

Supplementary File S2: Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018

Category and study	Methodological quality criteria					Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	
<b>Qualitative</b>						
Bradbury & Tierney 2022 - RL	Y	Y	Can't tell	Y	Y	Lack of detail in audit trail
McKeever et al., 2013 - RL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rodriguez-Costa et al., 2021 - RL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>Quantitative randomized (RCT)</b>						
Willoughby et al., 2009 - RL	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GMFCS levels not matched at baseline
<b>Quantitative non-randomized</b>						
Eisenberg et al., 2009 - RL	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	only matched for age and sex, two groups may have differed at baseline, convenience sample
Kuenzle & Brunner 2009 - RL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Relatively complete data
Smati et al., 2022	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Age and GMFCS not accounted for in group analysis - but raw data is provided for individual analysis
Van der Putten 2005 - RL	Y	Can't tell	Y	N	Y	Off-label scoring of TDMTT, groups differed in function
Wright et al., 1999 - RL	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	PEDI not scored for a number of participants
Wright & Jutai 2006 - RL	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Measurements at all time points not available. A number of participants no longer using device at follow-up.
<b>Mixed-methods</b>						
Paananen	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Essentially an interview survey study.

**Qualitative:**

1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?
2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?
3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data?
4. Is the interpretation of the results sufficiently substantiated by data?
5. Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?

**Quantitative randomized controlled trials (RCT)**

1. Is randomization appropriately performed?
2. Are the groups comparable at baseline?
3. Are there complete outcome data?
4. Are outcome assessors blinded to the intervention provided?
5. Did the participants adhere to the assigned intervention?

**Quantitative non-randomized**

1. Are the participants representative of the target population?
2. Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?
3. Are there complete outcome data?
4. Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?
5. During study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?

**Mixed methods**

1. Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to answer the research question?
2. Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?
3. Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?
4. Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?
5. Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?