

Patients' and Healthcare Professionals' Experiences and Views of Recurrent Urinary Tract Infections in Women: Qualitative Evidence Synthesis and Meta-Ethnography

Supplementary material

Supplementary table S1. eMERGe (Improving reporting of Meta-Ethnography) reporting guidance checklist [21].

| Criteria number | Criteria heading | Reporting Criteria | Location where item reported |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|
| PHASE 1—SELECTING META-ETHNOGRAPHY AND GETTING STARTED | | | |
| <i>Introduction</i> | | | |
| 1 | Rationale and context for the meta-ethnography | Describe the gap in research or knowledge to be filled by the meta-ethnography, and the wider context of the meta-ethnography | Page 2 |
| 2 | Aim(s) of the meta-ethnography | Describe the meta-ethnography aim(s) | Page 2 |
| 3 | Focus of the meta-ethnography | Describe the meta-ethnography review question(s) (or objectives) | Page 2 |
| 4 | Rationale for using meta-ethnography | Explain why meta-ethnography was considered the most appropriate qualitative synthesis methodology | Page 2 |
| PHASE 2—DECIDING WHAT IS RELEVANT | | | |
| <i>Methods</i> | | | |
| 5 | Search strategy | Describe the rationale for the literature search strategy | Pages 2-4 |
| 6 | Search processes | Describe how the literature searching was carried out and by whom | Pages 2-4 |
| 7 | Selecting primary studies | Describe the process of study screening and selection, and who was involved | Pages 4-5 |
| <i>Findings</i> | | | |
| 8 | Outcome of study selection | Describe the results of study searches and screening | Figure 1 and pages 5-6 |
| PHASE 3—READING INCLUDED STUDIES | | | |
| <i>Methods</i> | | | |
| 9 | Reading and data extraction approach | Describe the reading and data extraction method and processes | Pages 4-5 |
| <i>Findings</i> | | | |
| 10 | Presenting characteristics of included studies | Describe characteristics of the included Studies | Table 2 |

| Criteria number | Criteria heading | Reporting Criteria | Location where item reported |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| PHASE 4—DETERMINING HOW STUDIES ARE RELATED | | | |
| <i>Methods</i> | | | |
| 11 | Process for determining how studies are related | Describe the methods and processes for determining how the included studies are related: - Which aspects of studies were compared AND - How the studies were compared | Pages 4-5 |
| <i>Findings</i> | | | |
| 12 | Outcome of relating studies | Describe how studies relate to each other | Pages 4-5, tables 4 and 5 |
| PHASE 5—TRANSLATING STUDIES INTO ONE ANOTHER | | | |
| <i>Methods</i> | | | |
| 13 | Process of translating studies | Describe the methods of translation: - Describe steps taken to preserve the context and meaning of the relationships between concepts within and across studies - Describe how the reciprocal and refutational translations were conducted - Describe how potential alternative interpretations or explanations were considered in the translations | Pages 4-5 |
| <i>Findings</i> | | | |
| 14 | Outcome of translation | Describe the interpretive findings of the translation | Pages 13- 28 |
| PHASE 6—SYNTHESIZING TRANSLATIONS | | | |
| <i>Methods</i> | | | |
| 15 | Synthesis process | Describe the methods used to develop overarching concepts (“synthesised translations”) Describe how potential alternative interpretations or explanations were considered in the synthesis | Page 5 |
| <i>Findings</i> | | | |
| 16 | Outcome of synthesis process | Describe the new theory, conceptual framework, model, configuration, or interpretation of data developed from the synthesis | Page 28, Figures 2 and 3. |
| PHASE 7—EXPRESSING THE SYNTHESIS | | | |
| <i>Discussion</i> | | | |
| 17 | Summary of findings | Summarize the main interpretive findings of the translation and synthesis and compare them to existing literature | Pages 31-32 |

| Criteria number | Criteria heading | Reporting Criteria | Location where item reported |
|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 18 | Strengths, limitations, and reflexivity | <p>Reflect on and describe the strengths and limitations of the synthesis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodological aspects—for example, describe how the synthesis findings were influenced by the nature of the included studies and how the meta-ethnography was conducted. - Reflexivity—for example, the impact of the research team on the synthesis findings | Page 5 and Page 32 |
| 19 | Recommendations and conclusions | Describe the implications of the synthesis | Pages 32-33 |

