

Supplementary table 3: Quality appraisal of the reviewed studies using the Quality Assessment for Diverse Studies tool (QuADS)[16]

Author (Year)[Ref]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total Score	% Score
Allan (2011)[21]	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	19/39	48.72%
Butler et al (2013)[22]	3	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	15/39	38.46%
Cope & Alberti (2020)[23]	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	3	34/39	87.18%
Correia et al (2022)[24]	2	3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	0	2	28/39	71.79%
Dale et al (2017)[25]	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	0	3	33/39	84.62%
Eden & Peterson (2018)[26]	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	0	3	28/39	71.79%
Elma et al (2023)[27]	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	0	2	30/39	76.92%
Grierson et al (2021)[28]	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	32/39	82.05
Howard et al (2023)[29]	2	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	0	3	31/39	79.49%
Kitchener (2019)[30]	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	0	0	15/39	38.46%
Magee et al (2015)[31]	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	0	2	0	0	28/39	71.79%
McGrail & O'Sullivan (2020)[32]	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	0	3	29/39	74.36%
McKenzie et al. (2013)[33]	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	2	3	0	0	29/39	74.36%
McKenzie et al (2013)[6]	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	3	0	0	26/39	66.67%

Romain et al (2015)[34]	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	15/39	38.46%
Thornton et al (2022)[35]	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	0	0	25/39	64.10%

Note: (1) "theoretical or conceptual underpinning to the research", (2) "statement of research aim(s)", (3) "clear description of research setting and target population", (4) "appropriateness of study design to address research aim(s)", (5) "appropriate sampling to address the research aims", (6) "rationale for choice of data collection tools", (7) "appropriateness of the format and content of data collection tools", (8) description of data collection procedures, (9) "recruitment data provided", (10) justification for analytic methods", (11) "appropriateness of analytic methods to answer research aims", (12) "evidence of stakeholders involvement" and (13) "critical discussion of strengths and limitations".