

Main Trends in Research on the Solution-Focused Approach in 2023: A Scoping Review, (Pakrosnis & Žak, 2024)

Journal of Solution Focused Practices 8(2), 2024

Table S1. Summary of selected characteristics of the reviewed articles published in 2023

Author(s)	Publication characteristics	Sample characteristics	Methodology	Intervention characteristics	Main findings
Abdulla	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: International Setting: Coaching Characteristics: General population N = 130 Age group: Adults % female: 66 % SF dropout: 21 % Control dropout: 22</p>	<p>Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (binary questions)</p>	<p>Format: Computerized questioning Nr. of sessions: 1 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Identical questioning form for all Core elements: 1</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable. Process: Similar scaling vs. binary questions on goal attainment expectancy and commitment; gender not a moderator. Goal attainment expectancy and commitment seem not to be enhanced (much) by asking a single scaling question. When people are rating current success on a scale, the higher their scores the higher their expectations of further success.</p>
Abdulla	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 1.03 h5 = 21</p>	<p>Country: International Setting: Coaching Characteristics: General population N = 574 Age group: Adults % female: 70 % SF dropout: 18 % Control dropout: 19</p>	<p>Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Active (problem-focused coaching; GROW coaching)</p>	<p>Format: Computerized self-help Nr. of sessions: 1 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Identical computerized protocol for all Core elements: 2</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on problem-solving expectancy Between-group: +* on hope and problem-solving expectancy (when openness-to-experience high), but -* on goal clarity (when openness-to-experience low) vs elements of problem-focused coaching and GROW coaching. All three ∅ on positive-negative affect. Process: Superiority of MQ as computerized self-help over GROW and Problem-focused coaching might be not as great as claimed theoretically.</p>
Abdulla & Woods	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 3 SJR = 1.18</p>	<p>Country: UK Setting: Educational Characteristics: School students</p>	<p>Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental</p>	<p>Format: Computerized questioning Nr. of sessions: 1 Modality: Pure</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: Single success scaling q. and success scaling with follow-up SF q. ∅</p>

	h5 = 34	N = 235 Age group: Adolescents % female: 100 % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0	Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (problem focused questions)	Fidelity: Identical questioning form/protocol for all Core elements: 1	on improvement expectancy and commitment to improvement vs. binary success q. and problem-focused q. Success scaling techniques may not be as effective as is widely supposed. Brevity and simplicity, if taken too far, may not have the desired effect
Adzovie	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Ghana Setting: NA Characteristics: N = 30 Age group: Adults % female: 50 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: NA	Format: Couples' counseling Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: NA Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA	Within-group: +* on marital satisfaction Between-group: NA Process: Not applicable
Afshar Shandiz et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 60 Age group: Adults % female: 76 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Mixed (no treatment; mindfulness-based CBT)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: Pure (with educational elements) Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 4	Within-group: SF and Mindfulness-based CBT +* on quality of life vs no intervention control Between-group: SF and Mindfulness-based CBT +* on QOL vs no intervention control; SF ∅ on QOL vs Mindfulness-based CBT Process: Not applicable
Aisyah et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 10	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 16 Age group: Adolescents % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure (with educational elements) Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 4	Within-group: +* on career maturity Between-group: +* on career maturity vs no treatment control Process: Not applicable
Akbarinejad & Alamdari	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 45	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure (with educational elements)	Within-group: SF and Mindfulness-based CBT +* on quality of life and resilience vs no intervention control Between-group: SF and Mindfulness-

Akgul-Gundogdu & Selcuk-Tosun	h5 = NI Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.4 SJR = 0.68 h5 = 47	Age group: Adolescents % female: 100 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR Country: Turkey Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 128 Age group: Adolescents % female: 37 % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0	Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Mixed (no treatment; mindfulness-based CBT) Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Passive (waitlist)	Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 4 Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure Fidelity: NR Core elements: 6	based CBT +* on QOL and resilience vs no intervention control; SF \emptyset on QOL and resilience vs Mindfulness-based CBT Process: Not applicable Within-group: +* on internet addiction, nutrition-exercise attitude and behavior Between-group: +* on internet addiction, nutrition-exercise attitude and behavior vs waiting list control Process: Not applicable
Alsarhan & Ghaith	Language: Arabic Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Jordan Setting: Social care Characteristics: N = 14 Age group: Adolescents % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 11 Modality: NA Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA	Within-group: NR Between-group: +* on quality of relationship with siblings, behavior problems vs no-intervention control Process: Not applicable
Asadi Hasanvand et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 9	Country: Iran Setting: Counseling service Characteristics: N = 36 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Mixed (no treatment; integrated transdiagnostic intervention)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: NR Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	Within-group: + on suicidal thoughts intensity Between-group: +* on suicidal thoughts intensity vs no treatment control; \emptyset at post-test, but -* at 1-month follow-up on suicidal thoughts intensity vs transdiagnostic intervention. Process: Not applicable
Asqhari et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 30 Age group:	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Positive-	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Modified SF Fidelity: Protocol for each session	Within-group: NA Between-group: +* on coping styles and mental vitality vs waiting list control Process: Not applicable

