**Appendix 1 – Search strategy overview**

Database: Pubmed 1946 to Present.

(health literacy[MeSH Terms]) AND ((((((((((((((((((Back Pain[MeSH Terms]) OR Back Ache[MeSH Terms]) OR Back Pain with Radiation[MeSH Terms]) OR Back Pain without Radiation[MeSH Terms]) OR Backache[MeSH Terms]) OR Vertebrogenic Pain Syndrome[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Back Pain[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Back Ache[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Back Pain, Mechanical[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Back Pain, Posterior Compartment[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Back Pain, Postural[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Back Pain, Recurrent[MeSH Terms]) OR Low Backache[MeSH Terms]) OR Lower Back Pain[MeSH Terms]) OR Lumbago[MeSH Terms]) OR Mechanical Low Back Pain[MeSH Terms]) OR Postural Low Back Pain[MeSH Terms]) OR Recurrent Low Back Pain[MeSH Terms])

No search filters used (e.g. specifying years, language).

**Appendix 2 – PRISMA-ScR Checklist (Tricco et al. 2018)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Item** | **PRISMA-ScR checklist item** | **Reported****on page #** |
| **Title** |  |  |  |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a scoping review. | 1 |
| **Abstract** |  |  |  |
| Structured summary | 2 | Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results and conclusions that relate to the review question(s) and objective(s). | 2 |
| **Introduction** |  |  |  |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review question(s)/objective(s) lend themselves to a scoping review approach. | 4-5 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) and objective(s) being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts and context), or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review question(s) and/or objective(s)). | 5 |
| **Methods** |  |  |  |
| Protocol and registration | 5 | Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number. | 6-7 |
| Eligibilitycriteria | 6 | Specify the characteristics of the sources of evidence (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, and provide a rationale. | 6 |
| Information sources | 7 | Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with authors to identify additional sources) in the search, as well as the date the most recent search was executed. | 5-6 |
| Search | 8 | Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. | 7 |
| Selection of sources of evidence | 9 | State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening, eligibility) included in the scoping review. | 6-7 |

**Appendix 2 – continued**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Item** | **PRISMA-ScR checklist item** | **Reported****on page #** |
| Data charting process | 10 | Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., piloted forms; forms that have been tested by the team before their use, whether data charting was done independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtainingand confirming data from investigators. | 7 |
| Data items | 11 | List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made. | 6 |
| Critical appraisal of individual sources ofevidence | 12 | ***If done***, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate). | NA |
| Summarymeasures | 13 | Not applicable for scoping reviews. | NA |
| Synthesis ofresults | 14 | Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted. | 7 |
| Risk of biasacross studies | 15 | Not applicable for scoping reviews. | NA |
| Additional analyses | 16 | Not applicable for scoping reviews. | NA |
| **Results** |  |  |  |
| Selection of sources ofevidence | 17 | Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram. | 7 |
| Characteristics ofsources of evidence | 18 | For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations. | 10 |
| Critical appraisal within sources ofevidence | 19 | ***If done***, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12). | NA |
| Results of individualsources of evidence | 20 | For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review question(s) and objective(s). | 10 |
| Synthesis of results | 21 | Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review question(s) and objective(s). | 7-13 |

**Appendix 2 – continued**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Item** | **PRISMA-ScR checklist item** | **Reported on page #** |
| Risk of bias across studies | 22 | Not applicable for scoping reviews. | NA |
| Additional analyses | 23 | Not applicable for scoping reviews. | NA |
| **Discussion** |  |  |  |
| Summary of evidence | 24 | Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), explain how they relate to the review question(s) and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups. | 13-16 |
| Limitations | 25 | Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process. | 16 |
| Conclusions | 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review question(s) and objective(s), as well as potential implications and/or next steps. | 16-17 |
| **Funding** |  |  |  |
| Funding | 27 | Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review. | 23 |

**Appendix 3 – Key excluded sources with rationale for their exclusion**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Author (Year)** | **Rationale for exclusion** |
| Slater (2012) (63) | Study did not attempt to draw a relationship between HL and LBP health outcomes |
| Larsen (2015) (64) | Lack of significant LBP population |
| Khoshnevisan (2010) (65) | Lack of explicit study of HL |
| Kim (2009) (66) | Lack of significant LBP population  |
| Roth (2001) (67) | Lack of explicit study of HL Lack of significant LBP population |
| Hardie (2011) (68) | Lack of significant LBP population |
| Schulz (2010) (69) | Lack of explicit study of HL |
| Rabenbauer (2021) (70) | Study did not attempt to draw a relationship between HL and LBP health outcomes |