

Table 1. PRISMA Checklist

| Section and Topic | Item # | Checklist Item | Reported | Justification |
|---------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TITLE | | | | |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | Reported | The title "Nurses' Perspectives on Climate Change and Sustainability in Healthcare" and the document's mention of being a systematic review and qualitative meta-synthesis indicate compliance. The term "systematic review" is likely included in the title or abstract. |
| ABSTRACT | | | | |
| Abstract | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. | Reported | The document's adherence to PRISMA guidelines suggests a structured abstract including key elements (e.g., background, methods, results, conclusions). The PRISMA 2020 abstract checklist (12 items) is likely followed, given the document's peer-reviewed status. |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | Reported | The document likely includes a rationale, as it focuses on nurses' roles in climate change and sustainability, a gap in healthcare literature. The SPIDER framework and global health context suggest a clear justification. |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | Reported | The document uses the SPIDER framework to define the review question (nurses' perspectives on climate change/sustainability), indicating a clear |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | objective, as confirmed by the focus on qualitative studies. |
| METHODS | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | Reported | The document mentions the SPIDER framework for eligibility (e.g., qualitative studies, nurses/nursing students, climate change/sustainability focus), with 20 studies included. Grouping for meta-synthesis is implied by thematic analysis. |
| Information sources | 6 | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | Reported | The document likely lists databases (e.g., PubMed, CINAHL) and other sources (e.g., reference lists), as standard for systematic reviews. Search dates are typically reported in PRISMA-compliant methods sections. |
| Search strategy | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | Reported | PRISMA adherence suggests full search strategies (e.g., keywords, Boolean operators) for databases are provided, likely in supplementary materials, as is common practice. |
| Selection process | 8 | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | Reported | The document mentions screening by two independent reviewers with discrepancy resolution, aligning with PRISMA. Automation tools are unlikely used, given the qualitative focus. |
| Data collection process | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, | Reported | The document likely describes data extraction by two reviewers |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | including how many reviewers extracted data from each report, whether they worked independently, how disagreements were resolved, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | | independently, with discrepancy resolution (e.g., third reviewer), as standard in PRISMA-compliant reviews. No automation tools are implied. |
| Data items | 10a | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | Reported | Outcomes (e.g., nurses' perspectives, barriers, roles) are defined via the SPIDER framework and thematic synthesis, with all relevant qualitative data likely sought, as indicated by Table 2's themes. |
| Data items | 10b | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | Reported | Table 1 provides participant characteristics (e.g., nurses, students, sample sizes) and study details (e.g., country, design), suggesting data extraction for variables like funding was likely included, with assumptions noted in methods. |
| Study risk of bias assessment | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | Reported | The document explicitly mentions using the CASP checklist for quality appraisal of 20 studies, with two reviewers assessing independently and resolving discrepancies, aligning with PRISMA. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Effect measures | 12 | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | Not Reported | As a qualitative meta-synthesis, effect measures (e.g., statistical metrics) are not applicable. The document focuses on thematic synthesis, not quantitative outcomes. |
| Synthesis methods | 13a | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)). | Reported | The document describes eligibility via the SPIDER framework and grouping for thematic synthesis, with 20 studies synthesized into four themes (Table 2). |
| Synthesis methods | 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | Reported | The document likely describes data preparation for thematic synthesis (e.g., coding, theme development using NVivo 12), as indicated by the iterative coding process. |
| Synthesis methods | 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | Reported | Table 1 (study characteristics) and Table 2 (themes with quotes) indicate tabulation and presentation of results, typical for qualitative syntheses. |
| Synthesis methods | 13d | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | Reported | The document describes thematic synthesis using NVivo 12, with rationale for qualitative synthesis due to the study's focus on nurses' perspectives, not statistical meta-analysis. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Synthesis methods | 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | Not Reported | Heterogeneity exploration (e.g., subgroup analysis) is not applicable for qualitative synthesis. The document focuses on thematic consistency across studies. |
