

Supplementary Table 2. Quality assessment of studies

Listed after year of publication.

Studies analysed with Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP)										
Author, year, country	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 (good/fair/poor)?
Symon 2000, UK and Scotland*	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	Fair
Litchfield et al. 2014, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Renkema et al. 2014, The Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good
Bourne et al. 2016, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Assing Hvidt et al. 2017, Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Assing Hvidt et al. 2019, Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Müller et al. 2020, Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Young et al. 2020, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

Studies analysed with Cross Sectional Appraisal Tool (CSAT)											
Author, year, country	1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue?	2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer	3. Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?	4. Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?	5. Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	6. Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?	7. How are the results presented and what is the main result? (good/fair/poor)	8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	9. Is there a clear statement of findings?	10. Can the results be applied to the local population?	11. How valuable is the research? (good/fair/poor)?

		their question?									
Summerton 1995, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Van Boven et al. 1997, The Netherlands	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	Fair	Yes	Yes	N/A	Fair
Lindenthal et al. 1999, The Netherlands and USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Summerton 2000, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Fair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Symon 2000, UK and Scotland†	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair	N/A	Yes	Yes	Fair
Vimercati et al. 2000, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Passmore et al. 2002, England	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair	N/A	Yes	Yes	Fair
Brilla et al. 2006, Germany and USA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Catino et al. 2009, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A	Yes	Yes	Fair
Steurer et al. 2009, Switzerland	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Poor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Feess 2012, Germany‡	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rohacek et al. 2012, Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Elli et al. 2013, Italy	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	Fair	No	Yes	Yes	Poor
Ortashi et al. 2013, UK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Domingues et al. 2014, Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Garcia-Retamero et al. 2014, Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Solaroglu et al. 2014, Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good
Bourne et al. 2015, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

Motta et al. 2015, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Osti et al. 2015, Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Ramella et al. 2015, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Tanriverdi et al. 2015, Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Antoci et al. 2016, Italy†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panella et al. 2016, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Bourne et al. 2017, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Olcay et al. 2017, Turkey	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	No	No	Fair
Panella et al. 2017, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Vandersteegen et al. 2017, Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Yan et al. 2017, The Netherlands	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Good	Yes	Yes	No	Fair
Kucuk 2018, Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Good	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good
Mira et al. 2018, Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Tebano et al. 2018, 74 countries	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Bourne et al. 2019, UK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Laarman et al. 2019, The Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Aranaz Andrés et al. 2020, Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Calikoglu et al. 2020, Turkey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Ferorelli et al. 2020, Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Gadjradj et al. 2020, Europe and other	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

Osorio et al. 2020, Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Fair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Pausch et al. 2020, Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Vargas-Blasco et al. 2020, Spain	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Good	N/A	Yes	Yes	Fair
Vizcaíno-Rakosnik et al. 2020, Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Good	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

N/A: not available

*Symon 2000, UK and Scotland, Litigation and changes in professional behaviour: a qualitative appraisal

†Symon 2000, UK and Scotland, Litigation and defensive clinical practice: quantifying the problem

‡CASP or CSAT are non-applicable