

## Supplemental Material 2

### Data Extraction Tool

Details of publication	
• First author	
• Reference	
Introduction	
• Aims	
Study participants	
• Country of study	
• Recruitment	
• Characteristics of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number</li> <li>- Setting (home, hospital etc)</li> <li>- Age / sex / social class / ethnicity</li> </ul>	
Methods	
• Date of fieldwork	
• Research methods	
• Analysis	
Key findings relevant to review	
1) What is <b>current practice</b> ? <i>Who prescribes, for whom, proximity to death?</i> <i>Who administers?</i> <i>Absence of AP?</i>	
2) What are the <b>attitudes of patients</b> to AP? <i>Patients' acceptance / views</i>	
3) What are the <b>attitudes of family caregivers</b> to AP? <i>Carers' acceptance / views</i>	
4) What are the <b>attitudes of community healthcare professionals</b> to AP? <i>HCPs' acceptance of AP, concerns, views re use, barriers, facilitators, etc.</i>	

## Supplemental Material 2

### Data Extraction Tool

5) Evidence for <b>clinical effectiveness</b> ?  <i><b>Clinical:</b> comfort / symptom control (who reported)</i>	
6) Evidence for <b>cost / cost-effectiveness</b> ?  <i><b>Service use:</b> admission avoidance, place of death, healthcare activity, etc.</i>  <i><b>Cost:</b> costs of drugs, admissions, healthcare activity, ect</i>	
<b>Author(s) conclusion(s)</b>	
<b>Reviewer assessment of the internal validity, appropriateness and contribution of the study in answering the relevant research questions (Gough's WoE)</b>	
<b>Weight of Evidence A</b>  Coherence and integrity of the evidence <i>in its own terms</i>	
<b>Weight of Evidence B</b>  Appropriateness of <i>form of evidence</i> for answering review question	
<b>Weight of Evidence C</b>  <i>Relevance of the evidence</i> for answering review question	
<b>Weight of Evidence D</b>  <i>Overall assessment</i> of study contribution to answering review question	