

Supplemental Material.

Table S1. Quality assessment of the included papers.

No.	Included paper	Methodological item for rating (1-4)*									Total score
		Abstract & title	Introduction & aims	Method & data	Sampling	Data analysis	Ethics & bias	Results	Transferability (generalizable)	Implications & usefulness	
1	Master et al., 2017	3	4	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	27
2	Kazakoff & Bers, 2014	3	4	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	30
3	Kazakoff et al., 2013	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	24
4	Kazakoff et al., 2013	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	24
5	McDonald & Howell, 2012	3	3	3	2	3	1	4	3	3	25
6	Miller, 2019	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	35
7	Castro et al., 2018	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	27
8	Sullivan & Bers, 2016	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	29
9	Sullivan & Bers, 2018	4	4	3	2	3	1	4	3	3	27
10	Di Lieto et al., 2017	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	2	22
11	Sullivan & Bers, 2019	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	28

No.	Included paper	Methodological item for rating (1-4)*									Total score
		Abstract & title	Introduction & aims	Method & data	Sampling	Data analysis	Ethics & bias	Results	Transferability (generalizable)	Implications & usefulness	
12	Sullivan et al., 2013	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	27
13	Karp & Maloney, 2013	4	2	4	3	4	1	3	3	2	26
14	Sheehan et al., 2019	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	26
15	Pila et al., 2019	4	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	29
16	Miller, 2018	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	32
17	Schroeder & Kirkorian, 2016	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	30
18	Aladé et al., 2016	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	30
19	Aldemir & Kermani, 2017	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	31
20	Paulsen & Andrews, 2014	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	1	2	18
21	Taylor, 2018	3	4	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	24
22	Jowett et al., 2012	4	4	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	24

Note.

* Criteria of ratings followed the statements listed as below,

a) Abstract and title: Did they provide a clear description of the study?

Good (4) - Structured abstract with full information and clear title.

Fair (3) - Abstract with most of the information.

Poor (2) - Inadequate abstract.

Very Poor (1) - No abstract.

b) Introduction and aims: Was there a good background and clear statement of the aims of the research?

Good (4) - Full but concise background to discussion/study containing up-to-date literature review and highlighting gaps in knowledge. Clear statement of aim AND objectives including research questions.

Fair (3) - Some background and literature review. Research questions outlined.

Poor (2) - Some background but no aim/objectives/questions, OR Aims/objectives but inadequate background.

Very Poor (1) - No mention of aims/objectives. No background or literature review.

c) Method and data: Is the method appropriate and clearly explained?

Good (4) - Method is appropriate and described clearly (e.g., questionnaires included). Clear details of the data collection and recording.

Fair (3) - Method appropriate, description could be better. Data described.

Poor (2) - Questionable whether method is appropriate. Method described inadequately. Little description of data.

Very Poor (1) - No mention of method, AND/OR Method inappropriate, AND/OR No details of data.

d) Sampling: Was the sampling strategy appropriate to address the aims?

Good (4) - Details (age/gender/race/context) of who was studied and how they were recruited. Why this group was targeted. The sample size was justified for the study. Response rates shown and explained.

Fair (3) - Sample size justified. Most information given, but some missing.

Poor (2) - Sampling mentioned but few descriptive details.

Very Poor (1) - No details of sample.

e) Data analysis: Was the description of the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?

Good (4) - Clear description of how analysis was done. Qualitative studies: Description of how themes derived/respondent validation or triangulation.

Quantitative studies: Reasons for tests selected hypothesis driven/numbers add up/statistical significance discussed.

Fair (3) - Qualitative: Descriptive discussion of analysis. Quantitative.

Poor (2) - Minimal details about analysis.

Very Poor (1) - No discussion of analysis.

f) Ethics and bias: Have ethical issues been addressed, and what has necessary ethical approval gained? Has the relationship between researchers and participants been adequately considered?

Good (4) - Ethics: Where necessary issues of confidentiality, sensitivity, and consent were addressed. Bias: Researcher was reflexive and/or aware of own bias.

Fair (3) - Lip service was paid to above (i.e., these issues were acknowledged).

Poor (2) - Brief mention of issues.

Very Poor (1) - No mention of issues.

g) Results: Is there a clear statement of the findings?

Good (4) - Findings explicit, easy to understand, and in logical progression. Tables, if present, are explained in text. Results relate directly to aims. Sufficient data are presented to support findings.

Fair (3) - Findings mentioned but more explanation could be given. Data presented relate directly to results.

Poor (2) - Findings presented haphazardly, not explained, and do not progress logically from results.

Very Poor (1) - Findings not mentioned or do not relate to aims.

h) Transferability or generalizability: Are the findings of this study transferable (generalizable) to a wider population?

Good (4) - Context and setting of the study is described sufficiently to allow comparison with other contexts and settings, plus high score in Question (d) (sampling).

Fair (3) - Some context and setting described, but more needed to replicate or compare the study with others, PLUS fair score or higher in Question (d).

Poor (2) - Minimal description of context/setting.

Very Poor (1) - No description of context/setting.

i) Implications and usefulness: How important are these findings to policy and practice?

Good (4) - Contributes something new and/or different in terms of understanding/insight or perspective. Suggests ideas for further research. Suggests implications for policy and/or practice.

Fair (3) - Two of the above (state what is missing in comments).

Poor (2) - Only one of the above.

Very Poor (1) - None of the above.

Retrieved from: Appendix D (p. 1296-1297) of Hawker, S., Payne, S., Kerr, C., Hardey, M., & Powell, J. (2002). Appraising the evidence:

Reviewing disparate data systematically. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(9), 1284-1299. doi:10.1177/1049732302238251