

**Supplemental Table S1.** Critical appraisal of the included analytical cross-sectional studies using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools for study designs.

	Analytical cross-sectional study	Adler-Minstein et al., 2020 <sup>13</sup>	Lesser et al., 2022 <sup>23</sup>	Dolansky et al., 2021 <sup>18</sup>	Morgan et al., 2022 <sup>20</sup>	Lynch et al., 2021 <sup>19</sup>
1	Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Y	Y	U	Y	Y
4	Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5	Were confounding factors identified?	NA	NA	U	NA	NA
6	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	NA	NA	U	NA	NA
7	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
8	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Y	Y	U	Y	Y

Key: Y= Yes; N=No; U=Unclear; NA=Not applicable; EHR = Electronic Health Record.

**Supplemental Table S2.** Critical appraisal of the included qualitative research using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools for study designs.

	<b>Qualitative research</b>	<b>Adler-Milstein et al., 2023<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Gettel et al., 2022<sup>24</sup></b>	<b>Greenberg et al., 2022<sup>22</sup></b>
1	Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	Y	Y	Y
2	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	Y	Y	Y
3	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	Y	Y	Y
4	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	Y	Y	Y
5	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	Y	Y	Y
6	Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	Y	Y	NA
7	Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?	N	Y	Y
8	Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	Y	Y	Y
9	Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	Y	Y	Y
10	Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Y	Y	Y

Key: Y= Yes; N=No; U=Unclear; NA=Not applicable.

**Supplemental Table S3.** Critical appraisal of the included systematic reviews and research syntheses using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools for study designs.

	<b>Systematic reviews and research syntheses</b>	<b>Wang et al., 2023<sup>30</sup></b>	<b>Winterton et al., 2021<sup>14</sup></b>
1	Is the review question clearly and explicitly stated?	Y	Y
2	Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?	Y	Y
3	Was the search strategy appropriate?	Y	Y
4	Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?	Y	Y
5	Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?	Y	Y
6	Was critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?	Y	Y
7	Were there methods to minimize errors in data extraction?	Y	Y
8	Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?	Y	Y
9	Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	Y	Y
10	Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?	Y	Y
11	Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?	Y	Y

Key: Y= Yes; N=No; U=Unclear; NA=Not applicable.

**Supplemental Table S4.** Critical appraisal of the included studies reporting prevalence data using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools for study designs.

	<b>Studies reporting prevalence data</b>	<b>Lundy et al., 2021<sup>17</sup></b>
1	Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	Y
2	Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	Y
3	Was the sample size adequate?	Y
4	Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Y
5	Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	Y
6	Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	Y
7	Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	Y
8	Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	Y
9	Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	

Key: Y= Yes; N=No; U=Unclear; NA=Not applicable.

**Supplemental Table S5.** Critical appraisal of the included studies reporting prevalence data using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools for study designs.

	Quasi-experimental studies	Berish et al., 2023 <sup>26</sup>	Breda et al., 2023 <sup>27</sup>	Casey et al., 2020 <sup>15</sup>	Guth et al., 2020 <sup>16</sup>	Kuntz et al., 2023 <sup>28</sup>	McQuown et al., 2023 <sup>29</sup>	Severance et al., 2022 <sup>25</sup>	Shen et al., 2022 <sup>21</sup>
1	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e., there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3	Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	Was there a control group?	Y	Y	Y: a pre-postintervention design	Y: a pre-postintervention design	Y: a pre-postintervention design	Y: a pre-postintervention design	Y: targeted areas vs. non-targeted areas	Y
5	Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7	Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Key: Y= Yes; N=No; U=Unclear; NA=Not applicable.