Beauchemin et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1 SJR = 0.47 h5 = 19	Adolescents % female: 100 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR Country: USA Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 133 Age group: Adults % female: 74 % SF dropout: 25 % Control dropout: Not applicable	focused Control group: Passive (waitist) Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Mixed methods Design: Single-group Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Not applicable	Core elements: 5 Format: Computerized self-help Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Pure(with educational elements) Fidelity: Identical computerized protocol for all Core elements: 2	Within-group: +* at post-test and at 6 weeks follow-up on perceived wellness, satisfaction with life, and perceived stress, but Ø from post-test to follow-up (indicating that the intervention had a positive, lasting impact). +* at post-test on perceived happiness, but -* from post-test to follow-up (indicating a return to baseline after six weeks). Qualitative data revealed that participants found the intervention accessible, and convenient. Participation increased self-awareness and intentionality. Between-group: Not applicable Process: Significant correlations between setting realistic goals, confidence in goal completion, goal completion, typical completion of goals and wellness, life satisfaction, happiness, and stress. Within-group: NR Between-group: +* at 6 months, but Ø at 12 months on QOL, medical adherence vs TAU. Ø at 6 and 12 months on symptom severity, social function, internalized stigma vs TAU Process: Not applicable
Birabwa-Oketcho et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 10	Country: Uganda, Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 168 Age group: Adults % female: 54 % SF dropout: 8% at 6 months and 17% at 12 months % Control dropout: 8% at 6 months and 21% at 12 months	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Modified SF Fidelity: Audio recordings and adherence scale Core elements: 4	Within-group: NR Between-group: +* at 6 months, but Ø at 12 months on QOL, medical adherence vs TAU. Ø at 6 and 12 months on symptom severity, social function, internalized stigma vs TAU Process: Not applicable

Bokaie et al.	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 0.76 h5 = 58</p>	<p>Country: Iran Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 80 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: 8% % Control dropout: 8%</p>	<p>Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (placebo)</p>	<p>Format: Online group sessions Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 6</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on sexual QOL at post-test and at 1-month follow-up Between-group: +* on sexual QOL vs active control at post-test and 1-month follow-up Process: Not applicable</p>
Bokaie et al.	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 0.7 SJR = 0.14 h5 = 14</p>	<p>Country: Iran Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 72 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: 14 % Control dropout: 0</p>	<p>Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (placebo)</p>	<p>Format: Online group sessions Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on overall marital intimacy and all 9 dimensions for participants and their spouses Between-group: +* on overall marital intimacy and some of its dimensions (emotional, psychological, rational, physical, aesthetic) vs Active control, but Ø on sexual, spiritual, recreational/societal, temporal dimensions for participants at post-test and 4 weeks follow-up. +* on overall marital intimacy and all 9 dimensions vs. Active control for participants' spouses at post-test and 4-week follow-up. Process: Not applicable</p>
Chen et al.	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 9.5 SJR = 1.33 h5 = 75</p>	<p>Country: China Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 76 Age group: Adolescents % female: 78 % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 5</p>	<p>Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Passive (waitlist)</p>	<p>Format: Individual (online) Nr. of sessions: 3,29 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Training, integrity checklist, and protocol for each session Core elements: 6</p>	<p>Within-group: NR Between-group: +* at post-test and 1-month follow-up on anxiety state and trait, depression, problem-oriented coping vs Passive control. Ø at post-test and 1-month follow-up on emotion-oriented coping, parents' evaluation of anxiety and depression. High subjective satisfaction with the intervention and progress. Process: Not applicable</p>
Choi	<p>Language: Korean Journal's metrics:</p>	<p>Country: Korea Setting: NA</p>	<p>Type: Process Methodology: Qualitative</p>	<p>Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NA</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable</p>

IF = NI
SJR = NI
h5 = NI

Characteristics:
N = 2
Age group: NA
% female: NA
% SF dropout: Not applicable
% Control dropout: Not applicable

Design: Case analysis
Measurement: NA
Control group: Not applicable

Modality: NA
Fidelity: NA
Core elements: NA

Process: Feedback was the product of a rather dynamic interactive process than mechanical or linear. Despite the serious problems of the clients, the counselors were able to initiate 'solution talk' by themselves, paying attention to clients' resources and changes. Findings empirically support claims that feedback in SFBT is future-oriented and focused on the expansion of solutions rather than past-oriented and focused on problem elimination.

Dabo et al.

Language: English
Journal's metrics:
IF = NI
SJR = NI
h5 = NI

Country: Nigeria
Setting: Educational
Characteristics:
N = 60
Age group: Adolescents
% female: NR
% SF dropout: NR
% Control dropout: NR

Type: Outcome
Methodology: Quantitative
Design: Experiment
Measurement: Problem-focused
Control group: Active (conventional counseling)

Format: Individual
Nr. of sessions: NR
Modality: NR
Fidelity: NR
Core elements: NR

Within-group: NR
Between-group: +* on emotional problems and self-esteem problems vs Active control
Process: Not applicable

Dalimunthe et al.

