**Supplementary Table 3 – Quality appraisal methodology and results**

**Methodology**

The CASP tool, endorsed by the Cochrane Collaboration asks 10 questions relating to the rigour of the methodology used, quality of reporting and relevance of findings. One reviewer (SQ) appraised each study, assigning a rating of 0, 1 or 2 for each question which reflected the extent to which the obtained information from the paper answered the criteria (0 = not addressed, 1 = partially addressed and 2 = fully addressed). All papers were checked by 2 reviewers (SQ and AS). Any disagreements or clarity of issues arising with a paper were fully discussed between the two authors until a consensus agreement was reached.

CASP appraisal scores of included studies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference**  | **1****Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?** | **2****Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?** | **3****Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?** | **4****Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?** | **5****Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?** | **6****Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?** | **7****Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?** | **8****Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** | **9****Is there a clear statement of findings?** | **10****How valuable is the research?** | **Overall score**  | **Low****Medium** **High**  |
| **Park et al, 2006** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **16**  | **Medium**  |
| **Dressler et al, 2019**  | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **14** | **Medium**  |
| **Williams et al, 2016** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **18** | **High**  |
| **Lemke et al, 2017** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **19** | **High** |
| **Frigon et al, 2019** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **15** | **Medium**  |
| **Carroll et al, 2016** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **17** | **Medium**  |
| **Chase et al, 2017** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **18** | **High**  |
| **Unertl et al, 2015** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **16** | **Medium**  |
| **Haga et al, 2012**  | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **17** | **Medium**  |
| **Harding et al, 2019** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **17** | **Medium**  |
| **Lee et al, 2017**  | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **18** | **High**  |
| **Rafi et al, 2020**  | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **14** | **Medium**  |
| **Rigter et al, 2020** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **16** | **Medium**  |
| **Barr et al, 2008** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **17** | **Medium**  |
| **Issa et al, 2009** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **0** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **17** | **Medium**  |
| **DeMarco 2010** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **1** | **1**  | **2** | **1** | **15** | **Medium**  |
| **Haddy et al, 2010**  | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **0** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **18** | **High**  |
| **Van der Wouden et al, 2020** | **2**  | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **18** | **High**  |

Scoring system: 0=no criteria fulfilled or can’t tell; 1=some criteria fulfilled; 2= all criteria fulfilled.