S1Table. Methodological features of included studies on interactions with the pharmaceutical industry

a. Methodological features for survey studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>Sample size calculation</th>
<th>Sampling:</th>
<th>Recruitment method</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Administration method</th>
<th>Validity of tool Pilot testing done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Blake, 1995[1] | Not reported            | Frame: Adults (18 years of age and older) in two family practice centers operated by the University of Missouri-Columbia, Department of Family and Community Medicine.  
Method: Convenient sampling | In-person                     | 83.1%            | In person self-administered questionnaire | • Validity of tool: not reported  
• Pilot-testing: Yes  
“The questionnaire was developed specifically for this study and was pilot-tested on 43 adults in the waiting room of the Columbia clinic.” |
Method: Convenient sampling questionnaire distributed by a research associate to consecutive patients | In person                      | 74%            | In person, self-administered questionnaire. | • Validity of tool: Valid  
• Pilot-testing: Yes  
“The questionnaire for patients was pretested and validated” |
| Mainous, 1995[3] | Not reported            | Frame: Data base of phone numbers  
“an annual statewide omnibus survey of adult (18 years of age and older) Kentucky residents”  
Method: stratified random sampling | Telephone surveys  
“Waksberg clustering supplies an almost completely unbiased sample of households with telephones.” | 55%            | Telephone surveys                       | • Validity of tool: not reported  
• Pilot-testing: not reported |
Method: Random sampling at the military center, convenient sampling at the civilian center. | Not reported, probably in person. | 96% at the military center; not applicable | In person, interviewer administered | • Self-developed tool, no validation reported.  
• Pilot-testing: Yes.  
“The survey was pilot tested to ensure clarity and understanding” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Validity of tool</th>
<th>Pilot testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Qidawai, 2003[5] | Not reported | • Frame: Patients attending the outpatient settings of a busy tertiary care hospital  
• Method: Convenient sampling | In person  
“The questionnaire was administered by the study authors and trained volunteers.” | Not reported | Self-administered questionnaires  
“The questionnaire was administered by the study authors and trained volunteers” | Validity of tool: not reported  
Pilot-testing: Not reported |
| Semin, 2006[6] | Yes | • Frame: Patients who had been admitted to the primary health care centers in Izmir Centrum, the third largest city in Turkey.  
• Method: Stratified systematic sampling  
“44 primary health care centers were chosen among the 112 located in the city center” | In person  
“Almost all of the patients who were asked to participate in the study accepted it” | Not reported | In-person, self-administered questionnaires | Validity of tool: not reported  
Pilot testing: not reported |
• Method: Convenient sampling | E-mail  
“The survey was distributed through a bulk email containing a link to the website Survey Monkey” | 8.8% | Internet  
“The survey was distributed through a bulk email containing a link to the website Survey Monkey” | Validity of tool: Not reported  
Pilot testing: Yes  
“The internal consistency of the questionnaire was good, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha: 0.78” |
| Jastifer, 2009[8] | Not reported | • Frame: List of postal addresses Adult residents, 18 years and older, who reside in Alger County, in rural Michigan.”  
• Method: Convenience sampling  
“The survey was mailed to every residential postal address in Alger County.” | Mail  
“Two copies of the survey, consent forms, and a letter explaining the survey were mailed to every residential postal address in Alger County.” | 10.1% | Mail  
self-administered questionnaires | Validity of tool: Not reported  
Pilot-testing: Not reported |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample Frame</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Validity of Tool</th>
<th>Pilot Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tattersall, 2009[9]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Three general practices in metropolitan Sydney</td>
<td>Convenient sampling: “During October–November 2007, we surveyed patients attending three general practices in metropolitan Sydney, New South Wales.”</td>
<td>In person “Patients were either approached in the waiting room by a researcher or invited to participate by the doctor.”</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>In person, self-administered questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macneill, 2010[10]</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Electoral roll of the Hunter region of New South Wales Adults of New South Wales over the age of 18 years</td>
<td>Random sampling: “The public survey was mailed to 3000 people over the age of 18 years randomly sampled from the electoral roll of the Hunter region of New South Wales.”</td>
<td>Mail “The public survey was mailed to 3000 people over the age of 18 years”</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande, 2012[11]</td>
<td>Not reported but the objective was to complete interviews on 30 African American and 30 White respondents in each MSA.</td>
<td>A database of phone numbers “African-American and White adults in 40 large metropolitan areas”</td>
<td>Cluster random sampling. “A random sample of land-line telephone numbers from each Metropolitan Statistical Areas was selected.”</td>
<td>Phone “a random digit dial telephone survey of African American and White non-Latino adults in 40 metropolitan areas”</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, 2012[12]</td>
<td>Not calculated but authors mentioned they wanted to reach 200 individuals</td>
<td>Patients in waiting rooms of five outpatient clinics at a mid-Atlantic academic medical center. Eligible participants included all English-speaking adults (&gt;18 years old) in the waiting areas of five</td>
<td></td>
<td>In person “A fourth-year medical student explained the purpose of the survey and obtained verbal</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>In-person, self-administered questionnaires (with assistance) 61-item survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity of tool: Not reported. 
Pilot-testing: Yes “In a pilot study, 223 patients attending a rural NSW practice received the survey” “A split-half reliability analysis of the weighted data revealed a Cronbach’s α of 0.91.”

Validity of tool: Not reported 
Pilot-testing: not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Tool Validation</th>
<th>Pilot Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wise, 2012[13]</td>
<td>Postoperative adult patients at Grey’s Hospital, Pietermaritzburg.</td>
<td>Convenient sampling</td>
<td>Content validity with a convenience sample of patients, physicians, and the general public, then modified in response to feedback</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp, 2013[14]</td>
<td>Postoperative patients attending follow up hip and knee arthroplasty clinics at Mount Sinai Hospital and Holland Orthopaedic , Arthritic Centre and the New England Baptist Hospital in US(1) and Canada (2) English-speaking patients who were at least eighteen years old and who had undergone primary or revision hip or knee arthroplasty at least three months earlier were eligible to participate in the study.</td>
<td>Convenient sampling</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>In-person, self-administered questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Holbrook, 2013[15] | Not reported but authors mentioned the target was 1000 Canadian residents to allow the proportions to be estimated with an accuracy of ±3%, with 95% confidence | Frame: A database of phone numbers
Adult population of Canada (adults 18 years of age or older who speak English or French), and reside in private homes
Method: Stratified random sampling of “. All 10 provinces, but not the territories, were included, with representation in proportion to population.” |
| | Telephone interview “Random digit dial procedures were utilized to select households across Canada and, within households; the most recent birthday selection method used” | 46.8% |
| | Telephone survey | Validity of tool: Yes “Tool was previously developed based on a systematic review of the literature, COI guidelines and consultation with COI bilingual translation experts and validated using a series of cognitive interviews” Pilot-testing: Not reported |
### b. Checklist for methodological quality of included qualitative studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author’s last name, publication year (SN)</th>
<th>Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</th>
<th>Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</th>
<th>Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?</th>
<th>Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</th>
<th>Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?</th>
<th>Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</th>
<th>Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</th>
<th>Is there a clear statement of findings?</th>
<th>How valuable is the research?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakes, 2015[16]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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