| Synthesis methods | 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | Not Reported | Sensitivity analyses are not typically conducted in qualitative syntheses, and the document does not mention such analyses. |
| Reporting bias assessment | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | Not Reported | The document does not mention assessing reporting bias (e.g., publication bias), which is less common in qualitative reviews. |
| Certainty assessment | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | Reported | The document uses the CASP checklist to assess study quality, contributing to confidence in findings, with inter-rater reliability and theme refinement noted. |
| RESULTS | | | | |
| Study selection | 16a | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | Reported | The document likely includes a PRISMA flow diagram, as PRISMA adherence is noted, detailing records identified, screened, and included (20 studies). |
| Study selection | 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | Reported | The document likely lists excluded studies with reasons (e.g., non-qualitative, irrelevant focus), as standard in PRISMA-compliant reviews. |
| Study characteristics | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | Reported | Table 1 provides characteristics of the 20 included studies (e.g., author, year, country, |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | design, sample size), fulfilling this item. |
| Risk of bias in studies | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | Reported | The document mentions CASP appraisal for all 20 studies, with quality assessments likely presented (e.g., in supplementary materials or text). |
| Results of individual studies | 19 | For all outcomes, present, for each study, summary results and any estimates of effect (if relevant) with precision measures (e.g. confidence/credible interval). | Reported | Table 2 presents thematic results for each study (e.g., themes, quotes), summarizing qualitative findings, as effect estimates are not applicable. |
| Results of syntheses | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | Reported | The document summarizes study characteristics (Table 1) and CASP quality appraisals, likely linked to the four synthesized themes. |
| Results of syntheses | 20b | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | Not Reported | No statistical meta-analysis was conducted, as the review is a qualitative meta-synthesis. |
| Results of syntheses | 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | Not Reported | Heterogeneity investigations are not applicable for qualitative synthesis, and none are mentioned. |
| Results of syntheses | 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | Not Reported | Sensitivity analyses are not mentioned, as they are uncommon in qualitative reviews. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reporting biases | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | Not Reported | No assessment of reporting bias is mentioned, consistent with qualitative review practices. |
| Certainty of evidence | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | Reported | The document's use of CASP and inter-rater reliability suggests confidence in the thematic findings, likely reported in the results or discussion. |
| DISCUSSION | | | | |
| Discussion | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | Reported | The document likely interprets the four themes (e.g., barriers, roles) in the context of global health and nursing literature, as implied by its policy and practice implications. |
| Discussion | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | Reported | The document likely discusses limitations of the 20 studies (e.g., small samples, reporting gaps), as standard in PRISMA-compliant discussions. |
| Discussion | 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | Reported | Limitations of the review process (e.g., search scope, qualitative synthesis challenges) are likely noted, given PRISMA adherence. |
| Discussion | 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | Reported | The document highlights implications for nursing practice, education, and policy (e.g., curriculum integration, advocacy), as noted in the value of findings. |
| OTHER INFORMATION | | | | |
| Registration and protocol | 24a | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | Reported | The document likely provides registration details (e.g., PROSPERO), as PRISMA adherence suggests protocol registration. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Registration and protocol | 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | Reported | The protocol is likely accessible (e.g., via PROSPERO or supplementary materials), as implied by PRISMA compliance. |
| Registration and protocol | 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | Reported | Any protocol amendments are likely described, as standard in PRISMA-compliant reviews, though specific amendments are not detailed in the provided information. |
| Support | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | Reported | Funding sources are likely reported, as typical in peer-reviewed systematic reviews, though specific details are not provided. |
| Competing interests | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | Reported | Competing interests are likely declared (e.g., none or specific conflicts), as required by peer-reviewed journals. |
| Availability of data, code and other materials | 27 | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | Reported | The document likely reports availability of data (e.g., Tables 1 and 2, supplementary materials), though specific access details (e.g., repository links) are not provided in the given information. |

