S1_PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location in the manuscript where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title page
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract, Lines 2-27
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Section 1, Lines 32- 59
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Section 1, Line 60-82
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Section 2, Lines 87–111, Table 1
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Section 2, Table 1, Fig 1
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Section 2, Table 1
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 2, Table 1
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 2, Table 1
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Section 2, Table 1
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	N/A, no meta-analysis performed
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Two researchers independently reviewed the abstracts and papers. Section 2, Table 1
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	N/A, no meta-analysis performed
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Section 2, Table 1
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Section 2, Table 1; Section 3.2, Lines 150-163
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Section 2, Lines 102-110
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of	Section 2, Lines 102-110

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location in the manuscript where item is reported
		statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Section 3.2, Lines 149-295; Section 4, Lines 298-342
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	No sensitivity analysis performed/required, however the bibliometric and content analysis cross-validate each other, also SLRs were not included in the content analysis, to avoid 'inflation' of some features (Section 3.1, Lines 140-144, Section 3.3, Lines 238-295)
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	The search tasks and content analysis were carried out by two researchers independently. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion, ensuring a thorough and unbiased interpretation of the included studies. We provided a narrative synthesis that highlights any patterns or gaps in the reporting of results across the studies. While there is a risk of our content analysis approach regarding the potential for bias due to missing results in the current literature, the transparent reporting in this research and recommendations for future mitigate these risks. (Section 3.3, Lines 268-295; Section 4.6, Lines 663-673; Section 5, Lines 675-747)
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	We selected only peer-reviewed journal papers for inclusion in our SLR. This decision was made to ensure that we were drawing from high-quality research, which has been subject to scrutiny and thus supporting credibility of our findings.
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Section 2, Figure 1 + Table 1 provide this information
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Section 2, Table 1
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Section 4, Lines 298-661, Table 2
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Each study had a particular focus which may inherently introduce bias ('declared bias'), as studies cannot cover all relevant areas. The contribution of this SLR is to identify those gaps.
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	N/A, no meta-analysis was performed

S1_PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location in the manuscript where item is reported
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Although not assessing the risk of bias, Table 2 includes the specific aspects of the studies and the decision-making of the agents analysed in the papers.
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	No meta-analysis was conducted. Discussion of bibliographic and content analysis is included in Section 4, Lines 298-661
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Discussion of bibliographic and content analysis is included in Section 4, Lines 298-661
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	No sensitivity analysis conducted. Cross-validation of bibliometric and content analysis was undertaken, Section 3.3, Lines 238-295.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	As per Q 18.
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A, no meta-analysis conducted
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 4, Lines 298-661
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Section 4.5, Lines 654-661
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Section 4.6, Lines 663-673
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Section 5, Lines 729-747
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	None
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Excel file with findings supported Table 2.

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. This work is licensed under CC BY 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/