Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

BMJ Open

Appendix 10: Criteria used for assessing confidence in the evidence supporting the review findings using the CERQual

approach

Component	Definition	Threats to Component	Do not Downgrade Confidence Level		Downgrade Confidence Level	
			No or very little concerns	Minor Concerns	Moderate Concerns	Serious Concerns
Methodological limitations	Are there any methodological weaknesses within individual studies that impact our confidence in the findings?	CERQual suggests assessing issues of recruitment, data collection and analysis; but leaves the criteria selection to review authors. As previously defined by Hall et al., 2019, we will follow identified 4 areas to assess: - recruitment methods - data collection methods - assessor influence - data analysis methods Based on these criteria each individual study's methodological rigour was determined to be: low, moderate or good. Threats were considered to be present if the study was assessed to be of low	None of the supporting data comes from studies with low methodological rigour	<25% of the supporting data comes from studies with low methodological rigour	25-50% of the supporting data comes from studies with low methodological rigour	>50% of the supporting data comes from studies with low methodological rigour

		methodological rigour.				
Coherence	How clear and cogent the fit is between the data from the primary studies and a review finding that synthesizes that data? By 'cogent', we mean well supported or compelling	- Contradictory data - Ambiguous or incomplete data - Competing theories	No threats present in the supporting data	Threats present in <25% of the supporting data	Threats present in 25-50% of the supporting data	Threats present in >50% of the supporting data
Adequacy	The degree of richness as well as the quantity of data supporting the review finding.	- *Data richness - descriptive findings*: superficial data is ok, - *Data richness - explanatory findings*: superficial data may lack sufficient quality to fully explore the phenomenon - *Data quantity:* one or very few studies or small studies may cause concern. This, however, should be taken into context of the review aim and question. If the finding is about a broad phenomenon or large	The supporting data is of sufficient richness and quantity.	The data comes from multiple studies in different settings and varying sample sizes and <25% of the supporting data is too superficial.	The data comes from only a few studies or small studies and 25-50% of the supporting data is too superficial.	The data comes from only a few studies or small studies and >50% of the supporting data is too superficial.

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

BMJ Open

		variety of people have less confidence if it is based on small studies.				
Relevance	The extent to which the body of data from the primary studies is applicable to the context specified in the review question.	Relevance will be assessed in terms of the following elements of our review question: *Population:* Any URTI outlined in the Choosing Wisely Canada Guidelines: - Otitis Media - Pharyngitis - Sinusitis - The common cold - Bronchitis *Phenomenon of interest:* Family physicians' perspectives and experiences regarding evidence based antibiotic prescribing practices for URTIs. *Context:* Patients with URTIs in primary care settings.	The supporting data is of direct relevance to the review question.	Some of the supporting data (< 25%) is of indirect, partial or unclear relevance.	Some of the supporting data (25-50%) is of indirect, partial or unclear relevance.	The majority of the supporting data (>50%) is of indirect, partial or unclear relevance.
Note: Single study rule: for themes with data from a single study only, the following criteria was used to judge methodological limitation: If the study has moderate or low moderate methodological rigour, the confidence level was downgraded.						

* Reproduced from: Hall AM, Scurrey SR, Pike AE, Albury C, Richmond HL, Matthews J, et al. Physician-reported barriers to using evidence-based recommendations for low back pain in clinical practice: a systematic review and synthesis of qualitative studies using the Theoretical Domains Framework. *Implement Sci*. 2019;14:49.