

Supplementary Material

The Intellectual Landscape of Mental Health Literacy: A Global Bibliometric Analysis of Conceptual Expansion and Trends

File S1. Full search strategies

The following search strategies were applied in each database. The Scopus export was retrieved on 23 April 2026, and the Web of Science, MEDLINE, and CINAHL searches were conducted on 27 April 2026. In Scopus and Web of Science, records already indexed in MEDLINE and identifiable by a PubMed identifier were excluded at the query level, so that MEDLINE served as the primary source for those records and cross-database duplication was reduced at retrieval. Residual duplicates were removed during harmonisation (deduplication by DOI and, when absent, by normalised title).

MEDLINE (via PubMed)

CINAHL (via EBSCO)

Scopus

Web of Science (Core Collection)

Note on the Web of Science query. The exclusion clause enumerated all PubMed identifier prefixes from 100* to 999*, which operationally removes every record carrying a PubMed identifier, mirroring the Scopus exclusion above. The enumerated form is abbreviated here for readability and is available in full from the corresponding author.

Table S1. PRIBA reporting checklist

Completed against the Preferred Reporting Items for Bibliometric Analysis (PRIBA; Koo & Lin, 2023). Status reflects the current manuscript version. Items marked Pending depend on the bibliometrix and VOSviewer outputs and the associated figures.

Section	Item	Description	Status	Location
Title	1a	Identify the study as a bibliometric analysis	Reported	Title
Title	1b	Indicate the coverage period	Reported	Title (2000–2026)
Abstract	2a	Explicit statement of objective(s)	Reported	Abstract
Abstract	2b	Specify the data sources	Reported	Abstract
Abstract	2c	Specify the coverage period	Reported	Abstract
Abstract	2d	Results for main outcomes	Reported	Abstract
Abstract	2e	Overall interpretation and implications	Reported	Abstract
Introduction	3	Rationale for the study	Reported	Introduction
Introduction	4	Explicit statement of objective(s)	Reported	Introduction (a-e)
Methods	5a	Database(s)/data sources searched	Reported	2.2
Methods	5b	Characteristics of the data sources	Reported	2.2
Methods	5c	Date the search was conducted	Reported	2.2
Methods	6	Inclusion/exclusion criteria (language, type, period)	Reported	2.3
Methods	7	Search strategy and keywords	Reported	2.2; File S1
Methods	8	Bibliometric indicators used	Reported	2.4
Methods	9	Software package(s) and settings	Reported	2.4
Results	10	Search/selection results, with flow diagram	Reported	3; Figure 1
Results	11	Results of quantity, performance, structural indicators	Reported	3.1-3.6 (co-citation/coupling deferred)

Section	Item	Description	Status	Location
Results	12	Figures at adequate resolution	Reported	Figures 1-4 (300 dpi)
Discussion	13	Summarize key results vs objectives	Reported	4
Discussion	14	Limitations and potential bias	Reported	4.1
Discussion	15	Interpretation in context of prior knowledge	Reported	4
Other	16	Sources of support/funding	Reported	Funding
Other	17	Competing interests	Reported	Conflicts of Interest
Other	18	Data availability and route of access	Reported	Data Availability Statement

Table S2. BIBLIO checklist mapping

Mapping against the Guideline for Reporting Bibliometric Reviews of the Biomedical Literature (BIBLIO; Montazeri et al., 2023), registered with the EQUATOR Network. BIBLIO defines 20 minimum items across title (2), abstract (1), introduction (2), methods (7), results (4), and discussion (4). The definitive item wording is in Table 3 of the source; the completed BIBLIO checklist should be attached at submission.

Domain (items)	Status	Location / note
Title (2)	Reported	Title identifies the bibliometric analysis and its topic
Abstract (1)	Reported	Background, methods, results, conclusions integrated
Introduction: justification (1)	Reported	Introduction
Introduction: objectives (1)	Reported	Introduction (aim + a-e)
Methods: data sources (1)	Reported	2.2
Methods: search strategy (1)	Reported	2.2; File S1 (dates and strings)
Methods: eligibility (1)	Reported	2.3
Methods: selection/flow (1)	Reported	2.3; Figure 1
Methods: data refinement (1)	Reported	2.3 (deduplication)
Methods: quality assessment (1, optional)	Reported	2.3 (not applicable to bibliometrics, stated)
Methods: analysis/indicators (1)	Reported	2.4
Results (4)	Reported	3.1-3.6; Figures 1-4 (co-citation/coupling deferred)
Discussion: synthesis (1)	Reported	4
Discussion: interpretation (1)	Reported	4
Discussion: limitations (1)	Reported	4.1
Discussion: take-home/conclusion (1)	Reported	5

Note on GLOBAL

The reporting of this study is also aligned with the emerging Guidance List for the repOrting of Bibliometric AnaLyses (GLOBAL; Ng et al.), developed under the EQUATOR Network framework through a Delphi process and a consensus meeting. GLOBAL is more granular at the level of methods, in particular regarding data cleaning and disambiguation, software settings, and the limitations of specific indicators. As GLOBAL is still being finalised at the time of writing, PRIBA is adopted as the operational checklist and BIBLIO as the registered biomedical anchor, with GLOBAL used to strengthen methodological transparency.