

Table S1

Search strategy

PubMed Limits: All Adult:18+ years, English, Only items with abstracts, Human.	Hits	Identified and examined abstracts	Saved Abstracts	Abstracts not include
NIV*	4608	9	5	4
CPAP*	5828	13	7	6
NIV AND elderly patient	1901	5	1	4
CPAP AND elderly patient	2763	5	0	5
NIV AND patient experience	233	4	2	2
CPAP AND patient experience	197	6	4	2
NIV AND compliance	205	1	1	0
CPAP AND compliance	796	4	2	2
NIV AND respiratory failure	2082	4	1	3
CPAP AND patient attitude	40	6	5	1
NIV AND patient attitude	29	2	1	1
CPAP AND patient perception	55	0	0	0
NIV AND patient perception	20	1	1	0
Summary		60	30	30
CINAHL Limits: English, Abstracts	Hits	Identified and examined abstracts	Saved abstracts	Abstracts also in PubMed Not included
NIV	94	6	2	4
CPAP	1041	10	4	6
NIV AND elderly patient	1	0	0	0
CPAP AND elderly patient	8	0	0	0
NIV AND patient experience	6	0	0	0
CPAP AND patient experience	18	4	3	1
NIV AND compliance	5	0	0	0
CPAP AND compliance	180	7	4	3
NIV AND respiratory failure	42	3	0	3
CPAP AND patient attitude	12	6	1	5
NIV AND patient attitude	3	2	1	1
CPAP AND patient perception	2	0	0	0
NIV AND patient perception	1	1	0	1
Summary		39	15	24

*NIV= *non-invasive ventilation OR non-invasive positive pressure ventilation OR non-invasive mechanical ventilation* as keywords searched for together. *CPAP= *Continuous positive airway pressure*

Table S2

A hierarchy of evidence-for-practice in qualitative research

Type of Study	Features	Limitations	Evidence for Practice
Generalizable studies (level I)	Sampling focused by theory and the literature, extended as a result of analysis to capture diversity of experience. Analytic procedures comprehensive and clear. Located in the literature to assess relevance to other settings.	Main limitations are in reporting when the word length of articles does not allow a comprehensive account of complex procedures.	Clear indications for practice or policy may offer support for current practice, or critique with indicated directions for change.
Conceptual studies (level II)	Theoretical concepts guide sample selection, based on analysis of literature. May be limited to one group about which little is known or a number of important subgroups. Conceptual analysis recognizes diversity in participants' views.	Theoretical concepts and minority or divergent views that emerge during analysis do not lead to further sampling. Categories for analysis may not be saturated.	Weaker designs identify the need for further research on other groups, or urge caution in practice. Well-developed studies can provide good evidence if residual uncertainties are clearly identified.
Descriptive studies (level III)	Sample selected to illustrate practical rather than theoretical issues. Record a range of illustrative quotes including themes from the accounts of "many," "most," or "some" study participants.	Do not report full range of responses. Sample not diversified to analyse how or why differences occur.	Demonstrate that a phenomenon exists in a defined group. Identify practice issues for further consideration.
Single case study (level IV)	Provides rich data on the views or experiences of one person. Can provide insights in unexplored contexts.	Does not analyse applicability to other contexts.	Alerts practitioners to the existence of an unusual phenomenon.

A hierarchy of evidence-for-practice in qualitative research—summary features (reproduced from Daly et al., 2007)