PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review. ***This paper reports on a scoping review***	√
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. The abstract is present and provides a summary of the study. [ensure it includes the objectives, data sources, eligibility criteria, participants, study appraisal, and synthesis methods] ***The abstract contains these aspects, but not the study appraisal as it was a scoping review for which appraisal is not needed***	√
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. ***The introduction adequately explains the rationale of the review***	√
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. ***The introduction adequately explains the rationale of the review***	√
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. ***Clearly stated with inclusion and exclusion criteria, including justification for why certain studies were excluded.***	√
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. ***The databases searched are mentioned and it states that all searches were done between 1 – 31 May 2024.***	√
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. ***The search terms and strategy are described and the complete search string that was used is provided***.	√
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. ***The inclusion and exclusion criteria is provided and the selection process is explained with a PRISMA flow diagram included to show the screening process. Two reviewers screened throughout as discussed in the text.***	√
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. ***Paper states that 2 reviewers screened all titles, abstracts and full text papers separately, using Rayyan, with the inclusion and exclusion criteria as focus.***	√
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. ***Data sought was divided into descriptive information pertaining to the study (Table 4), , as well as the PCC (Population/Concept/context) framework suggested by the JBI. Information on the Population is shown in Table 5)], on the Exposure, in this case the use of the ICF (Table 6), and the Context is included in the descriptive information (Table 4)***	√
	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. ***Not applicable***	

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
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. ***Not applicable for a scoping review.***	
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. ***Not applicable for a scoping review***	
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)). ***Please see Tables 4, 5 and 6 which clearly outlines the criteria and the data synthesis form the two included papers.***	√
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. ***Not applicable for a scoping review***	
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. ***Data was synthesised in table format***	√
	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 statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. ***Not applicable for a scoping review***	
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). ***Not applicable for a scoping review***	
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. ***Not applicable for a scoping review***	
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). ***Not applicable***	
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. ***Not applicable, as quality appraisal of the two studies was not done, as a decision was made to include both papers.***	
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. ***The selection process is detailed with a flow diagram.***	√
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. ***Please see Table 3 which outlines the 4 studies excluded at full text level.***	√
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics. ***The two included studies are presented with its characteristics (Tables 4, 5 and 6)***	√
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. ***Not required for scoping reviews and not done to include as many studies as possible***	
Results of	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision	√

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
individual studies		(e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. ***This is done using descriptive text.***	
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. ***Characteristics are described although risk of bias is not addressed as alluded to earlier.***	√
	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. ***Not applicable***	
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. ***In-text discussion highlighting differences between two studies***	
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. ***Not applicable***	
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. ***Not applicable to scoping reviews***	
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. ***Not applicable to scoping reviews***	
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. **Included in the discussion section**	√
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. ***Included in limitations section***	√
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. ***Included in limitation section***	√
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. ***Five recommendations are provided under the Recommendations for future research and practice section***	√
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. ***As per the requirements of scoping reviews, the review protocol was not registered. This is stated in the text.***	√
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. ***Not applicable***	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. ***Not applicable***	
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. ***Collaborators on the larger project are acknowledged. There is no other forms of non-financial, or financial support linked to this review.***	√

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors. ***None of the authors declare any competing interests.***	√
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. ***The template for the data collection can be obtained from the corresponding author. It is not yet publicly available, due to this study being part of a larger study which has not yet been published.***	√

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