Supplementary table S2. Characteristics of excluded studies table (ordered by study first author).

| Study ID | Reason for exclusion |
|-------------------------|---|
| Ahmed 2016 | Study design: This study did not use qualitative methods for both data collection and analysis |
| Al-Demour 2018 | Study design: This study did not use qualitative methods for both data collection and analysis |
| Alraek 2001 | Study design: This study did not use qualitative methods for both data collection and analysis (after review team discussion) |
| Asiimwe 2021 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Aspevall 2001 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Audulv 2013 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Bjorkman 2013 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Bjornsdottir 1996, 1998 | Study design: This study did not use qualitative methods for both data collection and analysis |
| Bjornsdottir 2003, 2010 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Booth 2013 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Braund 2016 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Brookes-Howell 2018 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Coyne 2010 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Croghan 2019 | Study design: this study was a conference abstract that relates to a full study that is included |
| Cutajar 2019 | Conference abstract, PhD study currently not completed (correspondence from author) |
| Duane 2016 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Flottorp 2000 | Study design: This study did not use qualitative methods for both data collection and analysis |
| Flottorp 2003 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Flower 2016a and b | Study design: this study was a conference abstract that relates to a full study that is included |
| Gbinigie 2019 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Gbinigie 2022 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Glogowska 2022 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Hartman 2021 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Hayes 2021 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Hosoglu 2021 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Jones 2020 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Jones 2021 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |
| Jones 2021 | Topic of interest: This study did not include the relevant health issue, recurrent UTIs |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Most women describe a long history of rUTI with variability of frequency, severity, symptoms, and ability to self-diagnose. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: two studies of high quality, three of moderate quality and one study of low (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment) The study of low quality contributed minimally to the review theme. | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: the review finding reflects the variability and complexity of the data from the primary studies. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding adequacy: four studies offering rich data and two offering thin data. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding relevance: four studies were directly relevant and two studies were partially relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | Moderate confidence Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | Grigoryan et al. 2022 [35]; Croghan et al. 2021 [33]; Scott et al. 2021 [24]; Eriksson et al. 2014 [34]; Flower et al. 2014 [5]; Larcombe 2012 [38] |
| 2 | Various factors are described as triggers for rUTI, and patients worry about a serious underlying cause | Moderate concerns | No/Very minor concerns | Minor concerns | Minor concerns | Moderate confidence | Grigoryan et al. 2022 [35]; Groen and Lagro-Janssen 2005 [36]; Pat et al. 2020 [23]; |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of high quality, three of moderate quality and two studies of low quality (lack of justification and detail on study design and data collection methods, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment, possible selection bias and unclear ethical considerations) | Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: the review finding reflects the variability and complexity of the data from the primary studies. | Explanation: Minor concerns regarding adequacy: three studies offering rich data and three offering thin data. | Explanation: Minor concerns regarding relevance: two studies were directly relevant and four studies were partially relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | Gon-zalez et al. 2022 [31]; Flower et al. 2014 [5]; Larcombe 2012 [38] |
| 3 | Recurrent UTIs generally have significant and widespread effects on women's quality-of-life. | Moderate concerns Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding | Moderate confidence Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding | Grigoryan et al. 2022 [35]; Groen and Lagro-Janssen 2005 [36]; Croghan et al. 2021 [33]; Pat et al. 2020 [23]; Gonzalez et al. |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | limitations: two studies of high quality, three of moderate quality and three studies of low quality (lack of justification and detail on study design and data collection methods, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment, possible selection bias and unclear ethical considerations). One of the low-quality studies contributed minimally to the review theme. | concerns regarding coherence: the review finding reflects the variability and complexity of the data from the primary studies. | adequacy: four studies offering rich data and four offering thin data. | relevance: four studies were directly relevant and four studies were partially relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | 2022 [31]; Eriksson et al. 2014 [34]; Flower et al. 2014 [5]; Larcombe 2012 [38] |
