Table S1. Quality appraisal of included studies using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme Qualitative Research Checklist

| Items | Allen et al. (2017) | Backman et al. (2018) | Dolu et al. (2021) | Haldinget al. (2012) | Reedy-Cooper et al. (2020) | Rijpkema et al. (2021) | Swan et al. (2020) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered? | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| 1. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N |
| 1. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. Is there a clear statement of findings? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 1. How valuable is the research? | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| *Note*. Y = yes; N = no or “can’t tell” | | | | | | | |