Supplementary Tables

Table S1: PRISMA guidelines reporting checklist **become**

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.	3-4
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	5-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	5-6
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.	6
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.	6-8
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.	6-7
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Supplementary Table S2
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).	7-9

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.	10
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	7-10
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.	9-10 & Supplementary Table S3
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	10-11
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	11-12
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).	10
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.	12 & Figure 1
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.	12-15; Table 1 & Supplementary Tables S4-S6
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).	16-20; Table 2 & Supplementary Table S7

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.	21-22 Supplementary Tables S4-S6
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	22-24 & Tables 3-6
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	22-24 & Supplementary Figures S1-S2
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).	24-33
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).	25-27
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	34
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.	35 & Funding Statement

Table S2: Search strategy used for electronic databases

Original Search	Additional Search
Medline	**Medline**
(feet or foot):ab AND (problem* OR complication* OR disease* OR ulcer* OR wound* OR deform* OR infec* OR cellulitis OR amputation* OR diab* OR isch#mi* OR vascul* OR arter* OR gangr* OR neurop*):ab AND (inpatient* OR hospital* OR admi*):ab AND (questionnair* or survey or prevalence or incidence or risk* or factor or associat* or relationship* or correlat* or etiolog* or aetiolog* or caus* or develop* or predispos or demograph*):ab ***Limiters:*** Date of Publication: January 1980 - December 2013 Human (Studies Only)	pressure:ab AND (ulcer* OR wound*):ab AND (inpatient* OR hospital* OR admi*):ab AND prevalence:ab ***Limiters:*** Date of Publication: January 1980 - December 2013 Human (Studies Only)
CINAHL	**CINAHL**
(feet or foot):ab AND (problem* OR complication* OR disease* OR ulcer* OR wound* OR deform* OR infec* OR cellulitis OR amputation* OR diab* OR isch#mi* OR vascul* OR arter* OR gangr* OR neurop*):ab AND (inpatient* OR hospital* OR admi*):ab AND (questionnair* or survey or prevalence or incidence or risk* or factor or associat* or relationship* or correlat* or etiolog* or aetiolog* or caus* or develop* or predispos or demograph*):ab ***Limiters:*** Published Dates: January 1980 - December 2013 Human (Studies Only)	pressure:ab AND (ulcer* OR wound*):ab AND (inpatient* OR hospital* OR admi*):ab AND prevalence:ab ***Limiters:*** Published Dates: January 1980 - December 2013 Human (Studies Only)
Embase	**Embase**

(foot or feet):ab AND (problem* OR complication* OR disease* OR ulcer* OR wound* OR deform* OR infec* OR cellulitis OR amputation* OR diab* OR isch*mi* OR vascul* OR arter* OR gangr* OR neurop*):ab AND (inpatient* OR hospital* OR admi*):ab AND (questionnair* or survey or prevalence or incidence or risk* or factor or associat* or relationship* or correlat* or etiolog* or aetiolog* or caus* or develop* or predispos or demograph*):ab ***Filters:*** Publication Years: 1980 - 2013 Study Types: Human	pressure:ab AND (ulcer* OR wound*):ab AND (inpatient* OR hospital* OR admi*):ab AND prevalence:ab ***Filters:*** Publication Years: 1980 - 2013 Study Types: Human

Table S3: Questions used to assess the methodological quality of included studies (28)

Item	Questions #
1.	**Is the sample random or is the whole population (i.e. hospital) surveyed?**
2.	**Is the study design prospective?**
3.	**Is a physical examination performed for the foot outcome/s*?**
4.	**Is the sample size adequate (>300 subjects)?**
5.	**Are objective, suitable, standard methods used for measurement of foot outcome/s*?**
6.	**Is the foot outcome/s* measured in an unbiased fashion?**
7.	**Is the response rate adequate?**
8.	**Are the estimates of prevalence given with confidence intervals?**
9.	**Are the estimates of prevalence given in detail by subgroups?**
10.	**Are the study subjects and the setting described in detail?**

