**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

PubMed Search Strategy 18/11/2018

|  |  | **Query** | **Items found** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [#2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/advanced) |  | Search **(((((("Healthy Aging"[Mesh]) OR ((Successful ageing[Title/Abstract]) OR Successful aging[Title/Abstract])) OR (("Active ageing"[Title/Abstract]) OR "Active aging"[Title/Abstract])) OR (("positive ageing"[Title/Abstract]) OR "positive aging"[Title/Abstract])) OR (("optimal ageing"[Title/Abstract]) OR "optimal aging"[Title/Abstract])) OR (("Healthy ageing"[Title/Abstract]) OR "Healthy aging"[Title/Abstract])) AND (((((((((((((((Perception[Title/Abstract]) OR Perceptions[Title/Abstract])) OR ((Perspective[Title/Abstract]) OR Perspectives[Title/Abstract])) OR ((Attitude[Title/Abstract]) OR Attitudes[Title/Abstract])) OR (Opinion[Title/Abstract]) OR Opinions[Title/Abstract])) OR self-rated[Title/Abstract]) OR (View[Title/Abstract] OR Views[Title/Abstract])) OR (Interpretation[Title/Abstract] OR Interpretations[Title/Abstract])) OR Self-assessment[MeSH Terms]) OR Self concept[MeSH Terms]) OR Personal satisfaction[MeSH Terms]) OR "Attitude"[Mesh]) OR "Perception"[Mesh:noexp] OR "Aging/psychology"[Mesh])** | [2053](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?cmd=HistorySearch&querykey=2) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S1. Quality appraisal** |
|   | **SCREENING QUESTIONS** | **1. QUALITATIVE STUDIES** | **COMMENTS** |
| First author | Title | S1. Are there clear research questions? | S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?  | 1.1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question? | 1.2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question? | 1.3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data? | 1.4. Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?  | 1.5. Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation? |
| **(**[Carr and Weir, 2017](#_ENREF_7)**)** | A qualitative description of successful aging through different decades of older adulthood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[Chen et al., 2019](#_ENREF_10)**)** | A Self-Reliant Umbrella: Defining Successful Aging Among the Old-Old (80+) in Shanghai | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Can´t tell | No | Can’t tell |  Very few quotes used in the results, data not shown in depth  |
| **(**[Collis and Waterfield, 2015](#_ENREF_13)**)** | The understanding of pain by older adults who consider themselves to have aged successfully | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[Dionigi et al., 2011](#_ENREF_16)**)** | Meanings of aging among older Canadian women of varying physical activity levels | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[Horder et al., 2013](#_ENREF_21)**)** | Self-respect through ability to keep fear of frailty at a distance: successful ageing from the perspective of community-dwelling older people | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Can't tell | Yes | Yes | Few quotes used |
| **(**[Knight and Ricciardelli, 2003](#_ENREF_29)**)** | Successful Aging: Perceptions of adults aged between 70 and 101 years | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[McGrath et al., 2016](#_ENREF_36)**)** | Negotiating 'positive' aging in the presence of age-related vision loss (ARVL): The shaping and perpetuation of disability | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[Nosraty et al., 2015](#_ENREF_38)**)** | Perceptions by the oldest old of successful aging, Vitality 90+ Study | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[Torres and Hammarstrom, 2009](#_ENREF_52)**)** | Successful aging as an oxymoron: older people with and without home-help care talk about what aging well means to them | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| **(**[Sato-Komata et al., 2015](#_ENREF_46)**)** | Concept of successful ageing among the community-dwelling oldest old in Japan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
|   | **SCREENING QUESTIONS** | **4. QUANTITATIVE DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES** |  |
| First author | Title | S1. Are there clear research questions? | S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?  | 4.1. Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question? | 4.2. Is the sample representative of the target population? | 4.3. Are the measurements appropriate? | 4.4. Is the risk of nonresponse bias low? | 4.5. Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question? | **COMMENTS** |
| **(**[Bassett et al., 2007](#_ENREF_3)**)** | Living long and keeping well: elderly Canadians account for success in aging | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(**[Bowling, 2006](#_ENREF_4)**)** | Lay perceptions of successful aging: findings from a national survey of middle aged and older adults in Britain | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |   |
| **(**[Lee et al., 2017](#_ENREF_30)**)** | Successful Aging from the Viewpoint of Older Adults: Development of a Brief Successful Aging Inventory (SAI) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(**[Tate et al., 2013](#_ENREF_49)**)** | Older men's lay definitions of successful aging over time: the Manitoba follow-up study | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
|   | **SCREENING QUESTIONS** | **5. MIXED METHODS STUDIES** |  |
| First author | Title | S1. Are there clear research questions? | S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?  | 5.1. Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question? | 5.2. Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question? | 5.3. Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted? | 5.4. Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed? | 5.5. Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?  | **COMMENTS** |
| **(**[von Faber et al., 2001](#_ENREF_53)**)** | Successful aging in the oldest old: Who can be characterized as successfully aged? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S2. PRISMA Checklist** |
| **Section/topic**  | **#** | **Checklist item**  | **Reported on page #**  |
| **TITLE** |  |
| Title  | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.  | 1 |
| **ABSTRACT** |  |
| Structured summary  | 2 | Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.  | 2 |
| **INTRODUCTION** |  |
| Rationale  | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.  | 3 |
| Objectives  | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).  | 3-4 |
| **METHODS** |  |
| Protocol and registration  | 5 | Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.  | 4 |
| Eligibility criteria  | 6 | Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.  | 5-6 |
| Information sources  | 7 | Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.  | 4 |
| Search  | 8 | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.  | 45 |
| Study selection  | 9 | State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).  | 5-6 |
| Data collection process  | 10 | Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.  | 6 |
| Data items  | 11 | List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.  | NA |
| Risk of bias in individual studies  | 12 | Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.  | 7 |
| Summary measures  | 13 | State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).  | NA |
| Synthesis of results  | 14 | Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I2) for each meta-analysis.  | 7 |
|  **Section/topic**  | **#** | **Checklist item**  | **Reported on page #** |
| Risk of bias across studies  | 15 | Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).  | NA |
| Additional analyses  | 16 | Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.  | NA |
| **RESULTS** |  |
| Study selection  | 17 | Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.  | 7-8-44 |
| Study characteristics  | 18 | For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.  | 29-32 |
| Risk of bias within studies  | 19 | Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).  | NA |
| Results of individual studies  | 20 | For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.  | NA |
| Synthesis of results  | 21 | Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.  | NA |
| Risk of bias across studies  | 22 | Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).  | NA |
| Additional analysis  | 23 | Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).  | NA |
| **DISCUSSION** |  |
| Summary of evidence  | 24 | Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).  | 20-22 |
| Limitations  | 25 | Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).  | 23 |
| Conclusions  | 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.  | 23-24 |
| **FUNDING**  |  |
| Funding  | 27 | Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.  | 25 |

*From:*  Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097