

Supplementary file B. Quality appraisal

Table 1.
Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)

1. QUALITATIVE STUDIES								
Authors	Year	S1. Are there clear research questions? (Yes, No, Can't tell)	S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research question?	1.1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	1.2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	1.3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	1.4. Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	1.5. Is there coherence between qualitative data, sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?
Nancarrow et al.	2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Colón-Emeric et al.	2006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wynendaale et al.	2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Van den Berg et al.	2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Roberts	2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bowers and Nolet	2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lalani et al.	2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eaton	2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Forbes-Thompson et al.	2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Andersen and Spiers	2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bowers et al.	2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bowers et al.	2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gray et al. ¹	2015	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Can't tell	Can't tell	Can't tell
2. RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS								
3. NON-RANDOMIZED STUDIES								
Authors	Year	S1. Are there clear research questions? (Yes, No, Can't tell)	S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research question?	3.1. Are participants representative of the target population?	3.2. Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?	3.3. Are there complete outcome data?	3.4. Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?	3.5. During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?

¹ One author categorized this article as 'text and opinion' while the other author categorized this article as 'qualitative'. This difference in interpretation was discussed and the authors agreed to the category 'qualitative' because the study authors indicate that it is a case study and interviews were conducted. The authors also agreed that in this case, there are some shortcomings in the methodology.

Heyer et al.	2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
4. QUANTITATIVE DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES								
Authors	Year	S1. Are there clear research questions? (Yes, No, Can't tell)	S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research question?	4.1. Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?	4.2. Is the sample representative of the target population?	4.3. Are the measurements appropriate?	4.4. Is the risk of nonresponse bias low?	4.5. Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question?
Cott	1997	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lemke et al.	2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anderson et al.	2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes partially; unknown for some independent variables	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sikorska-Simmons	2008	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. MIXED-METHODS STUDIES								
Authors	Year	S1. Are there clear research questions (Yes, No, Can't tell?)	S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research question?	5.1. Is there an adequate rationale for using mixed-methods design to address the research question?	5.2. Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	5.3. Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	5.4. Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	5.5. Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?
Scheuer et al.	2021	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Klaassen et al.	2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Qualitative= yes. Quantitative = 4.4 can't tell
Cohen et al.	2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Qualitative= yes. Quantitative = 4.2 & 4.4 can't tell
Solimeo et al.	2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Qualitative= yes. Quantitative = 4.4 can't tell
Nielsen et al.	2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Qualitative= yes. Quantitative = 2.1 & 2.4 can't tell
Sharkey et al. ²	2010	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Qualitative= no

								Quantitative = 3.3 & 3.4 can't tell
Drennan et al.	2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eide et al.	2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Qualitative= yes. Quantitative = 3.4 can't tell
Yeatts et al.	2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2.

JBIC checklist for systematic review and review synthesis

Author	Year	1. Is the review question clearly stated? (Yes, No, Unclear, N/A)	2. Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?	3. Was the search strategy appropriate?	4. Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?	5. Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?	6. Was critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?	7. Were there methods to minimize errors in data extraction?	8. Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?	9. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	10. Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?	11. Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?
De Bruin et al.	2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Zimmerman & Cohen	2010	Yes	Yes	Yes, but: unclear what search strings were used	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes

Table 3.

JBIC checklist for text and opinion

Author	Year	1. Is the source of opinion clearly identified? (Yes, No, Unclear, N/A)	2. Does the source of opinion have standing in the field of expertise?	3. Are the interests of the relevant population the central focus of the opinion?	4. Is the stated position the result of an analytical process, and is there logic in the	5. Is there reference to the extant literature?	6. Is any incongruence with the literature/sources logically defined?
--------	------	---	--	---	--	---	---

² One author categorized this article as 'quantitative' while the other author categorized this article as 'mixed-methods'. This difference in interpretation was discussed and the authors agreed to the category 'mixed-methods' because the study authors denote it as an observational study including observations, interviews, and surveys. The authors also agreed that in this case, there are some shortcomings in the methodology.

					opinion expressed?		
Monsen and de Blok	2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Rabig et al.	2006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brune	2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Green	2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A
Zinn et al.	1995	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
De Blok & Reimer	2021	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A
Koren	2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Yeatts et al.	2004	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Michaels et al.	1994	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Rabig	2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kreitzer et al.	2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Gould	2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A