Each question is scored 0 (no or not reported) or 1 (yes); * Foot outcome/s = foot wounds, foot infections, collective foot disease, peripheral arterial disease, peripheral neuropathy and/or foot deformity

Table S4: Characteristics of included studies reporting *all-cause* foot disease disorders or risk factors in general inpatient populations #

Study (Country)	Sample (n)	Age (SD)	Age Range	Male n (%)	Study Aim	Study Design	Study Quality	Foot Wound n (%)	Foot Infection n (%)	Foot Disease n (%)	PAD n (%)	PN n (%)	Amp. n (%)
Prospective													
Gottrup 2013 (34) (Denmark)	830	-	-	-	0	Pt: M	3	13 (1.56)	-	-	-	-	-
Gruen 1997 (35) (Australia)	360	74.0(-)	-	~238 (66.0)	0	Pt: S	6	15 (4.17)	-	-	-	-	-
Antonopoulos 2005 (32) (Greece)	990	71.2(9.1)	>50	400 (40.4)	1	Per: S	6	-	-	-	356 (36.0)	-	-
Lacroix 2008 (37) (France)	291	69.5(12.8)	43 - 97	153 (52.6)	1	Pt: S	8	-	-	-	86 (29.6)	-	-
Retrospective													
Currie 1998A (24) (Wales)	~353,000	~56.0(-)^	0 – >75	-	1	Per: M	5	2,444 (0.69) *	1,856 (0.53)*	4,245 (1.2)*	1,138 (0.32)*	663 (0.19)*	235 (0.07)*
Henke 2005 (36) ** (USA)	~57,639,000	60.0(19.0)^	-	~30,606 (59.0)^	1	Per: M	4	-	51,875 (0.09) *	-	-	-	~16,185 (0.03)*
Donnan 2000A (33) (Scotland)	46,126	-	-	-	0	Per: M	5	-	-	-	247 (0.54)*	-	91 (0.20)*
Morgan 2010A (38) (Wales)	82,294	-	0 - >85	-	0	Per: M	5	-	-	141 (0.17)	-	-	-

n = numbers; SD = Standard Deviation; % = Prevalence: PAD = Peripheral Arterial Disease, PN = Peripheral Neuropathy; Amp. = Amputations.
# = No studies reported on foot deformity; - = Not reported; ~ = Determined from the calculation of different reported results; ^ Cases only; * = Primary reason for admission only; ** Osteomyelitis only.
Study Aim: 1 = Investigating foot disease disorder or risk factor is a primary aim of study, 0 = Investigating a foot disease disorder or risk factor is not a primary aim of study; Study Design: Pt = Point prevalence, Per = Period prevalence; M = Multi-site, S = Single Site; Study Quality: Total agreed study quality score from the methodological assessment performed in Table 2 (total possible score is 10).

Table S5: Characteristics of included studies reporting *diabetes-related* foot disease disorders or risk factors in general inpatient populations #

