

	Nakash 2008	Nicholas 2010	Postel 2010	Eborall 2011	Wells 2011	Shilling 2011	Sanders 2012	Johannson 2015	Sari 2017	Fernandez-Alvarez 2017	Henshall 2018
Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No – not explicitly in abstract or background	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	Yes	Yes	This reported some qualitative data from open ended questionnaire response options	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	Unclear – not mentioned in paper	Unclear - not mentioned in paper	Unclear	Unclear – status of interviewer mentioned but not discussed further	Unclear - not mentioned in paper	Unclear- not mentioned in paper	Unclear – not mentioned in paper	Yes, this was discussed	Yes, this was discussed	Yes, this was discussed	Yes, this was discussed

Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Unclear – informed consent mentioned, but not ethical approvals	Unclear – informed consent mentioned, but not ethical approvals
Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Yes, apparently so (although not huge detail)	Yes	Unclear – not mentioned other than that the data was systematically analysed – reflects that it was not a qualitative study as such.	Yes	Unclear – very brief details and presented in quantitative manner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is there a clear statement of findings?	Yes	Yes	Yes, but brief	Yes	Yes	Yes, but focus of report was not on reasons for withdrawing and so this was somewhat buried and limited.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
How valuable is the research to our review?	Useful findings – NB: Limited 1 st order construct data perhaps because paper also included data from trial retainers (and this seemed to be main emphasis)	Useful – perhaps one of the richer papers in terms of insights and data	Less useful than other studies but still provides helpful insights that help to build on the findings of other studies. Qualitative data presented was very limited (both 1 st and 2 nd)	Useful – more 1 st order constructs than some of the other papers e.g. Nakash, Sanders	Less useful than other studies but still provides helpful insights that help build on other studies. Qualitative data presented was very limited	Useful – but study focussed on decliners and withdrawers and provided limited data from the latter.	Useful – but only 3 were withdrawers, rest were decliners and so like Nakash the emphasis of the paper (and the bulk of data and reflection provided) was on decliners. Few 1 st order	Useful – perhaps one of the richer papers in terms of insights and data	Useful, although limited 1 st order constructs	Useful – more 1 st order constructs than some of the other papers e.g. Nakash, Sanders	Useful findings – NB: Limited 1 st order construct data perhaps because paper also included data from trial retainers – out of 20 participants interviewed,

			order constructs) and was discussed in a more quantitative way.		(both 1 st and 2 nd order constructs) and was discussed in a more quantitative way.		constructs from withdrawers.				only 4 had dropped out.
--	--	--	---	--	---	--	------------------------------	--	--	--	-------------------------