (2007) [16]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Baysari et al. (2011) [80]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Baysari et al. (2012) [73]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Baysari et al. (2014) [78]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Baysari et al. (2017) [92]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Baysari et al. (2018) [61]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Botta & Cutler	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?	
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No	
(2014) [54]														
Burgin et al. (2012) [98]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Burgin et al. (2014) [97]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Campbell et al. (2007) [90]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Campbell et al. (2009) [85]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Carpenter & Gorman (2001) [83]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Chow et al. (2015) [106]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Cornford et al.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings			Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No
(2010) [46]													
Cresswell et al. (2013a) [44]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cresswell et al. (2013b) [45]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cresswell et al. (2014) [9]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cresswell et al. (2016a) [109]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cresswell et al. (2016b) [62]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cresswell et al. (2017a) [23]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cresswell et al. (2017b) [22]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other	
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?		
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No		
Cresswell et al (2017c) [59]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Davidson & Chismar (2007) [47]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Debono et al. (2017) [88]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Dixon-Woods et al. (2013) [20]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Dykstra (2002) [101]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Garfield et al (2016) [100]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Griffon et al. (2017) [60]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Hardie et al. (2017) [56]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?	
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No	
Hawkins et al. (2017) [71]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Holden (2010) [82]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Holden (2011) [69]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Jeon et al. (2014) [49]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Johnson et al. (2006) [96]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Jung et al. (2013) [79]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Malato & Kim (2004) [41]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?	
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No	
McMullen et al. (2015) [70]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Mills et al. (2017) [65]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Mozaffar et al. (2016a) [21]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Mozaffar et al. (2016b) [64]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Mozaffar et al. (2017) [14]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Niazkhani et al. (2008) [102]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Niazkhani et al. (2010a) [94]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Niazkhani et al. (2010b) [103]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other	
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?		
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No		
Niazkhani et al. (2011) [84]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Nies & Pelayo (2010) [87]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
O'Grady et al. (2006) [72]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Omar et al. (2017) [75]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Pelayo et al. (2010) [99]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Pirnejad et al. (2008) [104]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Pirnejad et al. (2009) [74]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Pirnejad et al. (2011) [50]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design					Data collection				Data analysis and findings			Other
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No
Puar and Franklin (2018) [63]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Redwood et al. (2013) [77]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Riccioli et al. (2011) [68]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Santucci et al (2016) [76]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Savage et al. (2010) [89]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Shemilt et al. (2017) [93]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Simon et al. (2013) [19]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Sittig et al. (2005) [107]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Tschanne n et al	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Supplementary Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies (n=79)

Paper	Approach and design				Data collection				Data analysis and findings				Other	
	1. Was the research problem and/or research question clearly reported/defined?	2. Was there a clear statement of the aims and/or objectives of the research?	3. Was a qualitative methodology appropriate?	4. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	5. Was the sampling and recruitment strategy clearly defined and justified?	6. Was the method of data collection well described?	7. Were any techniques to enhance trustworthiness used?	8. Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?	9. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	10. Was the data analysis/interpretation process well described and justified?	11. Was there a clear statement of findings?	12. Are the analysis and findings credible?	13. Was any conflict of interest reported?	
	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes Partially No Unclear	Yes No	No
(2011) [67]														
van der Sijts et al. (2008) [91]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Wentzer et al. (2007) [86]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Wong et al. (2012) [105]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Yang et al. (2012) [66]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Zhou et al. (2011) [108]	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	35 16 28 0	69 7 3 0	63 16 0 0	66 8 2 3	44 24 9 2	57 18 4 0	38 12 15 14	10 16 51 2	24 39 6 10	43 22 14 0	69 10 0 0	55 22 1 1	4	75