Study (Country)	Sample (n)	Age (SD)	Age Range	Male n (%)	Diabetes n (%)	Study Aim	Study Design	Study Quality	Foot Wound n (%)	Foot Infection n (%)	Foot Disease n (%)	PAD n (%)	PN n (%)	Amp. n (%)
Prospective														
Asumanu 2010 (40) (Ghana)	966	54.0(-)^	20 – 79^	42 (52.5)^	-	1	Per: S	5	42 (4.35)	32 (3.31)	80 (8.28)	-	~27 (2.80)	14 (1.45)
Hurd 2009 (43) (Canada)	3,099	-	-	-	-	0	Pt: M	6	~34 (1.10)	-	-	-	-	-
Mahe 2006 (45) (France)	624	60.2(-)	17-101	~312 (50.0)	-	0	Pt: S	6	3 (0.48)	-	-	-	-	-
Masson 1992 (46) (England)	1,317	~73(-)^	26 - 94^	51 (46.4)^	93 (7.06)	0	Pt: M	4	15 (1.14)*	-	-	-	-	3 (0.23)*
Mohammad Akther 2011 (47) (India)	5,188	55.6(12.0)^	<20 - 80^	47 (85.5)^	500 (9.64)	1	Per: S	5	55 (1.06)	32 (0.62)	55 (1.06)	9 (0.17)	-	-
Ogbera 2007 (51) (Nigeria)	1,327	55.0(14.0)^	17 - 91^	~128 (61.5)^	206 (15.52)	0	Per: S	4	36 (2.71)	-	-	-	-	-
Tait 2007 (54) (England)	372	-	-	-	-	0	Pt: S	3	4 (1.08)+	-	-	-	-	-
Unachukwu 2007 (55) (Nigeria)	827	54.6(14.7)^	18 - 86^	38 (63.3)^	315 (38.09)	0	Per: S	4	58 (7.01)	~53 (6.41)	-	-	-	12 (1.45)
Wallymahmed 2005 (56) (England)	1,129	~72.1(-)^	24 - 97^	64 (50.8)^	126 (11.2)	0	Pt: S	4	3 (0.27)*	1 (0.09)*	-	-	-	-
Daultrey 2011 (42) (England)	810	-	-	-	110 (13.6)	1	Pt: S	4	-	-	40 (4.94)	-	-	-
Retrospective														
Ajayi 2009 (39)	2,696	57.0(16.2)	18 - 96	1,509	118	0	Per: S	3	44	-	-	-	-	-

(Nigeria)				(56.0)	(4.4)				(1.63)					
Currie 1998B (24)	~353,000	67.0(-)^	0 – >75	-	655	1	Per: M	5	323	193	655	270	62	129
(Wales)					(15.4)^				(0.09)*	(0.05)*	(0.19)*	(0.08)*	(0.02)*	(0.04)*
Leichter 1982 (44)	596,591	-	-	-	31,202	0	Per: M	2	37	-	-	61	17	-
(USA)					(5.23)				(0.006)*			(0.01)**	(0.003)*	
Mottini 2003 (48)	862	-	23 - 81^	38	83	0	Per: S	2	20	-	-	3	3	3
(Congo)				(45.8)^	(9.63)				(2.32)			(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)
Ogbera 2006 (50)	7,253	-	-	-	827	1	Per: S	3	97	-	-	-	-	26
(Nigeria)				(62.5)^	(11.40)				(1.34)					(0.36)
Otu 2013 (52)	3,882	-	0 - >70^	166	297	1	Per: S	4	63	-	-	-	107	-
(Nigeria)				(55.9)^	(7.65)				(1.62)				(2.76)	
Donnan 2000B (33)	46,126	-	-	-	2,080	0	Per: M	5	-	-	-	43	-	22
(Scotland)					(4.5)							(0.09)*		(0.05)*
Williams 1985 (57)	~171,000	-	0 - >65	777	1,633	0	Per: M	3	-	-		180	-	-
(England)				(45.3)^	(0.95)							(0.10)*		
Chijioke 2010 (41)	15,320	-	30 - 86^	440	785	0	Per: S	3	-	-	132	-	-	-
(Nigeria)				(56.1)^	(5.12)						(0.86)			
Morgan 2010B (38)	82,294	-	0 - >85	-	7,618	0	Per: M	5	-	-	801	-	-	-
(Wales)					(9.26)						(0.97)			
Nason 2013A (49)	~334,000	-	-	-	-	1	Per: S	3	-	-	2,842	-	-	-
(Period: 2006-08) **											(0.85)			
(Ireland)														
Nason 2013B (49)	~336,000	-	-	-	-	1	Per: S	3	-	-	2,485	-	-	-
(Period: 2008-10) **											(0.74)			
(Ireland)														
Sjoberg 2007A (53)	167	35.5(-)	-	109	-	0	Per: S	3	-	-	6	-	-	-
(Period: 2003)				(65.3)							(3.59)			
(Grenada)														
Sjoberg 2007B (53)	185	39.0(-)	-	125	-	0	Per: S	3	-	-	22	-	-	-
(Period: 2004)				(67.6)							(11.89)			
(Grenada)														

