

**Supplementary File 6.** Risk of bias assessment of quasi-experimental studies

(Please indicate whether low, moderate, serious, critical, no information)

Author (year)	Selection of participants	Confounding variables	Classification of interventions	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the reported result	Overall risk of bias
Abroms et al. (2015)	Moderate	No information	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate
Baumel et al. (2018)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Carissoli et al. (2021)	Low	Serious	Low	Low	Serious	Low	Low	Serious
Dalton et al. (2018)	Moderate	No information	Low	Low	Moderate	Serious	Low	Serious
Fujioka et al. (2012)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Globus et al. (2016)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Goetz et al. (2020)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Jallo et al. (2017)	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Kubo et al. (2021)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate
Song et al. (2013)	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	Serious	Low	Serious
Trude et al. (2021)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Serious	Low	Low	Serious

## Risk of bias assessment of observational cohort and cross sectional studies

(Please indicate whether yes, no, CD [cannot determine], NA [not applicable], NR [not reported])

Author	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Deave et al. (2019)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Özkan Şat et al. (2018)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NR	NA	NR

**1:** Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated? **2:** Was the study population clearly specified and defined? **3:** Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%? **4:** Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants? **5:** Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided? **6:** For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured? **7:** Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed? **8:** For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)? **9:** Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? **10:** Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time? **11:** Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? **12:** Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants? **13:** Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? **14:** Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

## Risk of bias assessment of qualitative studies

(Please indicate whether yes, no, or can't tell)

Author (Year)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Brown et al. (2014)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Connor et al. (2018)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Harrington et al. (2019)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Litterbach et al. (2017)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seshu et al. (2021)	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Skar et al. (2018)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yee et al. (2020)	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**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?

### Risk of bias assessment of mixed methods studies (Please indicate whether yes, no, or CT [can't tell])

Author (Year)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Avalos et al. (2020)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Blackwell et al. (2020)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Musiimenta et al. (2020)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CT	No	CT	No
Rhodes et al. (2020)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Seo et al. (2021)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Simpson et al. (2021)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Stonbraker et al. (2020)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

**1:** Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question? **2:** Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question? **3:** Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted? **4:** Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed? **5:** Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved? **6:** Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question? **7:** Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question? **8:** Are the findings adequately derived from the data? **9:** Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data? **10:** Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation? Questions 11-15 depends on whether it involves RCT, non-randomized, or quantitative descriptive studies.