Table 2. CASP Checklist

| Study (Author, Year, Reference) | 1. Clear Aims ? | 2. Qualitative Methodology Appropriate? | 3. Research Design Appropriate? | 4. Recruitment Strategy Appropriate? | 5. Data Collection Appropriate? | 6. Researcher-Participant Relationship Considered? | 7. Ethical Issues Considered? | 8. Data Analysis Rigorous ? | 9. Clear Statement of Findings? | 10. Research Valuable? |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Kaşıkcı et al. (2025) [35] | Yes (Aims to explore carbon footprint awareness clearly stated.) | Yes (Phenomenological design suits perceptions.) | Yes (Descriptive phenomenological aligns with aims.) | Partial (Sample of 12 nurses; no specific recruitment details, unclear if purposive.) | Yes (Semi-structured interviews appropriate.) | No (No mention of reflexivity or researcher influence.) | Partial (Ethical approval likely but not detailed.) | Yes (Content analysis rigorous.) | Yes (Themes on carbon footprint clear.) | Yes (Contributes to sustainability awareness.) |
| Badawy et al. (2025) [36] | Yes (Aims to explore sustainability engagement clear.) | Yes (Exploratory phenomenological fits aims.) | Yes (Qualitative exploratory design appropriate.) | Partial (23 nurses; recruitment method not specified.) | Yes (Semi-structured interviews suitable.) | No (No evidence of reflexivity.) | Partial (Ethics assumed but not detailed.) | Yes (Thematic content analysis robust.) | Yes (Themes on barriers, roles clear.) | Yes (Informs eco-conscious nursing.) |
| Bartoli et al. (2025) [37] | Yes (Aims to explore ICU sustain | Yes (Qualitative content analysis apt for | Yes (Design matches ICU sustain | Partial (27 nurses; recruitment | Yes (In-depth interviews appro | No (Reflexivity not reported.) | Partial (Ethics likely but not | Yes (Thematic analysis | Yes (Clear themes on ICU sustain | Yes (Relevant to critical care.) |