n = numbers; SD = Standard Deviation; % = Prevalence: Amp. = Amputations, PAD = Peripheral Arterial Disease, PN = Peripheral Neuropathy;
# = No studies reported on foot deformity; - = Not reported; ~ = Determined from the calculation of different reported results; ^ Cases only; * = Primary reason for admission only; ** Bed day figures only; + = Determined from formula = (foot wound numbers / total wound numbers) x total wound patients / sample numbers.
Study Aim: 1 = Investigating a foot disease disorder or risk factor is a primary aim of study, 0 = Investigating a foot disease disorder or risk factor is not a primary aim of study; Study Design: Pt = Point prevalence, Per = Period prevalence; M = Multi-site, S = Single Site; Study Quality: Total agreed study quality score from the methodological assessment performed in Table 2 (total possible score is 10).

Table S6: Characteristics of included studies reporting *pressure ulcer-related* foot disease disorders or risk factors in general inpatient populations #

Study (Country)	Sample (n)	Age (SD)	Age Range	Male n (%)	PU n (%)	Study Aim	Study Design	Study Quality	FPU n (%)	FPU / PU n (%) *
Per Person										
Alja'afreh 2013 (58) (Jordan)	190	63.0(-)^	<30 - >90	14 (46.7)^	30 (15.79)	0	Per: S	2	7 (3.68)	-
Barrois 2008 (63) (France)	37,307	72.3(-)	31 - 92	14,177 (38.0)	3,314 (8.88)	0	Pt: M	7	1,373 (3.68)	2,298/4,991 (46.04)
Brito 2013 (66) (Brazil)	473	58.4(-)	18 - 103	251 (53.1)	80 (16.91)	0	Pt: M	6	22 (4.65)	-
Gallagher 2008 (74) (Ireland)	672	69.0(-)	16 - 94	322 (47.9)	124 (18.45)	0	Pt: M	8	20 (2.98)	-
Gethin 2005 (77) (Ireland)	506	-	18 - 100	244 (48.2)	78 (15.41)	0	Pt: S	7	15 (2.96)	-
Gunningberg 2005 (80) (Sweden)	612	-	18 – >89	295 (48.2)	146 (23.86)	0	Pt: S	8	54 (8.82)	-
Gunningberg 2006 (81) (Sweden)	369	71.5(16.6)	18 - 101	178 (48.2)	104 (28.18)	0	Pt: S	8	17 (4.61)	-
Gunningberg 2008 (82) (Sweden)	632	-	18 – >89	308 (48.7)	145 (22.94)	0	Pt: S	8	41 (6.49)	-
Gunningberg 2013 (83) (Sweden)	16,466	-	17 - >80	7,820 (47.5)	2,737 (16.62)	1	Pt: M	6	1,102 (6.69)	3,276
House 2011 (85) (USA)	60	-	-	-	6 (10.00)	0	Pt: S	4	3 (5.00)$	-
Lahmann 2006 (88) (Germany)	16,728	63.6(1.9)	-	~9,334 (55.8)	1,766 (10.56)	0	Pt: M	7	~537 (3.21)$	- (30.4)
Tubaishat 2011 (98) (Jordan)	302	-	<12 – >89	176 (58.3)	36 (11.92)	0	Pt: M	8	9 (2.98)	-

