

APPENDIX 3

Table 1: Systematic review and meta-analyses checklist

Checklist	Study				
	Carvalho	Chaimowitz	Chevance et al[37]	Kois et al	Pedrosa et al
Is the review based on a focused question that is adequately formulated and described?	No	Yes	No	No	No
Were eligibility criteria for included and excluded studies predefined and specified?	No	No	No	No	No
Did the literature search strategy use a comprehensive, systematic approach?	Yes	No	No	No	No
Were titles, abstracts, and full-text articles dually and independently reviewed for inclusion and exclusion to minimize bias?	No	No	No	No	No
Was the quality of each included study rated independently by two or more reviewers using a standard method to appraise its internal validity?	No	No	No	No	No
Were the included studies listed along with important characteristics and results of each study?	No	No	No	No	No
Was heterogeneity assessed? (This question applies only to meta-analyses.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall quality rating	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor

Table 2: Observational Cohort and Cross-sectional studies

Checklist	Bandara et al	Novisky et al
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion	No	Yes

criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?		
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	No	No
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	NR	NR
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	Yes	Yes
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	NR	NR
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	NR	NR
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	NR	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	No	No
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	N/A	N/A
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	N/A	N/A
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	No	No
Overall quality rating	Poor	Poor

Table 3: Qualitative studies

Checklist	Gonçalves et al	Maycock and Dickson	Testoni et al
Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	Yes	Yes	Yes

Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	No	Yes	Yes
Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	No	No	No
Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	No	No	Yes
Is there a clear statement of findings?	No	No	No