

**AXIS quality appraisal**

<b>Bol et al. (2017)</b>					
	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<i>Introduction</i>					
1	Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	x			
<i>Methods</i>					
2	Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	x			
3	Was the sample size justified?	x			
4	Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	x			

5	Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
6	Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?			x	
7	Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?			x	
8	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	x			
9	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	x			
10	Is it clear what was used to determine statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (e.g. p-values, confidence intervals)	x			
11	Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	x			
<i>Results</i>					

12	Were the basic data adequately described?	x			
13	Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?		x		
14	If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?		x		
15	Were the results internally consistent?	x			
16	Were the results presented for all the analyses described in the methods?	x			
<i>Discussion</i>					
17	Were the authors' discussions and conclusions justified by the results?	x			
18	Were the limitations of the study discussed?	x			
<i>Other</i>					

19	Were there any funding sources or conflicts of interest that may affect the authors' interpretation of the results?		x		
20	Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?	x			

<b>König et al. (2017)</b>					
	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<i>Introduction</i>					
1	Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	x			
<i>Methods</i>					
2	Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	x			
3	Was the sample size justified?	x			

4	Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	x			
5	Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
6	Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
7	Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?			x	
8	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	x			
9	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	x			
10	Is it clear what was used to determine statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (e.g. p-values, confidence intervals)	x			
11	Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	x			

<i>Results</i>					
12	Were the basic data adequately described?	x			
13	Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	x			
14	If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?		x		
15	Were the results internally consistent?	x			
16	Were the results presented for all the analyses described in the methods?	x			
<i>Discussion</i>					
17	Were the authors' discussions and conclusions justified by the results?	x			
18	Were the limitations of the study discussed?	x			

<i>Other</i>					
19	Were there any funding sources or conflicts of interest that may affect the authors' interpretation of the results?		X		
20	Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?	X			

<b>Naszay et al. (2017)</b>					
	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<i>Introduction</i>					
1	Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	X			
<i>Methods</i>					
2	Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	X			

3	Was the sample size justified?	x			
4	Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	x			
5	Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
6	Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
7	Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?			x	
8	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	x			
9	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	x			
10	Is it clear what was used to determine statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (e.g. p-values, confidence intervals)	x			
11	Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	x			



<i>Results</i>					
12	Were the basic data adequately described?	x			
13	Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?		x		
14	If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?		x		
15	Were the results internally consistent?	x			
16	Were the results presented for all the analyses described in the methods?	x			
<i>Discussion</i>					
17	Were the authors' discussions and conclusions justified by the results?	x			
18	Were the limitations of the study discussed?	x			

<i>Other</i>				
19	Were there any funding sources or conflicts of interest that may affect the authors' interpretation of the results?		x	
20	Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?	x		

<b>Seifert et al. (2017)</b>					
	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<i>Introduction</i>					
1	Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	x			
<i>Methods</i>					

2	Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	x			
3	Was the sample size justified?		x		
4	Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	x			
5	Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
6	Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?	x			
7	Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?			x	
8	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	x			
9	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?			x	
10	Is it clear what was used to determine statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (e.g. p-values, confidence intervals)	x			

11	Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	x			
<i>Results</i>					
12	Were the basic data adequately described?	x			
13	Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	x	x		
14	If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?		x		
15	Were the results internally consistent?	x			
16	Were the results presented for all the analyses described in the methods?	x			
<i>Discussion</i>					
17	Were the authors' discussions and conclusions justified by the results?	x			

18	Were the limitations of the study discussed?	x			
<i>Other</i>					
19	Were there any funding sources or conflicts of interest that may affect the authors' interpretation of the results?		x		
20	Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?	x			

<b>Mackert et al. (2016)</b>					
	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<i>Introduction</i>					
1	Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	x			
<i>Methods</i>					

2	Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	x			
3	Was the sample size justified?		x		
4	Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	x			
5	Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?			x	
6	Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?			x	
7	Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?			x	
8	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	x			
9	Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	x			
10	Is it clear what was used to determine statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (e.g. p-values, confidence intervals)	x			

11	Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?		x		
<i>Results</i>					
12	Were the basic data adequately described?	x			
13	Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?			x	
14	If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?		x		
15	Were the results internally consistent?	x			
16	Were the results presented for all the analyses described in the methods?	x			
<i>Discussion</i>					
17	Were the authors' discussions and conclusions justified by the results?	x			

18	Were the limitations of the study discussed?	x			
<i>Other</i>					
19	Were there any funding sources or conflicts of interest that may affect the authors' interpretation of the results?		x		
20	Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?			x	



**MMAT quality appraisal**

1. QUALITATIVE STUDIES	0.1. - Are there clear qualitative research questions?	0.2. - Do the collected data allow address the research question?
Cabrita et al. (2019)	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL / Somewhat	CAN'T TELL / Somewhat
	<i>Screening question</i>	<i>Screening question</i>
2. QUANTITATIVE STUDIES	0.1. - Are there clear quantitative research questions?	0.2. - Do the collected data allow address the research question?
Bol et al. (2018)	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL
König et al. (2018)	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL
Naszay et al. (2018)	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL

<b>Seifert et al. (2017)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL
<b>Mackert et al. (2016)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL

<b>1. QUALITATIVE STUDIES</b>	<b>1.1. - Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?</b>	<b>1.2. - Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?</b>	<b>1.3. - Are the findings adequately derived from the data?</b>
<b>Cabrita et al. (2019)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL / Somewhat	CAN'T TELL / Somewhat	<b>CAN'T TELL / Somewhat</b>
<b>2. QUANTITATIVE STUDIES</b>	<b>2.1. - Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?</b>	<b>2.2. - Is the sample representative of the target population?</b>	<b>2.3. - Are the measurements appropriate?</b>
<b>Bol et al. (2018)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL
<b>König et al. (2018)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL

<b>Naszay et al. (2018)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL
<b>Seifert et al. (2017)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	No	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL
<b>Mackert et al. (2016)</b>	YES	YES	<b>YES</b>
	NO	No	NO
	<b>CAN'T TELL</b>	<b>CAN'T TELL</b>	CAN'T TELL

<b>1. QUALITATIVE STUDIES</b>	<b>1.4. - Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?</b>	<b>1.5. - Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?</b>
<b>Cabrita et al. (2019)</b>	YES	YES
	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
	CAN'T TELL / Somewhat	CAN'T TELL / Somewhat
<b>2. QUANTITATIVE STUDIES</b>	<b>2.4. - Is the risk of nonresponse bias low?</b>	<b>2.5. - Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question?</b>
<b>Bol et al. (2018)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	CAN'T TELL	CAN'T TELL

<b>König et al. (2018)</b>	YES	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	<b>CAN'T TELL</b>	CAN'T TELL
<b>Naszay et al. (2018)</b>	YES	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	<b>CAN'T TELL</b>	CAN'T TELL
<b>Seifert et al. (2017)</b>	YES	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	<b>CAN'T TELL</b>	CAN'T TELL
<b>Mackert et al. (2016)</b>	YES	<b>YES</b>
	NO	NO
	<b>CAN'T TELL</b>	CAN'T TELL