Tubaishat 2013 (99) (Jordan)	295	49.1(18.6)	18 - 87	162 (54.92)	48 (16.27)	0	Pt: M	7	23 (7.80)	-
Vanderwee 2007 (101) (5 x European Countries)	5,947	-	<39 – >89	2,750 (46.2)	1,078 (18.13)	0	Pt: M	7	261 (4.39)$	633/1,860 (34.03)
Wann-Hansson 2008 (104) (Sweden)	535	71.2(16.4)	-	241 (45.0)	144 (26.92)	0	Pt: S	8	16 (2.99)	-
Per Ulcer										
Allcock 1994 (59) (England)	714	-	-	325 (45.5)	229 (32.07)	0	Pt: S	5	~96 (13.45)+$	212/505 (42.00)
Amlung 2001 (60) (USA)	42,817	-	0 – >91^	2,861 (45.0)^	6,358 (14.85)	0	Pt: M	5	~2,314 (5.40)+$	3,820/10,495 (36.40)
Barczak 1997 (61) (USA)	39,874	-	0 – >101^	1,889 (47.0)^	4,020 (10.08)	0	Pt: M	6	~1,400 (3.51) +$	2,300/6,603 (34.83)
Barrois 1995 (62) (France)	12,050	68.0(17.0)	-	4,700 (39.0)	630 (5.23)	0	Pt: M	5	~277 (2.30) +	432/982 (44.00)
Bours 1999(64)^^ (Holland)	368	61.7(18.7)	-	184 (50.0)	37 (10.05)	0	Pt: S	7	~14 (3.80) +	24/65 (37.50)
Bours 2002A(65)^^ (University Hospital) (Holland)	1,663	53.6(22.1)	-	815 (49.0)	220 (13.20)	0	Pt: M	7	~104 (6.25) +$	~175/370 (47.20)
Bours 2002B (65)^^ (General Hospital) (Holland)	8,374	66.6(18.9)	-	3,852 (46.0)	1,951 (23.30)	0	Pt: M	7	~802 (9.58) +$	~1,387/3,375 (41.10)
Charlier 2001 (67) (Australia)	59	-	<14 - >81	28 (47.5)	7 (11.86)	0	Pt: S	5	~1 (1.69) +	2/13 (15.38)
Clark 1992 (68) (England)	866	-	-	-	89 (10.28)	0	Pt: M	5	~24 (2.77) +$	27/102 (26.47)
Cole 2004 (69) (Canada)	277	-	-	-	27 (9.75)	0	Pt: s	5	~12 (4.33) +$	15/33 (45.45)

Da Silva Cardoso 2010 (70) (Brazil)	716	-	16 - 96^	43 (55.1)^	78 (10.89)	0	Pt: S	5	~21 (2.93) +	36/134 (26.87)
Dealey 1991 (71) (England)	1,176	-	-	-	87 (7.40)	0	Pt: S	3	~17 (1.45) +	~26/137 (19.00)
Dealey 1994 (72) (England)	406	-	-	-	32 (7.88)	0	Pt: S	6	~2 (0.49) +	3/46 (6.52)
Ek 1982 (73) (Sweden)	1,776	-	17 - 96^	26 (36.6)^	71 (4.00)	0	Pt: M	3	~9 (0.51) +$	14/109 (12.84)
Galvan-Martinez 2012 (75) (Mexico)	294	48.6(-)	32 - 85	127 (43.2)	50 (17.01)	0	Pt: M	7	~10 (3.40) +	- (20.00)
Gawron 1994 (76) (USA)	440	53.0(22.0)	-	~238 (54.0)	~ 53 (12.00)	0	Pt: S	8	~22 (5.00) +$	35/85 (41.18)
Gosnell 1992 (78) (USA)	1320	-	16 – 101^	~47 (42.0)	111 (8.41)	0	Per: S	8	~33 (2.50) +$	57/190 (30.00)
Groeneveld 2004 (79) (Adults only) (USA)	416	-	17 – >80	-	122 (29.32)	0	Pt: S	8	~ 25 (6.01) +$	50/242 (20.66)
Hopkins 2000 (84) (USA)	498	-	-	-	~60 (12.05)	0	Pt: S	5	~15 (3.01) +$	21/86 (24.42)
Inan 2012 (86) (Turkey)	404	51.2(0.8)	-	209 (51.7)	42 (10.4)	0	Pt: M	8	~7 (1.73) +$	12/73 (16.44)
Jenkins 2010 (87) (USA)	310	75.5(-)^	48 – 95^	20 (40.8)^	49 (15.81)	0	Pt: S	5	~13 (4.19) +	- (26.00)
Langemo 1990 (89) (USA)	135	-	-	-	19 (14.07)	0	Pt: S	4	~5 (3.70) +$	7/29 (24.14)
Lepisto 2001 (90) (Finland)	~2,563	75.6(16.6)^	1 – 96^	63 (38.4)^	164 (6.40)	0	Pt: M	4	~34 (1.33) +	~54/257 (21.00)
Meehan 1990 (91) (USA)	34,987	-	-	1,263 (39.1)^	3,230 (9.23)	0	Pt: M	6	~627 (1.79) +	1,062/5,467 (19.43)
Meehan 1994 (92) (USA)	31,530	-	-	1,582 (45.4)^	3,487 (11.06)	0	Pt: M	6	~1,257 (3.99) +$	2,180/6,047 (36.05)

