

**Table S1:** Joanna Briggs Institute's (JBI) Data Extraction Form for Review for Systematic Reviews and Research Syntheses

<b>Items</b>	<b>Data extracted</b>
Study Details	
Authors	
Year of publication	
Origin/country of origin (where the source was published or conducted)	
Aims /objectives	
Participants (characteristic)	
Sample size	
Setting /context	
Description of Interventions/phenomena of interest	
Methodology	
Methods of analysis	
Intervention types (if applicable)	
Duration of the intervention (if applicable)	
Outcomes and details of these (e.g. how measured) (if applicable)	
Key findings that relate to the scoping review questions	
Appraisal instruments used	
Appraisal rating	
Comments	

**Table S2:** Methodological quality assessment for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies using National Institutes of Health (NIH) quality assessment tool

First Author, Year (Ref)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Final Quality Score	Rating

Y: Yes, N: No, CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported. Q1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated? Q2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined? Q3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%? Q4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants? Q5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided? Q6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured? Q7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed? Q8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)? Q9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? Q10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time? Q11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? Q12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants? Q13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Q14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)? Rating—Good, fair or Poor, Good quality= (≥10 yes); fair quality= (6-9 yes) and Poor quality= (≤5 yes).

**Table S3:** Methodological quality assessment for clinical trials using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) tool

First Author, Year (Ref)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Final Quality Score	Rating

Y: Yes, N: No, NC: Not clear, NA: Not applicable. (Q1. Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups? Q2. Was allocation to treatment groups concealed? Q3. Were treatment groups similar at the baseline? Q4. Were participants blind to treatment assignment? Q5. Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment? Q6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment? Q7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest? Q8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Q9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized? Q10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups? Q11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way? Q12. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? Q13. Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? Rating—Good, fair or Poor, Good quality= (≥10 yes); fair quality= (6-9 yes), and Poor quality= (≤5 yes).

**Table S4:** Methodological quality assessment for Quasi-experimental using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) tool

First Author, Year (Ref)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Final Quality Score	Rating

Y: Yes, N: No, NC: Not clear, NA: Not applicable. Q1. 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)? Q2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? Q3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? Q4. Was there a control group? Q5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure? Q6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Q7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Q8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way? Q9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? Rating—Good, fair or Poor, Good quality= (≥7 yes), fair quality= (4-6) and Poor quality= (≤3 yes)

**Table S5: Methodological quality assessment for systematic review and meta-analysis using the assessment of multiple systematic reviews (AMSTAR-2)**

<b>First Author, Year (Ref)</b>	<b>Q 1</b>	<b>Q 2</b>	<b>Q 3</b>	<b>Q 4</b>	<b>Q 5</b>	<b>Q 6</b>	<b>Q 7</b>	<b>Q 8</b>	<b>Q 9</b>	<b>Q 10</b>	<b>Q 11</b>	<b>Q 12</b>	<b>Q 13</b>	<b>Q 14</b>	<b>Q 15</b>	<b>Q 16</b>	<b>Final Quality Score</b>	<b>Rating</b>

Y: Yes, N: No, PY: Partial Yes. Q1. PICO: Patient/ Problem, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome, components described? Q2. A statement design provided? Q3. Selection of included studies designs explained? Q4. Comprehensive literature search performed? Q5. Duplicate study selection performed? Q6. Duplicate data extraction performed? Q7. List of excluded studies provided? Q8. Details of the included studies provided? Q9. Risk of bias of individual studies assessed? Q10. Sources of funding for studies included reported? Q11. Methods for statistical analysis appropriated? Q12. Impact of risk of bias on meta-analysis assessed? Q13 Risk of bias of individual studies in discussion accounted? Q14. Explanation for heterogeneity? Q15. Likelihood of publication bias assessed? Q16. Sources of conflict of interest reported? Rating—Good, fair or Poor, Good quality= (≥12 yes); fair quality= (7-11 yes), Poor quality= (≤6 yes).