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Table 1: Study characteristics

| **Authors** | **Participants** | **Participant’s country** | **Guideline(s) considered** | **Methods** | **Phenomena of interest** | **CASP rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Burford et al., 2013 [1] | 151 systematic review authors | Not reported | PRISMA Equity | Mixed methods survey | Perceived utility, facilitators, and barriers | Fairly valuable |
| Davies et al., 2015 [2] | 18 experts and 29 end users | USA, Canada, Sweden, the UK, and Norway | SQUIRE | Focus groups and interviews | Experiences with and impressions of the SQUIRE Guidelines | Valuable |
| Davies et al., 2016 [3] | 44 graduates faculty, and directors of healthcare | Not reported | SQUIRE | Mixed methods survey and written exercise | “whether SQUIRE 1.6 was understood and implemented as intended by the developers” | Valuable |
| De Vries et al. 2015 [4] | 7 researchers | Not reported | Systematic review protocols of animal intervention studies |  | Feedback on usability, missing items, possibilities for improvement and clarity | Not very valuable |
| Dewey et al., 2019 [5] | 74 out of 831 survey respondents that provided (optional) free text comments | The full survey was answered by respondents in the USA, Canada, China, South Korea, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, UK, Other European countries, Middle East, Latin America, Other. It’s unclear where respondents for the free text answers came from. | CONSORT, STROBE, PRISMA, STARD | Mixed methods survey | “(1) When and how are reporting guidelines and checklists used by authors and reviewers? (2) What is their impact on the content of final manuscript drafts according to authors? and (3) How do authors and reviewers perceive the value of reporting guidelines and related checklists?” | Fairly valuable |
| Eysenbach 2013 [6] | 61 authors | Not reported | CONSORT Ehealth | Mixed methods survey | Views on completing the checklist as part of submission | Fairly valuable |
| Fuller et al., 2015 [7] | 5 authors | USA and Australia | TREND and Reporting Guidelines in general | Semi structured interviews | Factors that affected authors’ use of TREND and other reporting guidelines | Valuable |
| Korevaar et al., 2016 [8] | 4 radiology residents, 8 laboratory medicine experts | Radiology residents were from the Netherlands. No geographical details provided for experts | STARD | Interview (residents) and mixed methods survey (experts) | To identify items that were vague, ambiguous, difficult to interpret, or missing | Fairly valuable |
| Macleod et al., 2021 [9] | 211 authors, but only some answered the free text question | The full survey was answered by participants in the USA, China, Japan, Germany, EU, and “Other” areas. It is unclear who answered the free text question. | Materials Design Analysis Reporting framework | Mixed methods survey | Whether the checklist was clear and useful | Fairly valuable |
| Page et al., 2021 [10] | 110 systematic review authors and experts | Not reported | PRISMA | Mixed methods survey | Opinions on PRISMA and proposed changes | Valuable |
| Prady et al., 2007 [11] | 40 authors | Not reported | Standards for Reporting Interventions in Controlled Trials of Acupuncture | Mixed methods survey | Experiences using PRISMA | Fairly valuable |
| Prager et al., 2021 [12] | 5 of 18 survey respondents that answered the free text question | Not reported | STARD | Mixed methods survey | Barriers to STARD 2015 adherence | Fairly valuable |
| Rader et al., 2014 [13] | 263 systematic reviewers | Not reported | PRISMA | Mixed methods survey | Barriers or difficulties in meeting more detailed reporting standards in PRISMA | Fairly valuable |
| du Sert et al., 2020 [14] | 11 authors | UK, USA, Belgium, Brazil | ARRIVE | Interview and writing task | Authors’ opinions, interpretation, and experiences of updated ARRIVE guidelines | Fairly valuable |
| Sharp et al., 2020 [15] | 203 of 1015 researchers that answered free text questions | The full survey was answered by participants in Africa, Asia, Europe, North and South America, Middle East, and Pacific Region. It is unclear who answered the free text question. | STROBE | Mixed methods survey | Experiences and attitudes towards STROBE | Valuable |
| Struthers et al., 2021 [16] | 623 authors, 274 of whom answered free the text question | Not reported | Reporting guidelines in general | Mixed methods survey | The question asked, “What could I do to improve the guideline?” | Fairly valuable |
| Svensøy et al., 2021 [17] | 10 authors | Not reported | Not specified | Semi structured interviews | Experiences using guidelines or templates | Valuable |
| Tam et al., 2019 [18] | 230 authors, 62 of whom answered the open-ended questions | Not reported | PRISMA | Mixed methods survey | Opinions on PRISMA | Fairly valuable |
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