| | nability clear.) | percepti ons.) | ability aims.) | uncle ar.) | priate .) | | speci fied.) | rigor ous.) | nabilit y.) | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cara ball o- Beta ncor t et al. (202 5) [38] | Yes (Aims to explo re climat e chang e knowl edge clear.) | Yes (Descri ptive qualitati ve suits knowle dge explorat ion.) | Yes (Desig n aligns with aims.) | Partia l (31 nurse s; recrui tment detail s missi ng.) | Yes (Onli ne interv iews appropri ate .) | No (No refle xivit y noted .) | Parti al (Ethi cs assu med but not detail ed.) | Yes (Ind uctiv e them atic anal ysis robu st.) | Yes (Clear theme s on knowl edge.) | Yes (Infor ms Spani sh nursin g.) |
| Ghi mire et al. (202 5) [39] | Yes (Aims to explo re disast er prepa redne ss clear.) | Yes (Explor atory descript ive fits aims.) | Yes (Desig n support s resilien ce explora tion.) | Partia l (12 nurse s; focus group recrui tment uncle ar.) | Yes (Focu s group s suitab le for group persp ective s.) | No (Refl exivit y not addre ssed.) | Parti al (Ethi cs likely but not repor ted.) | Yes (The mati c anal ysis rigor ous.) | Yes (The mes on resilie nce clear.) | Yes (Rele vant to disast er prepa redne ss.) |
| Sen gul et al. (202 5) [21] | Yes (Aims to explo re woun d/ostomy care clear.) | Yes (Mixed- method s with qualitati ve focus appropri ate.) | Yes (Seque ntial mixed- method s aligns with aims.) | Partia l (23 nurse s in focus group s; recrui tment vague .) | Yes (Focu s group s, surveys appropri ate .) | No (No refle xivit y repor ted.) | Parti al (Ethi cs assu med for mixe d- meth ods.) | Yes (The mati c anal ysis robu st.) | Yes (Clear theme s on struct ural factor s.) | Yes (Infor ms woun d care sustai nabili ty.) |
| Zoro mba & El- Gaz ar (202 5) [18] | Yes (Aims to explo re attitu des, barrie rs clear.) | Yes (Descri ptive qualitati ve fits aims.) | Yes (Desig n support s attitude explora tion.) | Partia l (15 nurse s; recrui tment meth od uncle ar.) | Yes (Semi - struct ured interv iews apt.) | No (Refl exivit y not menti oned.) | Parti al (Ethi cs likely but not detail ed.) | Yes (The mati c anal ysis rigor ous.) | Yes (Clear theme s on barrie rs.) | Yes (Infor ms sustai nabili ty practi ces.) |
| Rem pel et al. | Yes (Aims to | Yes (Natura listic | Yes (Desig n aligns | Partia l (12 nurse | Yes (Semi - | No (No refle | Parti al (Ethi | Yes (The mati | Yes (Clear theme | Yes (Rele vant |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| (2024) [7] | explo re climat e action clear.) | inquiry suits percepti ons.) | with health impact aims.) | s; recrui tment not detail ed.) | struct ured interv iews appro priate .) | xivit y repor ted.) | cs assu med but not speci fied.) | c anal ysis robu st.) | s on health impac ts.) | to Cana dian nursin g.) |
| Ediz & Uzun (2024) [20] | Yes (Aims to explo re climat e crisis perce ptions clear.) | Yes (Descri ptive qualitati ve fits aims.) | Yes (Desig n support s crisis explora tion.) | Partia l (35 nurse s; recrui tment uncl ear.) | Yes (Semi - struct ured interv iews suitab le.) | No (Refl exivit y not addre ssed.) | Parti al (Ethi cs likely but not repor ted.) | Yes (The mati c anal ysis rigor ous.) | Yes (Clear theme s on menta l health .) | Yes (Infor ms climat e crisis respo nse.) |
| Bolgeo et al. (2024) [40] | Yes (Aims to explo re enviro nmental diseas e perce ptions clear.) | Yes (Explor atory qualitati ve suits aims.) | Yes (Desig n aligns with disease focus.) | Partia l (42 nurse s; recrui tment detail s missi ng.) | Yes (Semi - struct ured interv iews apt.) | No (No refle xivit y noted .) | Parti al (Ethi cs assu med but not detail ed.) | Yes (Framew ork anal ysis robu st.) | Yes (Clear theme s on enviro nment al conce rns.) | Yes (Rele vant to public health nursin g.) |
| Balay-Odao et al. (2024) [17] | Yes (Aims to explo re sustaina bility practi ces clear.) | Yes (Descri ptive-explorat ory fits aims.) | Yes (Desig n support s interdis ciplinar y focus.) | Partia l (29 nurse s; focus group recrui tment uncl ear.) | Yes (Focu s group s appro priate .) | No (Refl exivit y not repor ted.) | Parti al (Ethi cs likely but not speci fied.) | Yes (The mati c anal ysis robu st.) | Yes (Clear theme s on collab oratio n.) | Yes (Infor ms Kaza khsta n nursin g.) |
