

## Quality Assessment

### **Systematic Review & Meta-Analyses**

Using the PRISMA checklist (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses), the details of each review's compliance are detailed in table 7.

INSERT TABLE 7 HERE

The first review by Hadlaczky et al. (2014) had a low compliance with the PRISMA statement and checklist, as the study was not clear on the objectives using the PICO approach as suggested in the statement. There was also no detailed presentation of data on the risk of bias. The more recent reviews by Morgan et al. (2018) & Maslowski et al. (2019) presented a higher level of compliance with the PRISMA statement and checklist.

### **Evaluation studies**

The quantitative non-randomized studies were of moderate to high quality. Only one study was below the moderate threshold of 3 stars (Mendenhall et. al., 2013), this was based on the study failing on the 3 quality criteria. This study did not use a validated tested measure which was considered appropriate in answering the set outcome measures. Participants were recruited through convenience sampling, which increases the risk of selection bias. The three included quantitative randomized studies were of relatively good quality. All 3 studies' quality criteria, not commonly met, were linked to details of the studies required to enable an assessment of bias. Common problems across these studies were the absence of power analyses to determine sample sizes, making it difficult to assess whether the studies were adequately powered.

### **Qualitative studies**

Qualitative research methods are more suitable for exploring 'what', 'how' and 'why' of a topic that is complex to understand, including the meaning people attach to experiences alongside understanding how an intervention works in the case of an evaluation.

Similar methodological approaches were adopted by the qualitative studies included here.

All the included studies in this category were judged to be of moderate to high quality.

Studies judged as moderate were commonly either lacking in the good use of data collection method in addressing their research questions or data collected were insufficient to capture the richness of people's experiences of MHFA.

### **Mixed method studies**

The studies included have met all the recommended criteria, the studies have shown a clear rationale for the use of mixed method design either by using in-depth interviews to explore the perceived effects of training on MHFA on trainees and feedback on delivery of the training from MHFA instructors (Crone et al., 2019; Massey et al., 2014; Talbot et al., 2017).

## **Delphi Studies**

The quality of the studies included in this category was checked against four quality items as suggested by Diamond et al. (2014). Table 2 shows details of the studies against quality criteria and their characteristics.

All included studies met the quality criteria recommended by Diamond et al.(2014). A few of the studies (Kelly et al., 2009; Kingston et al., 2011; Kingston et al., 2009; Ross et al., 2012) had problems recruiting a representative group for the development of their guidelines