**Appendix Two**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Author (s) & year** | **MMAT score of**  **relevant aspect**  **of study**  **(out of 5 where 5 indicates higher quality)** | **Issues identified by MMAT leading to deduction of points**  **(for relevant aspect of study,**  **not necessarily**  **the overall study quality)** |
| Quantitative studies | | |
| Church (2012) | 2/5 | Query how sample of 100 was selected, representativeness  & risk of nonresponder bias |
| Coughlin et al (2009) | 4/5 | Outcome data <80% complete |
| Damodaran et al (2012) | 2/5 | Measurements &  statistical analysis |
| Damodaran & Sherlock (2013) | 2/5 | Sampling strategy,  statistical analysis, incomplete reporting of outcomes |
| Flynn et al (2019) | 4/5 | Outcome data <80% complete |
| McGarry et al (2008) | 3/5 | Non-blinded,  outcome data <80% complete |
| McNicholas et al (2010) | 2/5 | Sampling strategy,  representativeness of the sample  and risk of nonresponder bias |
| McNicholas et al (2016) | 4/5 | Risk of nonresponder bias |
| O’Brien et al (2007) | 4/5 | Not blinded |
| Wynne et al (2016) | 4/5 | Query over possible confounders  & regression to mean |
| Mixed methods | | |
| McDonald et al  (2015) | 2/5 | Sampling, query over possible confounders & regression to mean |
| McNicholas et al (2018) | 4/5 | Possible nonresponder bias |
| Tanıl et al (2018) | 3/5 | Possible nonresponder bias, incomplete outcome data |
| Qualitative studies | | |
| Carr-Fanning & McGuckin (2018) | 4/5 | Data collection / possible bias in sample |
| Coyne et al (2015) | 5/5 | - |