

Supplementary Material – 2

COSMIN Study Design and Risk of Bias (RoB) evaluation tables are presented below.

Name of the scale	Source	Measurement properties	Content validity	Structural validity	Internal consistency	Measurement invariance	Measurement error and reliability	Criterion validity	Hypotheses testing for construct validity	Responsiveness	Translation process	Overall Quality Rating
Environmental Worry Scale	Bowler & Schwarzer, 1991	30/30	5/27	0/12	3/12	NA	0/24	NA	32/36	52/54	NA	Doubtful
Environmental Distress Scale	Higginbotham et al., 2007	30/30	10/27	8/12	10/12	NA	22/24	NA	15/15	24/24	NA	Adequate
Climate Change Distress Scale	Searle & Gow, 2010	27/30	3/27	10/12	12/12	NA	0/24	NA	21/21	30/30	NA	Adequate
Climate Change Anxiety Scale (CCAS)	Clayton & Karazsia, 2022	28/30	0/27	9/12	10/12	NA	0/24	NA	14/21	17/30	NA	Adequate
Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS)	Hogg et al, 2021	30/30	10/27	10/12	10/12	NA	22/24	NA	19/21	22/24	NA	Good
Eco-Anxiety, Eco-Guilt, and Ecological Grief Questionnaires*	Ágoston et al., 2022	28/30	23/27	10/12	10/12	NA	0/24	NA	21/21	30/30	NA	Adequate
Climate Change Worry Scale	Stewart, 2021	27/30	0/27	7/12	10/12	NA	18/24	NA	19/21	30/30	NA	Adequate
Scale of Solastalgia	Cáceres et al., 2022	30/30	15/27	10/12	10/12	NA	0/24	13/15	34/36	69/78	NA	Adequate

Validation of CCAS	Innocenti et al., 2021	28/30	NA	10/12	10/12	15/15	22/24	NA	19/21	28/30	26/36	Good
Validation of CCAS	Wullenkord et al., 2021	30/30	NA	9/12	6/9	3/12	0/24	NA	18/18	27/27	26/36	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Cruz et al., 2022	28/30	5/27	10/12	10/12	NA	0/24	NA	19/21	28/30	NA	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Larionow, 2021	26/30	NA	10/12	10/12	10/18	0/24	NA	19/21	28/30	30/36	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Mouguiama-Daouda et al., 2022	30/30	NA	10/12	10/12	9/12	0/24	NA	19/21	28/30	31/36	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Simon et al., 2022	27/30	NA	10/12	10/12	9/18	0/24	NA	13/15	13/15	NA	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Jang et al., 2023	27/30	NA	10/12	10/12	6/15	22/24	NA	19/21	30/30	30/36	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Tam et al., 2023	30/30	NA	10/12	9/12	16/18	0/24	NA	21/21	30/30	14/36	Adequate
Validation of CCAS	Wu et al., 2023	30/30	13/27	10/12	10/12	NA	0/24	NA	19/21	28/30	NA	Adequate
Validation of HEAS	Uzun et al., 2022	27/30	NA	10/12	10/12	0/18	0/24	NA	0/21	0/30	27/36	Doubtful
Validation of HEAS	Pavani et al., 2023	30/30	NA	8/12	10/12	0/18	0/24	NA	19/21	28/30	11/36	Adequate
Validation of CCAS and HEAS	Hogg et al., 2023	29/30	NA	10/12	7/12	16/18	0/24	NA	32/36	50/54	NA	Adequate

Note. This table shows the results of COSMIN Study Design checklist for Patient-Reported Outcome Measurement (PROM) instruments filled out for each instrument included in the review. The first seven rows present the assessment of scale development studies. Measurement properties evaluated in the second column include the research aim, and clear descriptions of the constructs, structure of the PROM, existing evidence of the PROM, the context of use, and the target population.

* These three questionnaires were assessed simultaneously as they were tested in the same sample by following the same methodology.

Name of the scale	Source	PROM development	Content validity	Structural validity	Internal consistency	Measurement invariance	Reliability	Measurement error	Criterion validity	Construct validity	Responsiveness	Overall Risk of Bias Rating
Environmental Worry Scale	Bowler & Schwarzer, 1991	17/105	0/93	0/9	3/9	NA	3/15	NA	NA	21/21	21/21	High
Environmental Distress Scale	Higginbotham et al., 2007	24/105	0/93	8/9	9/9	NA	15/15	NA	NA	9/9	9/9	Moderate
Climate Change Distress Scale	Searle & Gow, 2010	15/105	0/93	8/9	9/9	NA	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Climate Change Anxiety Scale (CCAS)	Clayton & Karazsia, 2022	17/105	0/93	9/9	9/9	NA	0/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS)	Hogg et al, 2021	21/105	12/93	7/9	9/9	NA	15/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Eco-Anxiety, Eco-Guilt, and Ecological Grief Questionnaires*	Ágoston et al., 2022	36/105	17/93	9/9	9/9	NA	4/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Climate Change Worry Scale	Stewart, 2021	15/105	0/93	8/9	9/9	NA	9/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate

Scale of Solastalgia	Cáceres et al., 2022	18/105	0/93	8/9	9/9	NA	0/15	NA	6/6	9/9	9/9	Moderate
Validation of CCAS	Innocenti et al., 2021	15/15	NA	9/9	9/9	12/12	15/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Low
Validation of CCAS	Wullenkord et al., 2021	15/15	NA	9/9	9/9	1/12	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Validation of CCAS	Cruz et al., 2022	14/15	NA	9/9	9/9	NA	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Low
Validation of CCAS	Larionow, 2021	13/15	NA	9/9	9/9	3/12	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Validation of CCAS	Mouguia ma-Daouda et al., 2022	15/15	NA	9/9	9/9	3/12	0/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Validation of CCAS	Simon et al., 2022	12 of 15	NA	9/9	9/9	3/12	3/15	NA	NA	6/6	6/6	Moderate
Validation of CCAS	Jang et al., 2023	12 of 15	NA	9/9	9/9	3/12	15/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Low
Validation of CCAS	Tam et al., 2023	15/15	NA	9/9	9/9	12/12	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Low
Validation of CCAS	Wu et al., 2023	15/15	NA	9/9	9/9	NA	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Low
Validation of HEAS	Uzun et al., 2022	12 of 15	NA	9/9	9/9	3/12	4/15	NA	NA	1 of 12	1/12	High
Validation of HEAS	Pavani et al., 2023	15/15	NA	9/9	9/9	1/12	3/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Moderate
Validation of CCAS and HEAS	Hogg et al., 2023	14/15	NA	9/9	6 of 9	NA	6/15	NA	NA	12/12	12/12	Low

Note. This table shows the results of COSMIN Risk of Bias (RoB) Checklist for Patient-Reported Outcome Measurement (PROM) instruments filled out for each instrument included in the review.