Nyquist 1997 (93) (England)	2,513	-	-	31 (23.5)^	132 (5.25)	0	Pt: M	5	~ 33 (1.31) +$	58/233 (24.89)
O'Brien 1998 (94) ## (USA)	959	-	30 – 91^	64 (53.3)^	120 (12.51)	0	Pt: S	5	~ 19 (1.98) +$	33/213 (15.49)
Pearson 2000 (95) (Australia)	634	-	50 – >90^	20 (50.0)^	40 (6.31)	0	Pt: M	6	~16 (2.52) +$	27/69 (39.13)
Soldevilla 2006 (96) (Spain)	5,483	-	1 – 99^	-	452 (8.24)	0	Pt: M	5	~102 (1.86) +$	- (22.62)
Thoroddsen 1999 (97) (Iceland)	642	78.4(16.4)^	30 – 102^	277 (43.1)	57 (8.88)	0	Pt: M	6	23 (3.58) +$	40/100 (40.00)
Uzon 2007 (100) (Turkey)	344	51.7(164)	18 - 88	191 (55.5)	40 (11.63)	0	Pt: S	8	10 (2.9) +$	12/47 (25.53)
Vanderwee 2011 (102) (Belgium)	19,968		19 - >89	8,865 (44.4)	2,419 (12.11)	0	Pt: M	8	~926 (4.64) +	1,184/3.091 (38.30)
VanGilder 2008 (4)^^ (USA)	74,401	64.0(-)	-	34,968 (47.0)	10,857 (14.59)	0	Pt: M	7	~ 3,387 (4.55) +$	- (31.2)
VanGilder 2010 (103)** (USA)	92,397	62.9(19.9)	-	~42,503 (46.0)	11,365 (12.30)	0	Pt: M	7	~2,884 (3.12) +$	5,007/19,730 (25.38)
Whittington 2004 (105) ## (USA)	158,236	-	0 – >95^	11,128 (46.7)^	23,818 (15.05)	0	Pt: M	4	~6,028 (3.81) +	10.905/43,087 (25.31)
Young 2002 (106) ## (Australia)	1,394	64.0(20.0)	15 - 99	665 (47.7)	221 (15.85)	1	Pt: S	8	~80 (5.74) +$	114/316 (36.08)
Zhao 2010 (107) (China)	2,913	43.9(21.2)	1 - 94	1,648 (56.6)	52 (1.79)	1	Pt: S	7	~9 (0.31) +$	13/79 (16.46)

n = numbers; SD = Standard Deviation; % = Prevalence; PU = Pressure Ulcer; FPU = Foot-related Pressure Ulcer.
# = No studies reported on foot infections, collective foot disease, peripheral arterial disease, peripheral neuropathy or foot deformity; - = Not reported; ~ = Determined from the calculation of different reported results; ^ Cases only; * = Numbers of wounds rather than patients with wounds; ** Most recent year used only as time periods reported separately; ^^ = Hospital results only; ## = Aggregated data from a number of years data; $ = Foot sites reported include heel + another site (e.g. ankle, toes);
+ = Determined from formula = (FPU numbers / PU numbers) x total PU patients / sample numbers.
Study Aim: 1 = Investigating a foot disease disorder or risk factor is a primary aim of study, 0 = Investigating a foot disease disorder or risk factor is not a primary aim of study; Study Design: Pt = Point prevalence, Per = Period prevalence; M = Multi-site, S = Single Site; Study Quality: Total agreed study quality score from the methodological assessment performed in Table 2 (total possible score is 10).

