

Table S1 – Risk of bias - CHERRIES Checklist

Author	Survey Design	IRB approval	Informed consent	Data protection	Development and testing	Closed survey	Contact mode through Internet	Advertising the survey	Web/E-mail	Context	Mandatory/voluntary	Incentives	Time/Date	Randomization of items or questionnaires	Adaptive questioning	Number of Items	Number of screens (pages)	Completeness check	Review step	Unique site visitor	View rate (Ratio of unique survey visitors/unique site visitors)	Participation rate (Ratio of unique visitors who agreed to participate/unique first survey page visitors)	Completion rate (Ratio of users who finished the survey/users who agreed to participate)	Cookies used	IP check	Log file analysis	Registration	Handling of incomplete questionnaires	Questionnaires submitted with an atypical timestamp	Statistical correction	Final Score	Assessment
Cotrin et al. (2020) [21]	1	1	0	NA	0	1	1	NA	1	0	1	NA	0	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	25.00	LOW
Moffat et al. (2020) [22]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	51.85	MODERATE
Peloso et al. (2020) [23]	1	1	0	NA	0	1	1	NA	1	0	1	NA	0	NA	NA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	33.33	LOW
Gonzales-Olmo et al. (2021) [25]	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	NA	1	1	1	0	1	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	38.46	MODERATE
Martina et al. (2021) [27]	1	0	NA	NA	0	1	1	NA	1	1	0	NA	1	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	30.43	LOW
Nazir et al. (2021) [28]	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	NA	1	1	1	NA	1	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	40.00	MODERATE
Quan et al. (2021) [29]	1	1	1	NA	0	1	1	NA	1	1	1	NA	1	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	41.67	MODERATE
Umeh et al. (2021) [30]	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	NA	0	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	26.92	LOW

For each item, we assessed value 1 if the topic was reported in the study and 0 if it was not registered. Each survey's final score was determined by calculating the sum of all valid items divided by their number. Low-, moderate-, or high-quality studies were assessed according to the following evaluation: score < 35% = low quality; 35% ≤ final score < 75% = moderate quality; final score ≥ 75% = high quality. NA: Not Applicable.

Table S2 – Risk of bias - SURge Checklist

Authors	Is the design of the study stated in the title and/or abstract?	Is there an explanation of why the research is necessary, placing the study in context of previous work in relevant fields?	Is the purpose or aim of the paper explained?	Is the questionnaire described?	If an existing tool was used, are its psychometric properties presented? If an existing tool was used, are references to the original work provided?	If a new tool was used, are the procedures used to develop and pre-test provided?	If a new tool was used, have its reliability and validity been reported? Is a description of the scoring procedures provided?	Is there a description of the survey population and the sample frame used to identify this population?	Do the authors provide a description of how representative the sample is of the underlying population?	Is a sample size calculation or rationale/justification for the sample size presented?	Mode of administration?	Do the authors provide information on the type of contact and how many attempts were made to contact subjects (i.e., prenotification by letter or telephone, reminder postcard, duplicate questionnaire with reminder)?	Do the authors report whether incentives were provided (financial or other)?	Is there a description of who approached potential participants (e.g., identification of who signed the covering letter)?	Is the method of data analysis described?	Do the authors provide methods for analysis of nonresponse error?	Is the method for calculating response rate provided?	Are definitions provided for complete versus partial completions?	Are the methods for handling item missing data provided?	Is the response rate reported?	Are all respondents accounted for?	Is information given on how nonrespondents differ from respondents? Are the results clearly presented?	Do the results address the objective(s)?	Are the results summarized with reference to the study objectives? Are the strengths of the study stated?	Are the limitations of the study (taking into account potential sources of bias or imprecision) stated?	Is there explicit discussion of the generalizability (external validity) of the results?	Study funding reported?	Research Ethics Board (REB) review reported? Reporting of subject consent procedures?	Total Score	Final Score	Assessment
Arqub et al. (2021) [24]	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	13	41%	MODERATE
Karagözoğlu et al. (2021) [26]	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	11	34%	LOW

For each item, we assessed value 1 if the topic was reported in the study and 0 if it was not registered. Each survey's final score was determined by calculating the sum of all valid items divided by their number. Low-, moderate-, or high-quality studies were assessed according to the following evaluation: score < 35% = low quality; 35% ≤ final score < 75% = moderate quality; final score ≥ 75% = high quality. NA: Not Applicable.