Language: English
Journal's metrics:
IF = NI
SJR = NI
h5 = 12

Country: Indonesia
Setting: Educational
Characteristics:
N = 30
Age group: Adolescents
% female: NR
% SF dropout: NR
% Control dropout: NR

Type: Outcome
Methodology: Quantitative
Design: Single-group
Measurement: Problem-focused
Control group: Not applicable

Format: Group
Nr. of sessions: 6
Modality: NR
Fidelity: NR
Core elements: NR

Within-group: +* on cyber bullying
Between-group: Not applicable
Process: Not applicable

Deng & Yang	Language: Chinese Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 0.15 h5 = NI	Country: China Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: children with nephrotic syndrome N = 96 Age group: Children % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: NA Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: NA Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA	Within-group: NA Between-group: +* on all aspects of self-management and coping style Process: Not applicable
Desouki & Mohamed	Language: Arabic Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 6	Country: Egypt Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 10 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 3 Modality: Pure Fidelity: NR Core elements: 6	Within-group: +* on fear of missing out and death anxiety Between-group: NA Process: Not applicable
Duan et al.	Language: Chinese Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 13	Country: China Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 84 Age group: Adults % female: 45 % SF dropout: 19 % Control dropout: 24	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure with medication Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 6	Within-group: +* on depression symptoms and cognitive flexibility Between-group: +* on depression symptoms and cognitive flexibility vs TAU (medication) Process: Not applicable
Eads	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 0.9 SJR = 0.45 h5 = 18	Country: USA Setting: NA Characteristics: N = NA Age group: Adolescents % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Mixed methods Design: Single-group Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Not applicable	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: NA Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA	Within-group: +* on overall problems and intervention acceptability evaluation Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable

Ebrahimi Sadr et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 45 Age group: Adults % female: 0 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: mixed (no intervention and mindfulness-based CBT)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Modified SF Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 2	Within-group: +* at post-test and follow-up on pain anxiety and quality of life Between-group: +* at post-test and follow-up on pain anxiety and quality of life vs no treatment, but ∅ vs Mindfulness-based CBT. Process: Not applicable
Ebrahimi et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 18	Country: Iran Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 30 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 6	Within-group: +* at post-test and follow-up (2 months) on social adjustment and depression Between-group: +* at post-test and follow-up (2 months) on social adjustment and depression vs No intervention control Process: Not applicable
Eenshuistra et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 0.7 SJR = 0.35 h5 = 15	Country: Netherlands Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 21 Age group: Mixed (adolescents and adults) % female: 44 % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable	Type: Process Methodology: Mixed methods Design: Thematic analysis Measurement: Process-focused (semi-structured interview) Control group: Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Combined with Motivational Interviewing Fidelity: Training, program manual, program workshop Core elements: 2	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: Residential care workers' experience with the MI+SF elements program: identified positive (e.g., getting to know the client, ideas for actions, making a change plan, balance, testing questions, open questions) and also negative elements (e.g., not being suited for not-collaborative adolescents or in compulsory care and difficulties in using the silence). A similar percentage (42%) identified only positive or only negative aspects. On average from 1(the worst) to 10 (the best) it scored 7.3 (.63) [7-9]. Adolescents experience with the program: positive (felt listened, pleasant atmosphere, good

Ekwelundu et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 5</p>	<p>Country: Nigeria</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: doctoral students with high academic stress N = 25</p> <p>Age group: Adults % female: 60 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experimental</p> <p>Measurement: Problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Active (TAU)</p>	<p>Format: NR</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 8</p> <p>Modality: NR</p> <p>Fidelity: NR</p> <p>Core elements: NR</p>	<p>questions, probing questions, being able to finish talking, no silence in the session), and negative (not linking the topic, not liking to talk, unclear aim, too long sessions)</p> <p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* on academic stress only in the SFBT group; gains maintained at 1-month follow-up.</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Erbas	<p>Language: Turkish</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 12</p>	<p>Country: Turkey</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: N = 24</p> <p>Age group: Adolescents % female: 63 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Mixed methods</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 5</p> <p>Modality: Pure</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol for each session</p> <p>Core elements: 5</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on wellness, competence and relatedness, but ∅ on autonomy. Qualitative: personal growth (responsibility, self-efficacy, happiness and positive thinking) and social relationships development (closeness, commitment and understanding) supported.</p> <p>Between-group: +* on wellness, competence and relatedness, but ∅ on autonomy vs No intervention control</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Feng et al.	<p>Language: Chinese</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 4</p>	<p>Country: China</p> <p>Setting: Medical/Health care</p> <p>Characteristics: N = 80</p> <p>Age group: Adolescents % female: NA % SF dropout: 7 % Control dropout: 5</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Quasi-experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Active (TAU)</p>	<p>Format: NA</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: NA</p> <p>Modality: NA</p> <p>Fidelity: NA</p> <p>Core elements: NA</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on anxiety, depression, QOL.</p> <p>Between-group: +* on anxiety, depression, QOL vs TAU control</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Fife et al.	<p>Language: English</p>	<p>Country: International</p>	<p>Type: Process</p>	<p>Format: Couple/Family</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable</p>

	<p>Journal's metrics: IF = 1.3 SJR = 0.44 h5 = 23</p>	<p>Setting: Counseling services Characteristics: N = NR Age group: NR % female: NR % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Methodology: Qualitative Design: Grounded theory Measurement: Not applicable Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Nr. of sessions: Not applicable Modality: Pure Fidelity: Not applicable Core elements: Not applicable</p>	<p>Between-group: Not applicable Process: Results include support for the current CFT common factors meta-theory, disconfirming evidence, and refinements to the meta-theory. Specifically, the results support the expanded therapeutic alliance, incorporate valuing clients' perspectives as an integral part of developing and maintaining the alliance, broaden relational conceptualization to include reframing difficulties in relational terms, and suggest facilitating constructive interactions as a refinement to disrupting dysfunctional interactions. Within-group: +* on student engagement Between-group: +* on student engagement, but ∅ on instructional strategies/classroom management and overall efficacy score vs No intervention control Process: Not applicable</p>
Garvey & Burke	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: UK and Ireland Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 62 Age group: Adults % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA</p>	<p>Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 2 Modality: NA Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: After reading solution-focused vignettes +* on positive and negative affect and positive expectations for treatment vs Reading problem-focused vignettes. Focusing on clients' goals, their strengths, and actively highlighting better moments and areas of problem-free functioning may increase therapists' in training positive emotions and their hope for clients' successful treatment.</p>
Geschwind & Dunn	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1.8 SJR = 0.73 h5 = 26</p>	<p>Country: Netherlands and UK Setting: Educational (University) Characteristics: N = 62 Age group: Adults % female: 94 % SF dropout: 8 % Control dropout: 19</p>	<p>Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Active (problem-focused case description vignettes)</p>	<p>Format: Survey Nr. of sessions: Not applicable Modality: Not applicable Fidelity: Not applicable Core elements: Not applicable</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: After reading solution-focused vignettes +* on positive and negative affect and positive expectations for treatment vs Reading problem-focused vignettes. Focusing on clients' goals, their strengths, and actively highlighting better moments and areas of problem-free functioning may increase therapists' in training positive emotions and their hope for clients' successful treatment.</p>

Gomez- Restrepo et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.2 SJR = 0.64 h5 = 36	Country: Colombia Setting: Educational Characteristics: N = 70 Age group: Adolescents % female: 56 % SF dropout: 6 % Control dropout: 1	Type: Outcome Methodology: Mixed methods Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Modified SF Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 3	Within-group: +* on quality of life and resilience. + on depression and anxiety symptoms, mental health problems. Ø on self-esteem, PTSD symptoms, and family functioning. Qualitative: the intervention was perceived as innovative and appealed to both adolescents and teachers. Between-group: +* (on mental health problems), Ø (on quality of life, resilience, self-esteem, PTSD symptoms, depression and anxiety symptoms, family functioning) vs TAU control. Process: Thematic analysis yielded 3 main themes: reflections on the DIALOG+ application and the use of technology, perceptions of the role of the student-teacher relationship in the implementation of the intervention, and perceived effects on the mental health and behavior of the participating students.
He et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 1.04 h5 = 45	Country: Australia Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 106 Age group: Adults % female: 64 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: Not applicable	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Single-group Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR (1-6) Modality: Pure Fidelity: Training Core elements: NR	Within-group: +* on suicide ideation, ED presentations, negative emotional states (depression, anxiety, and stress), functioning and well-being, but Ø on the frequency of inpatient admissions following clinic interventions. Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
Hertisyahrani	Language: Indonesian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: Counseling service Characteristics: N = 2	Type: Outcome Methodology: Mixed methods Design: Case-study Measurement: Mixed	Format: Couple/Family Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Modified SF Fidelity: Protocol for each session	Within-group: + on SF scale and couple communication satisfaction and more positive communication patterns observed Between-group: Not applicable

	h5 = 7	Age group: Adults % female: 50 % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable	positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Not applicable	Core elements: 4	Process: Not applicable
Hu et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 5.5 SJR = 1.49 h5 = 77	Country: China Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 75 Age group: Adults % female: 37 % SF dropout: 3 % Control dropout: 8	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 5 Modality: Modified SF nursing intervention Fidelity: Training, protocol for each session Core elements: 6	Within-group: +* on anxiety, depression and QOL at post-test and 1, 3, 6 months follow-up Between-group: +* on anxiety, depression, QOL vs TAU at post-test, 1, 3, 6 months follow-up Process: Not applicable
Jahara & Daulay	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 12	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational (School) Characteristics: N = 12 Age group: Adolescents % female: NR % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (not specific group counseling)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: NR Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	Within-group: +* on self-confidence Between-group: + on self-confidence Process: Not applicable
Ji & Zhang	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1.4 SJR = 0.36 h5 = 37	Country: China Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: N = 105 Age group: Children % female: 47 % SF dropout: 13 % Control dropout: 12	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Modified (based on empowerment theory) Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 3	Within-group: +* on loneliness, self-efficacy, subjective well-being Between-group: +* on loneliness, self-efficacy, subjective well-being vs No intervention control Process: Not applicable
Kamali Shervedani & Naghavi	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Counseling services Characteristics:	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: NA Fidelity: NA	Within-group: +* on wisdom and resilience Between-group: +* on wisdom and resilience vs No treatment control

