### Supplementary appendix 4: PRISMA and ENTREQ checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section and Topic</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Checklist Item</th>
<th>Location where item is reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify the report as a systematic review.</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABSTRACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.</td>
<td>p.4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.</td>
<td>p.2 and p.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility criteria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.</td>
<td>p.6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.</td>
<td>p.8-9, supplementary appendix 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search strategy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.</td>
<td>Supplementary appendix 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.</td>
<td>p.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection process</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.</td>
<td>p.9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data items</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.</td>
<td>p.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.</td>
<td>p.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study risk of bias assessment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.</td>
<td>p.9-10, supplementary appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect measures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis methods</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td>Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).</td>
<td>p.10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13b</td>
<td>Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.</td>
<td>p.10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13c</td>
<td>Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.</td>
<td>p.10-11, supplementary appendix 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13d</td>
<td>Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.</td>
<td>p.10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13e</td>
<td>Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13f</td>
<td>Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section and Topic</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Checklist Item</th>
<th>Location where item is reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting bias assessment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).</td>
<td>high risk, p.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty assessment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.</td>
<td>p.5, supplementary appendix 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study selection</td>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.</td>
<td>Figure 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16b</td>
<td>Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.</td>
<td>Figure 1, p.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study characteristics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cite each included study and present its characteristics.</td>
<td>Supplementary appendix 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of bias in studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.</td>
<td>Supplementary appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of individual studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of syntheses</td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.</td>
<td>Supplementary appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20b</td>
<td>Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.</td>
<td>p.11-14. Supplementary appendix 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20c</td>
<td>Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20d</td>
<td>Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting biases</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty of evidence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.</td>
<td>Table 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>23a</td>
<td>Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.</td>
<td>p.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23b</td>
<td>Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.</td>
<td>p.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23c</td>
<td>Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.</td>
<td>p.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23d</td>
<td>Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.</td>
<td>p.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and protocol</td>
<td>24a</td>
<td>Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.</td>
<td>p. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24b</td>
<td>Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.</td>
<td>p.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24c</td>
<td>Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.</td>
<td>p.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing interests</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Declare any competing interests of review authors.</td>
<td>p.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section and Topic</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Checklist Item</th>
<th>Location where item is reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of data, code and other materials</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.</td>
<td>p.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For more information, visit: [http://www.prisma-statement.org/](http://www.prisma-statement.org/)

Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ Checklist (Tong, et al., 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Guide and Description</th>
<th>Report Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aim</td>
<td>State the research question the synthesis addresses</td>
<td>Background, p.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Synthesis methodology</td>
<td>Identify the synthesis methodology or theoretical framework which underpins the synthesis, and describe the rationale for choice of methodology (e.g. meta-ethnography, thematic synthesis, critical interpretive synthesis, grounded theory synthesis, realist synthesis, meta-aggregation, meta-study, framework synthesis)</td>
<td>Data analysis, p.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach to searching</td>
<td>Indicate whether the search was pre-planned (comprehensive search strategies to seek all available studies) or iterative (to seek all available concepts until they theoretical saturation is achieved)</td>
<td>search strategy screening and eligibility criteria SPIDER, p.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Specify the inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g. in terms of population, language, year limits, type of publication, study type)</td>
<td>Eligibility criteria, p.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data sources</td>
<td>Describe the information sources used (e.g. electronic databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, psycINFO), grey literature databases (digital thesis, policy reports), relevant organisational websites, experts, information specialists, generic web searches (Google Scholar) hand searching, reference lists) and when the searches conducted; provide the rationale for using the data sources</td>
<td>search strategy, p.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Electronic Search strategy</td>
<td>Describe the literature search (e.g. provide electronic search strategies with population terms, clinical or health topic terms, experiential or social phenomena related terms, filters for qualitative research, and search limits)</td>
<td>Supplementary appendix 1 and p.6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Study screening methods</td>
<td>Describe the process of study screening and sifting (e.g. title, abstract and full text review, number of independent reviewers who screened studies)</td>
<td>p.9 study selection process, Fig 1 PRISMA flow diagram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Study characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Present the characteristics of the included studies (e.g. year of publication, country, population, number of participants, data collection, methodology, analysis, research questions)</td>
<td>Table 2 in supplementary appendix 3, Characteristics of included studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Study selection results</strong></td>
<td>Identify the number of studies screened and provide reasons for study exclusion (e.g. for comprehensive searching, provide numbers of studies screened and reasons for exclusion indicated in a figure/flowchart; for iterative searching describe reasons for study exclusion and inclusion based on modifications to the research question and/or contribution to theory development)</td>
<td>Fig 1 - PRISMA flow diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Rationale for appraisal</strong></td>
<td>Describe the rationale and approach used to appraise the included studies or selected findings (e.g. assessment of conduct (validity and robustness), assessment of reporting (transparency), assessment of content and utility of the findings)</td>
<td>Table 1, CERQual approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Appraisal items</strong></td>
<td>State the tools, frameworks and criteria used to appraise the studies or selected findings (e.g. Existing tools: CASP, QARI, COREQ, Mays and Pope [25]; reviewer developed tools; describe the domains assessed: research team, study design, data analysis and interpretations, reporting)</td>
<td>Appraisal of the methodological limitations of included studies, Table 1, CERQual approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Appraisal process</strong></td>
<td>Indicate whether the appraisal was conducted independently by more than one reviewer and if consensus was required</td>
<td>p.10, independently done by the three researchers and consensus achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Appraisal results</strong></td>
<td>Present results of the quality assessment and indicate which articles, if any, were weighted/excluded based on the assessment and give the rationale</td>
<td>Table 1, CERQual approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Data extraction</strong></td>
<td>Indicate which sections of the primary studies were analysed and how were the data extracted from the primary studies? (e.g. all text under the headings “results/conclusions” were extracted electronically and entered into a computer software)</td>
<td>Data extraction and analysis, p.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Software</strong></td>
<td>State the computer software used, if any</td>
<td>None used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Number of reviewers</strong></td>
<td>Identify who was involved in coding and analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Coding</strong></td>
<td>Describe the process for coding of data (e.g. line by line coding to search for concepts)</td>
<td>p.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Study comparison</strong></td>
<td>Describe how were comparisons made within and across studies (e.g. subsequent studies were coded into pre-existing concepts, and new concepts were created when deemed necessary)</td>
<td>Table 2 in supplementary appendix 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Derivation of themes</strong></td>
<td>Explain whether the process of deriving the themes or constructs was inductive or deductive</td>
<td>Inductive process, p.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Quotations</strong></td>
<td>Provide quotations from the primary studies to illustrate themes/constructs, and identify whether the quotations were participant quotations of the author’s interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. Synthesis output</strong></td>
<td>Present rich, compelling and useful results that go beyond a summary of the primary studies (e.g. new interpretation, models of evidence, conceptual models, analytical framework, development of a new theory or construct)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>