

Online Supplementary Table 1. Quality appraisal of extracted qualitative studies using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme Checklist

Items	Davis et al. (2012)	Gowing et al. (2016)	Hudon et al. (2015)	Sandberg et al. (2014)	Williams et al. (2011)
1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	N	N	N	N	N
7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9. Is there a clear statement of findings?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10. How valuable is the research?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Note. Y = yes; N = no.

Online Supplementary Table 2. Quality appraisal of extracted experimental studies using the Amsterdam–Maastricht Consensus List

[illegible]

Items	Baldwin et al. (2014)	Bodenmann et al. (2017)	Brokel et al. (2012)	Bui et al. (2019)	Chow & Wong (2014)	Edgren et al. (2016)	Gabbay et al. (2013)	Ishani et al. (2011)	G. S. Kim et al. (2014)	Lu et al. (2020)	Meisinger et al. (2013)	Reinius et al. (2013)	Silva et al. (2020)	Tao et al. (2015)
9. Were the groups similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	+
10. Were co-interventions avoided or similar?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11. Was the compliance acceptable in all groups?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. Was the timing of the outcome assessment similar in all groups?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Total	7	10	10	7	10	10	10	10	5	7	10	10	10	10

Note. Range = 0–12 points; + = Yes (score 1); – = No (score 0), criterion was not met or not clearly stated.

Online Supplementary Table 3. Quality appraisal of extracted mixed method study using the Mixed-Methods Appraisal Tool, Version 2018

Category of study designs		Hudon et al. (2018)
Screening questions	S1. Are there clear research questions?	Y
	S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?	Y
1. Qualitative	1.1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Y
	1.2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Y
	1.3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Y
	1.4. Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Y
	1.5. Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Y
2. Quantitative randomized controlled trials	2.1. Is randomization appropriately performed	Y
	2.2. Are the groups comparable at baseline?	Y
	2.3. Are there complete outcome data?	Y
	2.4. Are outcome assessors blinded to the intervention provided?	Y
	2.5. Did the participants adhere to the assigned intervention?	N
3. Mixed method	5.1. Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?	Y
	5.2. Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	Y
	5.3. Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	Y
	5.4. Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	Y
	5.5. Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?	N

Note. Y = yes; N = no or clearly not stated.