	h5 = 18	N = 32 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Core elements: NA	Process: Not applicable
Karami et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 0.23 h5 = 12	Country: Iran Setting: Counseling services Characteristics: N = 45 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Mixed (no treatment and mindfulness-based stress reduction)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Solution-focused narrative therapy with educational elements Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 2	Within-group: +* on expressed emotions Between-group: Both interventions +* on expressed emotions vs No intervention control. Solution-focused narrative therapy +* on expressed emotions vs Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction Process: Not applicable
Karami et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Counseling services Characteristics: N = 45 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Mixed (no treatment and mindfulness-based stress reduction)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: combined with narrative therapy and education elements Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 2	Within-group: +* on sleep quality Between-group: Both interventions +* on sleep quality vs No intervention control. Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction +* on sleep quality vs Solution-focused narrative therapy Process: Not applicable
Kazemi et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Counseling services Characteristics: N = 30 Age group: Adults % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: Modified SF Fidelity: Protocol for each session Core elements: 4	Within-group: +* on spiritual vitality and marital adjustment at post-test and follow-up Between-group: +* on spiritual vitality and marital adjustment vs No treatment control at post-test and follow-up Process: Not applicable
Kitai et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI	Country: Japan Setting: Mixed (Educational and Workplace related)	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment	Format: Computerized worksheets Nr. of sessions: 1 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on negative affect and self-efficacy, but \emptyset on positive affect and understanding of the problem.

Langari et al.	<p>h5 = NI</p> <p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 9</p>	<p>Characteristics: N = 156 Age group: Adults % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p> <p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Counseling service</p> <p>Characteristics: N = 48 Age group: Adults % female: 50 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Active (problem-focused questions)</p> <p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Mixed (no treatment and schema therapy)</p>	<p>Fidelity: Similar questions to everyone</p> <p>Core elements: 1</p> <p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 7</p> <p>Modality: Modified SF</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol for each session</p> <p>Core elements: 4</p>	<p>Between-group: ∅ on positive-negative affect, self-efficacy and understanding of the problem vs Problem-focused questions.</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p> <p>Within-group: +* on marital satisfaction at post-test and 2 months follow-up</p> <p>Between-group: Both interventions +* on marital satisfaction vs No intervention control, but SF ∅ on marital satisfaction vs Schema therapy at post-test and 2 months follow-up</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Li et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 4</p>	<p>Country: China</p> <p>Setting: Medical/Health care</p> <p>Characteristics: N = 10 Age group: Adults % female: 40 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Single-group</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Individual</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: NR</p> <p>Modality: Modified SF</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol for each session</p> <p>Core elements: 3</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on knowledge mastery, attitude towards prevention and treatment, personal behavior, and self-care ability. Satisfaction rate - 80%. Complication rate - 10%.</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Li et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = 1.7 SJR = 0.66 h5 = 32</p>	<p>Country: China</p> <p>Setting: Social care</p> <p>Characteristics: vulnerable children N = 39 Age group: Children % female: 44 % SF dropout: 5 % Control dropout: 0</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: RCT</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Active (TAU)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: Combined with CBT</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol and fidelity questionnaire</p> <p>Core elements: 5</p>	<p>Within-group: NA</p> <p>Between-group: +* on self-esteem and anxiety related to severe events. Only gains in anxiety were maintained at 1-month follow-up.</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Lin et al.	<p>Language: Chinese</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI</p>	<p>Country: China</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: high school students</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Mixed</p> <p>Design: Quasi-experiment & Semi-structures</p>	<p>Format: NR</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: Modified</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol for each</p>	<p>Within-group: +* overall problem-solving attitudes, gains maintained at 1-month follow-up with low scores on problem-solving attitudes. +* self-</p>

	SJR = NI h5 = NI	N = 8 Age group: Adolescents % female: 25 % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0	interviews Measurement: Positive- focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	session Core elements: 6	confidence orientation and + escape orientation with * improvement at 1- month follow-up Between-group: ∅ on overall problem-solving attitudes; -* confidence orientation +* escape orientation Process: Not applicable Within-group: + on self-resilience Between-group: +* on selfresilience Process: Not applicable
Listiawati et al.	Language: Indonesian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational Characteristics: boarding school students with low self- resilience N = 10 Age group: NR % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive- focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: NR Nr. of sessions: 5 Modality: NR Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	
Ma et al.	Language: Chinese Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: China Setting: Medical/health care Characteristics: hepatitis C patients N = 100 Age group: NA % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Positive- focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: Modified to nursing intervention Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA	Within-group: NA Between-group: +* on quality of life ; + on treatment compliance (98% vs 86%), + on nursing satisfaction (100% vs 92%) Process: Not applicable
Manubens et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 3 SJR = 1.13 h5 = 47	Country: Argentina Setting: Medical/health care Characteristics: adults diagnosed with emotional disorders N = 96 Age group: Adults % female: 61.5	Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Single-group Measurement: Mixed Control group: Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 4 Modality: NR Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: high treatment alliance associated with low symptom severity both within a session and across treatment. Positive variation in treatment alliance predicts clinical change.

