

**Table S1.** PRISMA 2009 Checklist (Moher et al., 2009).

Section/Topic	#	Checklist Item	Reported on Page, Table or Figure
<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1, 3
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	1, 2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design.	3
<b>METHODS</b>			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	3
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	3, 4
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources in the search and date last searched.	3, 4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	3, 4
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (screening, eligibility, included in systematic review).	4, Figure 2
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	5
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Table 2
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	5
Summary	13	State the principal summary measures.	NA

measures			
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency for each meta-analysis.	NA
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence.	5
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	NA
<b>RESULTS</b>			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	Figure 2
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted and provide the citations.	Table 2
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	Table 2
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	NA
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	NA
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	5
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	NA
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	5-15
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	16, 17
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	15-17
<b>FUNDING</b>			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support; role of funders for the systematic review.	17

NA: Not applicable.

**Table S2.** Quality appraisal of quantitative descriptive studies (Hong et al., 2018).

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Criteria	First Author & (Year)				
	Borges F et al. (2016) [ref?]	Cabero et al. (2018)	Kugelman et al. (2018)	Hoang et al. (2017)	Agudelo et al. (2019)
Clear research question(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Collected data addresses the research questions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sampling strategy is relevant to address the re-search question(s)	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Sample is representative of target population	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Measurements are appropriate	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
The risk of nonresponse bias is low	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
The statistical analysis is appropriate to answer the research question	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

**Table S3.** Quality appraisal of quantitative studies (non-randomized: case-control studies) (Hong et al., 2018).

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Criteria	First Author & Year			
	Rochlen et al. (2017)	Nørgård et al. 2019.	Jamali et al. 2015.	Jorge el al. 2016
Clear research question(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Collected data addresses the research questions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Participants are representative of the target population	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Measurements are appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Outcome data are complete	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Confounders are accounted for in the design and analysis	No	No	No	No
During the study period, the intervention is administered (or exposure occurred) as intended	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Table S4.** Quality appraisal of quantitative studies (randomized controlled trials) (Hong et al., 2018).

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Criteria	First Author & (Year)			
	Bogomolova et al. (2020)	Henssen et al. (2019)	Barmaki et al. (2019)	Ferrer-Torregrosa et al. (2016)
Clear research question(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Collected data addresses the research questions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Randomization is appropriately performed	Yes	No	Yes	No
the groups are comparable at baseline	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
there are complete outcome data	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Outcome assessors are blinded to the intervention provided	No	No	No	No
The participants adhere to the assigned intervention	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Table S5.** Quality appraisal of mixed methods studies (Hong et al., 2018).

Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Criteria	Author(s) & Year					
	Khan et al. (2019)	Bork et al. (2019)	Quqandi et al. (2018)	Moro et al. (2017)	Vaughn et al. 2016	Küçüc et al. 2016
Clear research question(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Collected data addresses the research questions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed method design to address the research question?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes