**Supplementary Data 1: Risk of bias tables and levels of evidence for the included records of the current systematic review**

**A. Randomized controlled trials**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author (year)** | **Items** | | | | | | | | | | | |  | **Level of evidence** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5a | 5b | 6a | 6b | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Score |
| **Sharan et al. (2012)** | + | ? | - | ? | + | / | + | / | + | ? | + | - | 5/10 | B |
| **Gates et al. (2012)** | + | + | - | - | + | / | + | / | + | ? | + | + | 7/10 | B |
| **Jannink et al. (2008)**  **Part 2** | + | ? | - | ? | + | / | + | / | + | + | + | - | 6/10 | B |

**+ = yes, - = no, ? = too little information, / = inapplicable**

Items

1. Was the assignment of intervention to the patients randomized?

2. Whoever enclosing patients in the study is not supposed to be aware of the order of randomization. Was that the case?

3. Were the patients and therapists blinded to the treatment?

4. Were the impact assessors blinded to the treatment?

5a. Were the groups comparable at the beginning of the trial? (If not: 5b)

5b. Were corrections in the analyses applied for the difference between the groups?

6a. Is a complete follow-up of a sufficient proportion of all included patients available? (If not: 6b)

6b. Is selective loss to follow-up sufficiently excluded?

7. Are all included patients analyzed in the group in which they were randomized?

8. Are the groups, except for the intervention, treated equally?

9. Is selective outcome reporting sufficiently excluded?

10. Is bias due to funding or sponsorship sufficiently excluded?

**B. Case-Control Studies**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author (year)** | **Items** | | | | | | | | **Level of evidence** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Score |
| **Tatla et al. (2015)\*** | + | + | - | / | - | + | + | 4/6 | C |
| **Calderita et al. (2013)\*** | - | + | - | / | - | - | - | 1/6 | C |
| **Sun (2012)\*** | + | + | + | / | / | + | + | 5/5 | C |
| **Brütsch et al. (2011)\*** | + | + | ? | / | - | + | + | 4/6 | C |
| **Brütsch et al. (2010)\*** | + | + | ? | / | - | + | + | 4/6 | C |
| **Bryanton et al. (2006)**\* | + | + | ? | / | - | + | + | 4/6 | C |
| \* Case-control study: therefore, question 4 is inapplicable | | | | | | | | | |

**+ = yes, - = no, ? = too little information, / = inapplicable**

Items

1. Are the groups to be compared clearly and adequately defined?

2. Was selection of the patients valid for this study?

3. Were exposure and outcomes independently (and blind) assessed from each other?

4. In cohort research: Was Follow-Up Long Enough for Outcomes to Occur?

5. In case-control research: were incident (new) disease cases selected?

6. In case-control research: can misclassification be sufficiently excluded?

7. Are the most important confounders identified and are they adequately taken into account in the design of the study or in the analysis?

**C. Non-Comparative Studies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Author (year)** | **Level of evidence** |
| **Bingham et al. (2015)** | C |
| **Järvikoski et al. (2015)** | C |
| **Bilde et al. (2011)** | C |
| **Harris & Reid (2005)** | C |
| **Reid (2002)** | C |

**D. Qualitative Studies**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author (year)** | **Items** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1a | 1b | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5a | 5b | 5c | 5d | 5e | 5f | 6 | 7 | Score |
| **Gilmore et al. (2010)** | + | + | + | + | + | - | ? | ? | - | + | + | + | + | 9/13 |
| **Jannink et al. (2008)** | + | + | + | ? | + | - | ? | - | - | + | / | + | + | 7/12 |

**+ = yes, - = no, ? = too little information, / = inapplicable**

Items

1a. Does the research question fit with qualitative research?

1b. Is the research question relevant?

2. Is the used observational method adequate?

3. Were the data/materials adequately gathered?

4. Could the research be checked/controlled?

5a. Cyclic alternation of data gathering and data analysis?

5b. Has the analysis been performed by expert researchers?

5c. Have there been sufficient searches for contrasting opinions?

5d. Has the analysis been sufficiently described?

5e. Does the description provide sufficient insight in the steps the researcher takes to reach to categories and conclusions starting from the data?

5f. Are the quotes adequate?

6. Is the point of view of the researcher clear (for analysis)?

7. Do the conclusions match the qualitative character of the research?