Maykam et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>% SF dropout: 22.92</p> <p>% Control dropout: Not applicable</p> <p>Country: Indonesia</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: students with low or very low social awareness</p> <p>N = 10</p> <p>Age group: Adolescents</p> <p>% female: NR</p> <p>% SF dropout: NR</p> <p>% Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Single-group</p> <p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 3</p> <p>Modality: NR</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 1</p>	<p>Within-group: + social awareness</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Mirarab Razi et al.	<p>Language: Persian</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: NR</p> <p>Characteristics: wives of addicted partners</p> <p>N = NA</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: 100</p> <p>% SF dropout: NA</p> <p>% Control dropout: NA</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Quasi-experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Mixed (waitlist and acceptance and commitment therapy)</p>	<p>Format: NA</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 8</p> <p>Modality: NA</p> <p>Fidelity: NA</p> <p>Core elements: NA</p>	<p>Within-group: NA</p> <p>Between-group: +* sexual intimacy and marital instability vs waitlist, Ø vs acceptance and commitment therapy</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Miś	<p>Language: Polish</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 6</p>	<p>Country: Poland</p> <p>Setting: Social care</p> <p>Characteristics: Social workers and students in social work</p> <p>N = NR</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: NR</p> <p>% SF dropout: Not applicable</p> <p>% Control dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Type: Process</p> <p>Methodology: Qualitative</p> <p>Design: Thematic analysis</p> <p>Measurement: Survey on experience</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Not applicable</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: Not applicable</p> <p>Modality: Not applicable</p> <p>Fidelity: Not applicable</p> <p>Core elements: Not applicable</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p> <p>Process: Social workers perceived exceptions, scaling questions and the increase in self-confidence as useful elements of SFBT. Students in social work perceived weaknesses in omitting the past, time consumption, and miracle question. Issues in learning SFBT: ignoring clients' resources, avoiding controversial and conflicting topics, and not including clients' view as a basis for change.</p>

Mulawarman et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 0.17 h5 = NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: Counseling service Characteristics: counselors working with teenagers N = 9 Age group: Adults % female: NR % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable	Type: Process Methodology: Qualitative Design: Thematic analysis Measurement: Semi-structured interview Control group: Not applicable	Format: Not applicable Nr. of sessions: Not applicable Modality: Not applicable Fidelity: Not applicable Core elements: Not applicable	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: Themes from counselors' view on the process of working online with adolescents on SF single-session: Creating a counseling relationship, Fundamental communication skills and Time management.
Naderipour et al.	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Medica/Health care Characteristics: females with multiple sclerosis N = 30 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Protocol Core elements: 4	Within-group: +* on pain management and distress tolerance at post-test and two-month follow-up Between-group: +* on pain management and distress tolerance Process: Not applicable
Najafigard & Gorji	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Iran Setting: Counseling service Characteristics: couples N = 30 Age group: Adults % female: 50 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Passive (waitlist)	Format: Couple online Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: Modified Fidelity: Protocol Core elements: 4	Within-group: +* on marital burden, ∅ in control group Between-group: +* on marital burden Process: Not applicable
Ndze et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI	Country: Cameroon Setting: Educational Characteristics: university students	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 3 Modality: Pure Fidelity: Protocol	Within-group: +* on resilience only in the SFBT group Between-group: +* on resilience Process: Not applicable

Njuki et al.	<p>h5 = 20</p> <p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>N = 20</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: NR</p> <p>% SF dropout: NR</p> <p>% Control dropout: NR</p> <p>Country: Kenya</p> <p>Setting: Social care</p> <p>Characteristics: women experiencing intimate partner violence</p> <p>N = 116</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: 100</p> <p>% SF dropout: NR</p> <p>% Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p> <p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Mixed</p> <p>Design: Quasi-experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Core elements: 5</p> <p>Format: Either individual or group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: Up to 10</p> <p>Modality: Pure</p> <p>Fidelity: NR</p> <p>Core elements: NR</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on PTSD symptoms only in the SFBT group; gains maintained at 3-months follow-up</p> <p>Between-group: +* on PTSD symptoms</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Oral et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: Turkey</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: primary school pupils experiencing peer bullying</p> <p>N = 18</p> <p>Age group: Children</p> <p>% female: 44</p> <p>% SF dropout: 0</p> <p>% Control dropout: 0</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 3</p> <p>Modality: Combined with psychoeducation</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 3</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* on peer bullying</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Panabad et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 8</p>	<p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Counseling service</p> <p>Characteristics: couples with marital maladjustment</p> <p>N = 4</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: 50</p> <p>% SF dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Case-study</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Couple in individual and group format</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 18</p> <p>Modality: Modified for domestic violence; included mindfulness</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 1</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on mental health, sexual intimacy, and marital violence; gains maintained at 1.5 and 3 months follow-up</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>

