Table S1. Criteria for evaluating internal validity of reported studies using quantitative methodologies [48,49].

	Questions	Evaluation	
Purpose	Q1: Was the study purpose stated clearly?	1=Yes	0=No
Study background	Q2: Was the relevant background literature reviewed?	1=Yes	0=No
Study design	Q3: Was the design appropriate for the research question?	1=Yes	0=No
Sampling	Q4: Was the sample described in detail?	1=Yes	0=No
	Q5: Was the sample size justified?	1=Yes	0=No
	Q6: Was informed consent obtained? (if not described, assume No)	1=Yes	0=No If not applicable, assume 3
Measurement	Q7: Were the outcome measures reliable? (if not described, assume No)	1=Yes	0=No
	Q8: Were the outcome measures valid? (if not described, assume No)	1=Yes	0=No
	Q9: Was the method described in detail	1=Yes	0=No
Data analysis	Q10: Were results reported in terms of statistical significance?	1=Yes	0=No
	Q11: Were the analysis methods appropriate?	1=Yes	0=No
	Q12: Was importance for the practice reported?	1=Yes	0=No
	Q13: Were any drop-outs reported?	1=Yes	0=No If not applicable, assume 3
Conclusions	Q14: Were the conclusions appropriate given the study methods?	1=Yes	0=No
Implications	Q15: Are there any implications for practice given the results of the study?	1=Yes	0=No
Limitations	Q16: Were limitations of the study acknowledged and described by the authors?	1=Yes	0=No

Table S2. Results of study quality evaluation using the McMaster Critical Review Form for Quantitative Studies.

| Study | Items | | | | | | | | | Score | |
	Purpose	Study Background	Study Design	Sampling	Measurement	Data Analysis	Conclusions	Implications	Limitations	Raw	%
Pan & Frey (2005) [56]	Y	Y	Y	3Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	16	100
Pan & Frey (2006) [57]	Y	Y	Y	3Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	16	100
Pan (2008 a) [31]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	3Y	3Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8
Pan (2008 b) [41]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8
Pan (2009) [58]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	2Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	14	87.5
Pan et al. (2011a) [42]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	2Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	14	87.5
Pan et al. (2011b) [59]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4Y	Y	Y	N	11	68.8
Pan et al. (2011c) [60]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8
Memari et al. (2013) [61]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8
Memari et al. (2015) [62]	Y	Y	Y	Y	2Y	4Y	Y	N	Y	12	75
Pan et al. (2015) [43]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	2Y	4Y	Y	N	Y	13	81.3
Bicer & Alsaffar (2016) [63]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	12	75
Pan et al. (2016) [40]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	2Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8
Memari et al. (2017) [23]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8
Pan et al. (2021) [24]	Y	Y	Y	2Y	3Y	4Y	Y	Y	Y	15	93.8