| 4 | Women with rUTI commonly use self-help, lifestyle, and Complementary and Alternative Medicines (CAM) options to try and treat and prevent UTIs. | Moderate concerns Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns | Moderate confidence Explanation: Moderate concerns | Grigoryan et al. 2022 [35]; Groen and Lagro-Janssen 2005 [36]; Pat et al. 2020 [23]; Scott et al. 2021 [24]; Gonzalez |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | methodological limitations: two studies of high quality, four of moderate quality and two studies of low quality (lack of justification and detail on study design and data collection methods, limited information on data analysis, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment, possible selection bias and unclear ethical considerations) | minor concerns regarding coherence: the review finding reflects the majority of the variability and complexity of the data from the primary studies. | regarding adequacy: five studies offering rich data and three offering thin data. | regarding relevance: four studies were directly relevant and four studies were partially relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | et al. 2022 [31]; Eriksson et al. 2014 [34]; Flower et al. 2014 [5]; Larcombe 2012 [38] |
| 5 | The effectiveness of antibiotics varied, and patients are concerned about their use. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of high quality, four studies | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding adequacy: four | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding relevance: | Moderate confidence Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, | Grigoryan et al. 2022 [35]; Gulliford et al. 2021 [37]; Pat et al. 2020 [23]; Scott et al. 2021 [24]; Gonzalez et al. 2022 [31]; Flower et al. 2014 [5]; |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | of moderate quality and one study of low quality (lack of justification and detail on study design and data collection methods, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment, possible selection bias and unclear ethical considerations). The study of low quality had contributed minimally to the review theme | regarding coherence: the review finding reflects the variability and complexity of the data from the primary studies. | studies offering rich data and three offering thin data. | three studies were directly relevant and four studies were partially relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | Larcombe 2012 [38] |
| 6 | Women with rUTI seek healthcare for most, but not all, UTIs. They describe anger and frustration with healthcare in terms of their care, the use of antibiotics and an underestimation of the impact of rUTI. | Moderate concerns Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations: two studies of high | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding coherence: the review finding | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: Very minor concerns regarding adequacy: five | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding relevance: four studies were | Moderate confidence Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations, | Grigoryan et al. 2022 [35]; Pat et al. 2020 [23]; Scott et al. 2021 [24]; Gonzalez et al. 2022 [31]; Eriksson et al. 2014 [34]; Flower et al. 2014 [5]; |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | quality, four of moderate quality and one study of low quality (lack of justification and detail on study design and data collection methods, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment, possible selection bias and unclear ethical considerations) | reflects most of the variability and complexity of the data from the primary studies. | studies offering rich data and two offering thin data. | directly relevant and three studies were partially relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | Minor concerns regarding coherence, No/Very minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | Larcombe 2012 [38] |
| 7 | Women sought information and support from a variety of sources and feel more information and research is needed. | Moderate concerns Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of high quality, three of moderate quality and one study of low quality (lack of | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: the review finding reflects the variability and | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: Very minor concerns: four studies offering rich data and one offering moderately rich data. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding relevance: three studies were directly relevant and two studies were partially | Moderate confidence Explanation: Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, | Pat et al. 2020 [23]; Scott et al. 2021 [24]; Gonzalez et al. 2022 [31]; Eriksson et al. 2014 [34]; Flower et al. 2014 [5] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | justification and detail on study design and data collection methods, no reflexivity and unclear recruitment and possible selection bias, unclear ethical considerations) | complexity of the data from the primary studies. | | relevant to the review question in terms of age of participants included and the potential for inclusion of data related to patients acute UTIs. | No/Very minor concerns regarding adequacy, and Minor concerns regarding relevance | |
| HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS | | | | | | | |
| 8 | There are differences in the use of, and reason for, conducting urine culture. | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: two studies of moderate quality and one study of high quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity)</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: The review finding reflects the variation and complexity</p> | <p>Serious concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: three studies contributing. Two of these offered very thin data.</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding relevance: three studies that were directly relevant to the review question.</p> | <p>Low confidence</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding</p> | Flower et al. 2015 [22]; Cooper et al., 2020 [39]; Larcombe 2012 [38] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | of the contributing primary studies. | | | adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance | |
| 9 | Making the correct diagnosis is important and HCPs worry about missing serious disease. | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: two studies of moderate quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity)</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: The review finding reflects the themes identified from the contributing primary studies.</p> | <p>Serious concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: two studies contributing of which one of these offered very thin data.</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding relevance: two studies that were directly relevant to the review question.</p> | <p>Low confidence</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance</p> | Flower et al. 2015 [22]; Cooper et al. 2020 [39] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|----|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 10 | HCPs appreciate that rUTIs have a significant impact on quality-of-life. | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of moderate quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity)</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: The review finding reflects the themes identified from the single contributing primary study.</p> | <p>Serious concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: one study contributing rich data.</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding relevance: one study that was directly relevant to the review question.</p> | <p>Low confidence</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance</p> | Flower et al. 2015 [22] |
| 11 | HCPs believe self-help measures are important to prevent UTI recurrence | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: two</p> | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding</p> | <p>Serious concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Serious concerns regarding</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor</p> | <p>Low confidence</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding</p> | Flower et al. 2015 [22]; Cooper et al. 2020 [39] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| | | studies of moderate quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity) | coherence: the review finding represents the findings from most of the primary studies, but one study mentions the potential limitation of self-care in rUTI (as they have likely already tried this prior to consulting) | adequacy: two studies contributing of which one of these offered very thin data. | concerns regarding relevance: two studies that were directly relevant to the review question. | methodological limitations, Minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance | |
| 12 | Some HCPs are interested in the use of CAM but have significant concerns about their use and admit a lack of knowledge about them. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of moderate quality | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding | Serious concerns Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: one study | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding | Low confidence Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, | Flower et al. 2015 [22] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|----|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity) | coherence: The review finding reflects the themes identified from the single contributing primary study. | contributing rich data. | relevance: one study that was directly relevant to the review question. | No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance | |
| 13 | HCPs feel antibiotics are effective short term but are concerned about their use. | Minor concerns Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: two studies of moderate quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity) | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: The review finding reflects the themes identified from the | Serious concerns Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: two studies contributing of which one of these offered very thin data. | No/Very minor concerns Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding relevance: two studies that were directly relevant to the review question. | Low confidence Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding | Flower et al. 2015 [22]; Cooper et al. 2020 [39] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | contributing primary studies. | | | adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance | |
| 14 | Attitudes towards when to refer to secondary care and its benefits varied amongst HCPs. | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of moderate quality and one study of high quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity)</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: The review finding reflects the themes identified from the contributing primary studies.</p> | <p>Serious concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: two studies contributing very thin data.</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding relevance: two studies that were directly relevant to the review question.</p> | <p>Low confidence</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance</p> | Cooper et al. 2020 [39]; Larcombe 2012 [38] |

| # | Summarised review finding | Methodological limitations | Coherence | Adequacy | Relevance | GRADE-CERQual assessment of confidence | References |
|----|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | HCPs must consider and balance several competing interests when managing rUTI. | <p>Minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations: one study of high quality and two studies of moderate quality (lack of justification and detail on study design, no reflexivity)</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding coherence: The review finding reflects the complexity of the themes identified from the contributing primary studies.</p> | <p>Serious concerns</p> <p>Explanation: Serious concerns regarding adequacy: three studies contributing of which two of these offered very thin data.</p> | <p>No/Very minor concerns</p> <p>Explanation: No/ very minor concerns regarding relevance: three studies that were directly relevant to the review question.</p> | <p>Low confidence</p> <p>Explanation: Minor concerns regarding methodological limitations, No/Very minor concerns regarding coherence, Serious concerns regarding adequacy, and No/Very minor concerns regarding relevance</p> | <p>Flower et al. 2015 [22]; Cooper et al. 2020 [39]; Larcombe 2012 [38]</p> |