Pirmoradi et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 0.22 h5 = 8</p>	<p>% Control dropout: Not applicable</p> <p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Counseling service</p> <p>Characteristics: couples with marital conflict</p> <p>N = 30</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: 50</p> <p>% SF dropout: 0</p> <p>% Control dropout: 0</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed</p> <p>Control group: Active (TAU)</p>	<p>Format: Couple group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 8</p> <p>Modality: Pure</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 5</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on marital commitment and marital burnout; gains maintained at follow-up</p> <p>Between-group: +* on marital commitment and marital burnout; difference maintained at follow-up</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Pirzadi et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 6</p>	<p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Medical/Health care</p> <p>Characteristics: women after mastectomy due to breast cancer with scores under the cut-off point for depression symptoms</p> <p>N = 56</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: 100</p> <p>% SF dropout: NR</p> <p>% Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: RCT</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused</p> <p>Control group: Active (TAU)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: Pure</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol for each session</p> <p>Core elements: 4</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* on depression and quality of life</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Porreza Sangestani et al.	<p>Language: Persian</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Medical/Health care</p> <p>Characteristics: survivors of corona virus</p> <p>N = 45</p> <p>Age group: Adults</p> <p>% female: 100</p> <p>% SF dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Mixed (no treatment and mindfulness-based CBT)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: Pure</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 3</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* resilience vs no treatment, similar to other therapeutic approach applied in 8 sessions. Gains maintained at 1-month follow-up.</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>

Pourreza Sangestani et al.	<p>Language: Persian</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 7</p>	<p>% Control dropout: NR</p> <p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Medical/Health care</p> <p>Characteristics: patients with COVID-19 N = 45</p> <p>Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Randomized Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Control group: Mixed (no treatment and mindfulness-based cognitive therapy)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: Pure</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 3</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* on hope vs no treatment, \emptyset vs 8-sessions mindfulness-based cognitive therapy; gains maintained at 1-month follow-up</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Pourdel et al.	<p>Language: Persian</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 4</p>	<p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Counselling service</p> <p>Characteristics: women which are head of the household N = 36</p> <p>Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused</p> <p>Control group: Mixed (no treatment and compassion focused therapy)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 8</p> <p>Modality: Combined with CBT elements</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 4</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* on post-traumatic stress symptoms and coping vs no treatment; \emptyset vs compassion-focused therapy</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Pu et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = 7.8 SJR = 2.19 h5 = 57</p>	<p>Country: China</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: colleagues students with moderate to high level of Internet addiction N = 26</p> <p>Age group: Adults % female: 58 % SF dropout: 12.5 % Control dropout: 25</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem-focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (waitlist)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 5</p> <p>Modality: Adapted for Internet usage</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 5</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on Internet usage and future time perspective; gains maintained at 1 and 6 months follow-up. Also -* in the alpha and beta bands (linked with attention and emotion) linked with Internet addiction - in the left central, left posterior and right posterior brain regions, and -* in the gamma (linked with impulsivity and response inhibition) bands in the central region</p> <p>Between-group: +* on Internet usage and future time perspective</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Putri et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics:</p>	<p>Country: Indonesia</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Qualitative</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: NR</p>	<p>Within-group: + on career self-efficacy</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p>

	IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 23	Characteristics: high-school students N = 8 Age group: Adolescents % female: 50 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: Not applied	Design: Action research Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Not applicable	Modality: Modified Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	Process: Not applicable
Rafiola et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 8	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational Characteristics: high-school students N = 5 Age group: Adolescents % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: Not applicable	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Single-group Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Not applicable	Format: NR Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: NR Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	Within-group: + on self-efficacy in career decision making Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
Sahrah et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational Characteristics: postgraduate students experiencing quarter-life crisis N = 12 Age group: Adults % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	Type: Outcome Methodology: Mixed Design: Quasi-experiment and Observations Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 1 Modality: Pure Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR	Within-group: +* on spiritual well-being Between-group: +* on spiritual well-being Process: Not applicable
Sakuraba et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: Japan Setting: Educational Characteristics: preventing school refusal in pupils N = 128	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Single-group longitudinal Measurement: Problem-	Format: Survey Nr. of sessions: Not applicable Modality: Not applicable Fidelity: Not applicable Core elements: 5	Within-group: 15% students decreased in school refusal during the 1st year; 19% during the 2nd year Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable

Salimi & Sodani	<p>Language: Persian</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 5</p>	<p>Age group: Adolescents % female: 48 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: Not applicable</p> <p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Counselling service</p> <p>Characteristics: conflicted couples N = 24 Age group: Adults % female: 50 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>focused</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p> <p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Format: Couple</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: Adapted to couples</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: 5</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: + * on marital self-regulation and distress tolerance; gains maintained at 1-month follow-up</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Sermet Kaya et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = 1.9 SJR = 0.73 h5 = 37</p>	<p>Country: Turkey</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: adolescents with problematic Internet usage and poor sleep quality N = 44 Age group: Adolescents % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: RCT</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Format: NA</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: NA</p> <p>Modality: Combined with education and counselling</p> <p>Fidelity: NA</p> <p>Core elements: NA</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on Internet usage and sleep quality only in the SFBT group</p> <p>Between-group: +* on Internet usage and sleep quality; ∅ on school achievement</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Stackpole & Quiroga-Garza	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = 0.39 h5 = 19</p>	<p>Country: Mexico</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: dance students N = 16 Age group: NA % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Mixed-methods</p> <p>Design: Single-group</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: NA</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 5</p> <p>Modality: NA</p> <p>Fidelity: NA</p> <p>Core elements: NA</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on dance performance, + on performance anxiety, self-perceived anxiety and credibility, and anxious thoughts. Participants could identify problems, distance from problems, change negative thoughts into positive ones, and be aware of resources to cope with anxiety-related situations.</p>

