

Supplementary Table 2. Characteristics of studies included in the review (n=61)

Country [Reference(s)]	Year(s) of survey	Method of gathering survey data	Target population	Range of study	Number of respondents	Age of respondents (yr)	Sampling method	Justified sample size	Response rate (%)	Ever trained in CPR (%)	Trained in CPR within previous 1 year (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 2 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 5 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR over 5 years ago (%) ¹	Willing to be trained in CPR (%)
Australia [Clark et al., 2002; Johnston et al., 2003; Johnston et al., 2004]	1998	Telephone survey	General public	State (Queensland)	4,490	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	No	72	54	22	-	-	-	-
Australia [Jelinek et al., 2001; Celenza et al., 2002]	1999	Telephone survey	General public	State (Western Australia)	803	Adults	Stratified random sample	No	55	64	20	-	58	42	-
Australia [Smith et al., 2003]	2000–2001	Telephone survey	General public	State (Victoria)	1,489	Adults	Stratified random sample	Yes	52	52	21	-	-	-	-
Australia [Dwyer, 2008]	2005	Telephone survey	General public	Region (Central Queensland)	1,208	≥ 18	Simple random sample	No	39	74	-	-	-	-	-
Australia [Bray et al., 2016; Bray et al., 2017]	2016	Telephone survey	General public	State (Victoria)	404	≥ 18	-	Yes	45	68	28	-	47	51	-
Australia [Cartledge et al., 2020]	2017	Online survey	General public (interested/registered to participate in surveys)	Country	1,076	≥ 18	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	No	-	56	22	-	56	42	73 ²
Belgium [Scavee et al., 2011*]	-	Questionnaire self-completion (in public places + email)	General public	Country	2,070	≥ 16	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	30	-	-	-	-	-
Brazil [Bartlett et al., 2020]	2017–2019	Face-to-face interview (household survey)	General public	Three municipalities (Padre Paraíso, Poçoões, Vitória da Conquista)	962 (Padre Paraíso), 1,019 (Poçoões), 1,054 (Vitória da Conquista)	≥ 30	Systematic random sample	Yes	-	3 (Padre Paraíso), 6 (Poçoões), 16 (Vitória da Conquista)	-	-	-	-	-
Canada [Cheskes et al., 2016]	-	Online survey	General public (interested/registered to participate in surveys)	Country	428	≥ 18	Non-probability sample (voluntary response sample)	Yes	-	64	-	-	-	-	-
China [Cheung et al., 2003]	2002	Telephone survey	General public	Region (Hong Kong)	357	≥ 16	Simple random sample	Yes	45	12	19	36	48	52	-

(continued to the next page)

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Country [Reference(s)]	Year(s) of survey	Method of gathering survey data	Target population	Range of study	Number of respondents	Age of respondents (yr)	Sampling method	Justified sample size	Response rate (%)	Ever trained in CPR (%)	Trained in CPR within previous 1 year (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 2 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 5 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR over 5 years ago (%) ¹	Willing to be trained in CPR (%)
China [Hung et al., 2011*; Chair et al., 2014]	2010	Telephone survey	General public	Region (Hong Kong)	1,013	15–64	Simple random sample	Yes	46	21	-	-	-	51	-
China [Chen et al., 2017]	2014	Online survey	General public (interested/registered to participate in surveys; excluding medical-related persons)	Country	1,841	No limit	Simple random sample	No	-	26	-	-	-	-	-
China [Duber et al., 2018]	2015	Face-to-face interview (household survey)	General public	Metropolitan cities (Beijing, Shanghai)	1,524 (Beijing), 1,537 (Shanghai)	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	No	-	26 (Beijing), 15 (Shanghai)	-	-	-	-	-
China [Yan et al., 2020]	2018–2019	Questionnaire self-completion	General public	Country	99,186	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	No	57	38	-	-	-	-	733
China [Liu et al., 2012*]	-	Questionnaire completion	General public	Metropolitan city (Zhengzhou)	338	-	-	No	-	12	-	-	-	-	943
China [Chan and Chan, 2016*]	-	Telephone survey	General public	Region (Hong Kong)	524	-	-	No	-	23	-	-	-	-	-
Costa Rica [Schmid et al., 2015*; Schmid et al., 2016]	2014	Face-to-face interview (in public gathering places)	General public	Metropolitan city (San José)	370	-	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	36	-	-	-	-	553
Ghana [Anto-Ocrah et al., 2020]	2019	Online survey	General public (social media network users)	Country	479	≥ 18	Non-probability sample (snowball sample)	Yes	-	31	34	51	82	18	903
Greece [Hatzakis et al., 2008]	-	Telephone survey	General public	County (Heraklion)	390	≥ 18	Simple random sample	No	81	29	30	-	65	35	-
Iceland [Amar et al., 2001*]	-	Telephone survey	General public	Country	804	16–75	Random sample (type unknown)	No	-	73	-	-	-	-	-
India [Duber et al., 2018]	2015	Face-to-face interview (household survey)	General public	Metropolitan city (Bangalore)	2,400	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	No	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesia [Pranata et al., 2020]	2016	Questionnaire self-completion (in public places)	General public (excluding persons with medical background)	Metropolitan city (Jakarta)	303	> 17	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	87	40	-	-	-	-	743

