

Supplemental Digital Content 4: Description of the methodological quality variables (adapted from Chacón-Moscoso et al. 2016).

1. **Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the units provided:** The reasons why some people were able to participate in the study and others were not were stated explicitly:
 1. **Yes:** Adequate selection criteria for units and applied to all the potential participants.
 2. **No:** Inadequate selection criteria for units and/or with exceptions in their application.
2. **Methodology or design:** Something an experimenter could manipulate or control in an experiment to help address a threat to validity (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002, p. 507):
 1. **Experimental; randomized:** An experiment (exploration of the effects of manipulating a variable; Shadish et al., 2002, p. 507) in which units are randomly assigned to conditions (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 511).
 2. **Quasi-experimental (two groups without randomized assignment) non-equivalent control groups with pre-test and post-test:** An experiment (exploration of the effects of manipulating a variable; Shadish et al., 2002, p. 507) in which units are not randomly assigned to conditions (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 511).
 3. **Pre-experimental/others (questionnaires/observational/naturalistic)** (Olivares, Rosa, & Sánchez-Meca, 2000; Sánchez-Meca, 1997): A study in which there is only one group and one measure; or when there was no intervention, but recordings were made of the participants' behavior, whether this was spontaneous or elicited (usually by means of questions).
3. **Attrition:** Loss of units. In randomized experiments, this refers to loss that occurred after the random assignment had taken place (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 505); percentage of the initial sample that did not conclude the study.
4. **Occasions of measurement for each variable (specify number)** (Olivares et al., 2000): This item specified when the measurements were taken.
 1. **Concurrent:** Both outcome and family variables were taken at the same moment. The specific number of measurements was recorded.
 2. **Outcome post family:** Family variables were taken before outcome variables. The specific number of measurements on each occasion was recorded.
 3. **Outcome concurrent and post family:** Outcome variables were both taken at the same moment and after family variables. The specific number of measurements on each occasion was recorded.

5. **Measures are taken in all the measurement occasions** (Olivares et al., 2000): This item counted the number of measurements that were taken the first moment and for the remaining measurement occasions.
 1. **All of them** (Olivares et al., 2000): All measurements were taken at all the measurement occasions.
 2. **Some**: At least one of the measurements was taken at all measurement occasions.
 3. **None**: None of the measurements was taken at all measurement occasions.
 4. **Cross-sectional**: There was only one measurement occasion.

6. **Standardized dependent variables**: Level of normalization of the tool to measure the variable that varied in response to the independent variable (also called effect or outcome) (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 507).
 1. **Standardized questionnaires or standardized self-reports** (Olivares et al., 2000): At least one measurement was taken using structured tools. The data were gathered using a homogeneous procedure. Some study of their psychometric properties was carried out.
 2. **Without (self-reports and post hoc records)** (Olivares et al., 2000): All the measurements were taken using ad hoc tools, developed in a specific situation, and whose validity was not checked.

7. **Standardized independent variables**: Level of normalization of the tool to measure the variable that purports to be independent of other influences (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 508).
 1. **Standardized questionnaires or standardized self-reports** (Olivares et al., 2000): At least one measurement was taken using structured tools. The data were gathered using a homogeneous procedure. Some study of their psychometric properties was carried out.
 2. **Without (self-reports and post hoc records)** (Olivares et al., 2000): All the measurements were taken using ad hoc tools, developed in a specific situation, and whose validity was not checked.

8. **Control techniques** (Olivares et al., 2000):
 1. **Yes**: Double-masking: also called double-blind, this refers to a procedure that prevented participants and experimenters from knowing the hypotheses (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 78); Masking (beneficiaries): also called blind, this refers to a procedure that prevented participants from knowing the hypotheses (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 78); Masking (implementers): Also called blind, this refers to a procedure that prevented experimenters from knowing the hypotheses (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 78); Other (need to specify): when control techniques were not those mentioned in the previous options (i.e., matching, blocking, or stratifying).

2. **No**

9. **Construct definition of outcome:** Explanation of the concept, model, or schematic idea measured as a dependent variable (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 506):

1. **Replicable by reader in own setting:** All the concepts measured as dependent variables were defined in a conceptual and empirical way.
2. **Vague definition:** At least one concept measured as a dependent variable was defined in a conceptual and/or empirical way.
3. **No definition:** No concept measured as a dependent variable was measured in a conceptual or empirical way.

10. **Construct definition of family variable:** Explanation of the concept, model, or schematic idea measured as family variable:

1. **Replicable by reader in own setting:** All the concepts measured as a family variables were defined in a conceptual and empirical way.
2. **Vague definition:** At least one concept measured as a family variable was defined in a conceptual and/or empirical way.
3. **No definition:** No concept measured as a family variable was measured in a conceptual or empirical way.

11. **Responder rate:** Number of people that were asked to participate in the study and number of people that actually participated:

1. **Mentioned:** The information is given.
2. **Not mentioned:** The information is not given.

12. **Representativeness:** The degree the sample of the study represents the population of reference:

1. **High:** The sample represents highly the population of reference.
2. **Low:** The sample represents scarcely the population of reference.
3. **Not mentioned:** The information is not given.

13. **Statistical methods for imputing missing data:** To estimate what the study would have yielded if there had been no attrition (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 337):

1. **Yes (specify):** Values for the missing data points were imputed so that they could be included in the analyses. The specific method used was specified, that is, sample mean substitution, last value forward method for longitudinal data sets, hot deck imputation, single imputation, or multiple imputation.
2. **No:** Attempts were made to estimate effects without imputing missing data.

14. Perspective. Definition retrieved from <https://learning.closer.ac.uk/introduction/types-of-longitudinal-research/prospective-vs-retrospective-studies/>

1. **Prospective:** “Individuals are followed over time and data about them is collected as their characteristics or circumstances change”
2. **Retrospective:** “Information is collected about their past. This might be through interviews in which participants are asked to recall important events, or by identifying relevant administrative data to fill in information on past events and circumstances”
3. **Unclear:** There is not enough information to ensure the type of perspective.

References

- Olivares, J., Rosa, A. I., and Sánchez-Meca, J. (2000). Meta-análisis de la eficacia de las habilidades de afrontamiento en problemas clínicos y de salud en España [Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of coping skills in clinical and health problems in Spain]. *Anuario Psicol.* 31, 43–61.
- Sánchez-Meca, J. (1997). Methodological issues in the meta-evaluation of correctional treatment, in *Advances in Psychology and Law: International Contributions*, eds S. Redondo, V. Garrido, J. Pérez, and R. Barberet (New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter), 486–498.
- Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental research designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- UCL Institute of Education. *Types of longitudinal studies*. Retrieved from <https://learning.closer.ac.uk/introduction/types-of-longitudinal-research/prospective-vs-retrospective-studies/>