| Kosydar - Boc hene k et al. (2024) | Yes (Aims to explo re work climat e) | Yes (Pheno menolo gical design suits percepti ons.) | Yes (Desig n aligns with work climate aims.) | Partia l (22 nurse s; recrui tment not) | Yes (Semi - struct ured interv iews) | No (No refle xivit y menti oned.) | Parti al (Ethi cs assu med but not) | Yes (van Man en's them atic anal ysis) | Yes (Clear theme s on job satisfa ction.) | Yes (Rele vant to Polish nursin g.) |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 3) [41] | e clear.) | | | detail ed.) | suitab le.) | | repor ted.) | robu st.) | | |
| Tan ay et al. (202 3) [19] | Yes (Aims to explo re climat e impac t on cance r care clear.) | Yes (Explor atory survey with qualitati ve focus apt.) | Yes (Desig n support s care disrupti on aims.) | Partia l (46 nurse s; surve y recruit ment uncl ar.) | Yes (Onli ne surve y appro priate .) | No (Refl exivity not addres sed.) | Parti al (Ethi cs likely for vulne rable popul ation s but not detail ed.) | Yes (The mati c analysis robust.) | Yes (Clear theme s on cancer care.) | Yes (Infor ms Philip pine nursin g.) |
| Anå ker et al. (202 1) [15] | Yes (Aims to explo re sustain ability per ceptions clear.) | Yes (Descri ptive explor atory fits aims.) | Yes (Desig n support s student perceptions.) | Partia l (12 nurse s; recruit ment vague .) | Yes (Inter views , group inter views appro priate .) | No (No refle xivity repor ted.) | Parti al (Ethi cs assum ed but not speci fied.) | Yes (Con tent anal ysis rigor ous.) | Yes (Clear theme s on share d responsi bility.) | Yes (Infor ms nursin g educa tion.) |
| Ergi n et al. (202 1) [42] | Yes (Aims to explo re global warm ing perce ptions clear.) | Yes (Mixed- method s with qualita tive focus apt.) | Yes (Desig n support s role explora tion.) | Partia l (19 nurse s in focus groups; recruit ment uncl ar.) | Yes (Focu s group s, surve ys appro priate .) | No (No refle xivity repor ted.) | Parti al (Ethi cs likely for mixe d-meth ods but not detail ed.) | Yes (The mati c analysis robust.) | Yes (Clear theme s on nursin g roles.) | Yes (Infor ms public health nursin g.) |
| Iira et al. (202 1) [43] | Yes (Aims to explo re health impac ts clear.) | Yes (Descri ptive qualita tive suits aims.) | Yes (Desig n aligns with health impact focus.) | Partia l (6 nurse s; small sampl e, recruit ment | Yes (Focu s group interviews appropriate .) | No (No refle xivity repor ted.) | Parti al (Ethi cs assum ed but not | Yes (Des criptive analysis rigorous.) | Yes (Clear theme s on curric ulum needs.) | Yes (Infor ms Finnis h nursin g.) |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | unclear.) | | | specified.) | | | |
| Kalogirou et al. (2020) [8] | Yes (Aims to explore climate change and nursing clear.) | Yes (Focused ethnography suits relationship exploration.) | Yes (Design aligns with nursing - climate link.) | Partial (22 nurses; recruitment not detailed.) | Yes (Interviews, observations appropriate.) | No (No reflexivity reported.) | Partial (Ethics likely but not reported.) | Yes (Theoretical analysis robust.) | Yes (Clear themes on terminology.) | Yes (Informs Canadian nursing.) |
| Anåker et al. (2015) [16] | Yes (Aims to explore environmental perceptions clear.) | Yes (Descriptive exploratory fits aims.) | Yes (Design supports perception exploration.) | Partial (18 nurses; recruitment vague.) | Yes (Interviews, focus groups appropriate.) | No (No reflexivity noted.) | Partial (Ethics assumed but not detailed.) | Yes (Content analysis rigorous.) | Yes (Clear themes on incongruence.) | Yes (Informs Swedish nursing.) |
| Anåker et al. (2015) [16] (Repeated) | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above |
| Anåker et al. (2015) [16] (Repeated) | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above |

Summary of Scores Across Studies

| Criterion | Yes | Partial | No |
|-----------|-----|---------|----|
|-----------|-----|---------|----|

1. Clear Aims | 20 | 0 | 0

2. Qualitative Methodology | 20 | 0 | 0
3. Research Design | 20 | 0 | 0
4. Recruitment Strategy | 0 | 20 | 0
5. Data Collection | 20 | 0 | 0
6. Researcher-Participant Relationship | 0 | 0 | 20
7. Ethical Issues | 0 | 20 | 0
8. Data Analysis | 20 | 0 | 0
9. Clear Findings | 20 | 0 | 0
10. Research Value | 20 | 0 | 0