(continued to the next page)

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Country [Reference(s)]	Year(s) of survey	Method of gathering survey data	Target population	Range of study	Number of respondents	Age of respondents (yr)	Sampling method	Justified sample size	Response rate (%)	Ever trained in CPR (%)	Trained in CPR within previous 1 year (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 2 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 5 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR over 5 years ago (%) ¹	Willing to be trained in CPR (%)
Ireland [Jennings et al., 2009]	2008	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Country	974	≥ 16	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	Yes	-	28	-	38	85	-	-
Japan [Kuramoto et al., 2008]	2006	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Country	1,132	15-79	Stratified random sample	No	47	35	-	-	-	-	-
Japan [Sasaki et al., 2012*; Sasaki et al., 2015]	2012	Online survey	General public (interested/registered to participate in surveys; excluding persons with medical education and healthcare professionals)	Country	4,853	≥ 15	Stratified random sample	No	58	49	11	-	72	28	-
Japan [Otani et al., 2011*]	-	Questionnaire self-completion (in public places)	General public	Metropolitan city (Hiroshima)	5,956	-	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	60	49	-	-	-	-	-
Korea [Lee et al., 2008*]	2006	Telephone survey	General public	Metropolitan city (Seoul)	1,007	≥ 19	Random sample (type unknown)	No	-	45	21	30	-	-	-
Korea [Lee et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2016*]	2007	Telephone survey	General public	Country	1,029	≥ 19	Stratified random sample	No	41	48	-	30	40	60	553
Korea [Lee et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2016*]	2011	Telephone survey	General public	Country	1,000	≥ 19	Stratified random sample	No	37	38	-	49	63	37	593
Korea [Moon et al., 2017*; Son et al., 2017; Moon et al., 2019]	2012	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Metropolitan city (Daegu)	1,000	≥ 19	Probability quota sample	No	-	36	27	47	66	31	-
Korea [Ro et al., 2016]	2012	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Country	228,921	≥ 19	Stratified random sample	No	-	27	-	42	-	-	-
Korea [Lee et al., 2016*]	2015	Telephone survey	General public	Country	1,000	≥ 19	Stratified random sample	No	-	51	-	60	-	-	803
Korea [Moon et al., 2017*; Moon et al., 2019]	2016	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Metropolitan city (Daegu)	1,141	≥ 19	Probability quota sample	No	-	55	-	55	-	-	-

(continued to the next page)

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Country [Reference(s)]	Year(s) of survey	Method of gathering survey data	Target population	Range of study	Number of respondents	Age of respondents (yr)	Sampling method	Justified sample size	Response rate (%)	Ever trained in CPR (%)	Trained in CPR within previous 1 year (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 2 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 5 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR over 5 years ago (%) ¹	Willing to be trained in CPR (%)
Korea [Kang et al., 2006*]	-	Survey	General public	Metropolitan city (Incheon)	5,114	Adults	-	No	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Malta [Caruana et al., 2013*]	-	Interview	General public	Country	656	-	Probability quota sample	No	-	35	-	-	-	-	-
New Zealand [Larsen et al., 2004]	2002	Telephone survey	General public	Metropolitan city (Wellington)	400	> 17	Systematic random sample	No	76	74	12	-	37	63	-
Oman [AlShaqsí et al., 2015]	2014	Face-to-face interview (in public places)	General public	Five cities (Muscat, Sur, Ibri, Nizwa, Salalah)	873	-	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	58	39	26	-	-	-	-
Oman [Al-Riyami et al., 2019*]	-	Questionnaire completion (in public places)	General public (excluding persons with medical background)	Country	924	-	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	21	-	-	-	-	833
Poland [Rasmus and Czekało, 2000]	1997	Questionnaire self-completion	General public	Country	1,092	-	Random sample (type unknown)	No	-	73	-	-	-	-	823
Portugal [Díxe and Gomes, 2015]	2010–2012	Questionnaire self-completion (at workplace)	General public (employees of public and private institutions)	Country	1,700	≥ 18	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	18	-	-	-	-	963
Russia [Birkun and Kosova, 2018a; Birkun and Kosova, 2018b*; Birkun and Kosova, 2018c]	2017–2018	Face-to-face interview (in public places)	General public	Region (Crimean peninsula)	384	≥ 18	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	Yes	95	53	24	-	42	54	523
Saudi Arabia [Qara et al., 2019]	2018	Questionnaire self-completion	General public (excluding healthcare providers)	Metropolitan city (Jeddah)	600	≥ 18	-	No	-	29	-	-	-	-	-
Singapore [Quah et al., 2012*; Ong et al., 2013]	2009–2010	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Country	4,192	18–69	Simple random sample	No	65	31	-	-	-	-	-