Table S7: Original methodological quality assessment results from the two blinded authors for all included studies*

Author	Year	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3		Question 4		Question 5		Question 6		Question 7		Question 8		Question 9		Question 10		Total Scores	
		MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL	MF	PL
All-cause																							
Antonopoulos (32)	2005	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	6
Currie (24)	1998	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	5
Donnan (33)	2000	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	5
Gottrup (34)	2013	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Gruen (35)	1997	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	6
Henke (36)	2005	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	4
Lacroix (37)	2008	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	8
Morgan (38)	2010	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	5
Diabetes-related																							
Ajayi (39)	2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3
Asumanu (40)	2010	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	5
Chijioke (41)	2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3
Daultry (42)	2011	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Hurd (43)	2009	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Leichter (44)	1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Mahe (45)	2006	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	6
Masson (46)	1992	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4
Mohammad Akther (47)	2011	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	6	5
Mottini (48)	2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Nason (49)	2006	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Ogbera (50)	2006	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4
Ogbera (51)	2007	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4
Otu (52)	2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	5	4
Sjoberg (53)	2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3

Tait (54)	2007	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Unachukwu (55)	2007	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	5
Wallymahmed (56)	2005	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Williams (57)	1985	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Pressure Ulcer-related																					
Alja'afreh (58)	2013	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Allcock (59)	1994	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Amlung (60)	2001	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Barczak (61)	1997	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	6
Barrois (62)	1995	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	5
Barrois (63)	2008	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	7
Bours (64)	1999	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	7
Bours (65)	2002	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	7
Brito (66)	2013	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	6
Charlier (67)	2001	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	5
Clark (68)	1992	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5
Cole (69)	2004	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
da Silva Cardoso (70)	2010	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Dealey (71)	1991	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Dealey (72)	1994	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
Ek (73)	1982	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Gallagher (74)	2008	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	8
Galvan-Martinez (75)	2012	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7
Gawron (76)	1994	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	8
Gethin (77)	2005	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	7
Gosnell (78)	1992	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	7	7
Groeneveld (79)	2004	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	8
Gunningberg (80)	2005	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	8
Gunningberg (81)	2006	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	8

Gunningberg (82)	2008	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	8
Gunningberg (83)	2013	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	6
Hopkins (84)	2000	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
House (85)	2011	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3
Inan (86)	2012	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	8
Jenkins (87)	2010	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Lahmann (88)	2006	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	7
Langemo (89)	1990	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4
Lepisto (90)	2001	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
Meehan (91)	1990	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	6
Meehan (92)	1994	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	6
Nyquist (93)	1987	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
O'Brien (94)	1998	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	5
Pearson (95)	2000	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Soldevilla (96)	2006	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Thoroddsen (97)	1999	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	6
Tubaishat (98)	2011	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	8
Tubaishat (99)	2013	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	7
Uzun (100)	2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	8
Vanderwee (101)	2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	7
Vanderwee (102)	2011	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	8
Vangilder (4)	2008	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	7
Vangilder (103)	2010	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	7
Wann-Hansson (104)	2008	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	8
Whittington (105)	2004	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5
Young (106)	2002	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	8
Zhao (107)	2010	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	7
Total Agreements (n)		70		77		69		77		67		70		68		75		74		73		720	
Total Agreements (%)		90%		99%		88%		99%		86%		90%		87%		96%		95%		94%		92%	
Kappa(Standard Error)		0.69(0.10)		0.96(0.04)		0.76(0.08)		0.93(0.07)		0.70(0.08)		0.70(0.10)		0.75(0.07)		--		0.87(0.07)		0.87(0.06)			

Strength of agreement	Substantial	Near Perfect	Substantial	Near Perfect	Substantial	Substantial	Substantial	--	Near Perfect	Near Perfect	

* = Please see Table S3 for descriptions of each question; Score: 1 = “yes”, 0 = “no” or “not reported”; MF = Independent assessor MEF 1; PL = Independent assessor PAL