

S3 File: Adapted* confidence in study findings

	Grade down one or two levels for each of the following domains for which there are serious (-1) or very serious (-2) concerns (final GRADE: High, moderate, low, very low)**.
Intervention studies, descriptive/observational studies, qualitative studies, reviews (HIGH starting point)	<div>1. Study limitations (concerns about whether methods appropriate; researcher relationship considered (qualitative studies); selection bias; incomplete outcome data inadequately addressed; inadequate accounting/adjustment for confounders)</div> <div>2. Adequacy of data (concerns about sampling, sample size, data analysis)</div> <div>3. Indirectness/relevance (concerns about outcome measures)</div>
Expert opinions and commentaries (LOW starting point)	<div>1. Evidence (concerns about lack of supporting evidence and/or references)</div> <div>2. Expertise (concerns about no representative expert body identified)</div>

* based on modified GRADE approach (Murad, Mustafa, Schunemann, Sultan, & Santesso, 2017)

** Inconsistency and publication bias not assessed because GRADE was applied to single studies. All intervention studies, descriptive/observational studies (i.e. High epidemiological evidence), qualitative studies and reviews started from ‘High Confidence’ in this rapid review. Expert opinions and commentaries started from ‘Low Confidence’.