(continued to the next page)

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Country [Reference(s)]	Year(s) of survey	Method of gathering survey data	Target population	Range of study	Number of respondents	Age of respondents (yr)	Sampling method	Justified sample size	Response rate (%)	Ever trained in CPR (%)	Trained in CPR within previous 1 year (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 2 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 5 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR over 5 years ago (%) ¹	Willing to be trained in CPR (%)
Slovenia [Rajapakse et al., 2010]	2006	Telephone survey	General public (excluding persons with medical education background)	Country	500	≥ 18	Simple random sample	Yes	30	69	2	4	12	86	-
Spain [Bailesteros-Peña et al., 2016]	2015	Face-to-face interview (in public places)	General public (excluding persons with healthcare education)	Metropolitan cities of the Basque Country (Bilbao, San Sebastian, Vitoria)	605	15-64	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	Yes	-	37	29	39	59	42	642
Spain [Rafecas Ventosa et al., 2017]	2016	Questionnaire completion (in public places)	General public	Metropolitan city (Barcelona)	3,067	≥ 12	Non-probability sample (voluntary response sample)	No	-	34	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden [Axelsson et al., 2006]	2000	Questionnaire self-completion (postal)	General public	Country	3,167	18-79	Stratified random sample	No	63	45	-	-	-	-	502
Taiwan [Pei-Chuan Huang et al., 2019]	2013	Telephone survey	General public	Country	1,073	≥ 20	Stratified random sample	Yes	32	41	22	35	52	47	-
The UK, England [Donohoe et al., 2006]	2003	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	County (Greater London)	1,011	> 16	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	No	-	30	33	-	-	16	-
The UK, England [Brooks et al., 2015]	2014	Face-to-face interview (in a shopping centre)	General public	City (Southampton)	1,004	No limit	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	61	-	-	-	-	-
The UK, Scotland [Dobbie et al., 2018]	2015	Face-to-face interview (in-home)	General public	Country (Scotland)	1,027	≥ 16	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	No	-	52	-	-	-	-	422
The UK, whole [Hawkes et al., 2017 [†] ; Hawkes et al., 2019]	2017	Online survey	General public (interested/registered to participate in surveys)	Country	2,084	≥ 18	Purposive non-probability sample (quota sample)	No	-	59	17	-	46	54	-

(continued to the next page)

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Country [Reference(s)]	Year(s) of survey	Method of gathering survey data	Target population	Range of study	Number of respondents	Age of respondents (yr)	Sampling method	Justified sample size	Response rate (%)	Ever trained in CPR (%)	Trained in CPR within previous 1 year (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 2 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR within previous 5 years (%) ¹	Trained in CPR over 5 years ago (%) ¹	Willing to be trained in CPR (%)
The USA [Barnhart et al., 2005]	2000	Telephone survey	General public	Six counties in three states (Hartford County, Connecticut; Manhattan and Suffolk Counties, New York; Camden and Bergen/Passaic Counties, New Jersey)	1,880	≥ 18	Simple random sample	No	50	42	-	-	-	-	-
The USA [Coons and Guy, 2009]	2008	Questionnaire self-completion (postal)	General public	Two counties in one state (Maricopa County, Santa Cruz County, Arizona)	755	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	Yes	50	55 (rural), 63 (urban)	-	-	-	-	-
The USA [Sipsma et al., 2011]	2008	Telephone survey	General public	County (King County, Washington)	1,001	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	Yes	39	79	17	-	46	53	-
The USA [Blewer et al., 2015*; Murray et al., 2016*]	2014–2015	Telephone survey	General public	Region in a state (Southeastern Pennsylvania)	10,048	Adults	Stratified random sample	No	-	65	-	-	-	-	-
The USA [Blewer et al., 2017; Blewer, 2018*]	2015	Telephone survey	General public	Country	9,022	≥ 18	Stratified random sample	No	-	65	-	28	-	-	-
The USA [Fratia et al., 2020]	2015–2017	Questionnaire self-completion (at public gatherings)	General public	Metropolitan city (Baltimore, Maryland)	516	≥ 14	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	68	-	-	-	-	-
The USA [Petruncio et al., 2018]	2016	Face-to-face interview (in a shopping center)	General public	County (Charleston County, South Carolina)	318	≥ 18	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	70	-	-	-	-	-
The USA [Knapp et al., 2018*]	-	Survey (in public places)	General public	City (Norfolk, Virginia)	712	18–89	Non-probability sample (convenience sample)	No	-	72	-	-	-	-	-

CPR, cardiopulmonary resuscitation.

*Conference abstracts, dissertation abstract [Blewer, 2018] and non-English articles (data from English-language abstracts and tables only); em dash — no data/unknown.

¹Percentage out of respondents who were trained in CPR. ²Percentage out of respondents who were not trained in CPR. ³Percentage out of all respondents.