Taminu	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: Nigeria Setting: Educational Characteristics: victims of armed banditry N = 20 Age group: Adolescents % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Single-group Measurement: Problem-focused Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: NR Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: NR Fidelity: NR Core elements: NR</p>	<p>Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable Within-group: +* on depression Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable</p>
Tillman et al.	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: USA Setting: Workplace Characteristics: First responders firefighters N = 12 Age group: Adults % female: 50 % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Type: Process Methodology: Qualitative Design: Grounded theory Measurement: Semi-structured interviews Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Training Nr. of sessions: 4 Modality: Adapted to crisis intervention Fidelity: Not applicable Core elements: Not applicable</p>	<p>Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: First responders experience with using SF in crisis intervention (5 themes): intentionality, becoming SF informed, integration of new ideas, questions as interventions, and self-care.</p>
van Beek et al.	<p>Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1.6 SJR = 0.50 h5 = 20</p>	<p>Country: The Netherlands Setting: Counselling service Characteristics: parents from multi-stressed families N = 111 Age group: Adults % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Type: Process-outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Single-group Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Family Nr. of sessions: 3 Modality: Combined with multiple family therapy Fidelity: NR Core elements: 3</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on family functioning and parenting stress in both parents; gains maintained at 3-months follow-up only for family functioning, respectively for parenting stress only for fathers Between-group: Not applicable Process: Therapeutic alliance was a * predictor of parenting stress; Clients' engagement in the therapy was * predictor for family functioning</p>

van Loggerenberg et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = 3.2 SJR = 1.02 h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: Multinational (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia and Uganda)</p> <p>Setting: Medical/ Health care</p> <p>Characteristics: patients with chronic diseases N = 117</p> <p>Age group: Adults % female: 71 % SF dropout: 8 % Control dropout: Not applicable</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Single-group</p> <p>Measurement: Mixed positive-and-problem focused</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p>	<p>Format: Individual</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 1 to 3</p> <p>Modality: Modified (DIALOG+)</p> <p>Fidelity: Not clear if a manual was used</p> <p>Core elements: NR</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on quality of life and anxiety and depression symptoms at 3-months follow-up</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Vatankhah & Bakhtiarpoor	<p>Language: Persian</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI</p>	<p>Country: Iran</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: children with intellectual disabilities N = 30</p> <p>Age group: Children % female: NR % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Passive (no treatment)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 8</p> <p>Modality: Kids's skills method adapted to intellectual disability</p> <p>Fidelity: Protocol</p> <p>Core elements: Not applicable (Kids skills method used)</p>	<p>Within-group: NR</p> <p>Between-group: +* communication and life skills</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Widigdo et al.	<p>Language: English</p> <p>Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 10</p>	<p>Country: Indonesia</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p> <p>Characteristics: pupils with low career self-efficacy N = 14</p> <p>Age group: Adolescents % female: NR % SF dropout: 0 % Control dropout: 0</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Quantitative</p> <p>Design: Experiment</p> <p>Measurement: Positive-focused</p> <p>Control group: Active (reality therapy)</p>	<p>Format: Group</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: 6</p> <p>Modality: NR</p> <p>Fidelity: NR</p> <p>Core elements: NR</p>	<p>Within-group: +* on career self-efficacy in both SFBT and reality therapy groups</p> <p>Between-group: ∅ on career self-efficacy</p> <p>Process: Not applicable</p>
Yandri et al.	<p>Language:</p> <p>Journal's metrics:</p>	<p>Country: Indonesia</p> <p>Setting: Educational</p>	<p>Type: Outcome</p> <p>Methodology: Qualitative</p>	<p>Format: Individual</p> <p>Nr. of sessions: NR</p>	<p>Within-group: + anxiety</p> <p>Between-group: Not applicable</p>

	IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = 12	Characteristics: victims of bullying N = 1 Age group: Adult % female: 0 % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable	Design: Case analysis Measurement: Semi-structured interview Control group: Not applicable	Modality: Pure Fidelity: NR Core elements: 3	Process: Not applicable
Yates et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 0.9 SJR = 0.45 h5 = 18	Country: USA Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: women with HIV N = 14 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Process Methodology: Qualitative Design: Thematic analysis Measurement: Not applicable Control group: Not applicable	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Modified Fidelity: NA Core elements: NA	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: Themes identified: not being defined by HIV, skills to find solutions, group support, progression toward goals, safety in expressing emotions, positive response to the intervention, recommending the intervention and improving access to the intervention.
Ying et al.	Language: Chinese Journal's metrics: IF = NI SJR = NI h5 = NI	Country: China Setting: Medical/Health care Characteristics: patients with cerebrovascular malformations after endovascular embolization N = 80 Age group: NA % female: NA % SF dropout: NA % Control dropout: NA	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: NA Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: NA Fidelity: NA Core elements: 2	Within-group: +* symptom management, rehabilitation exercise, emotion management, resource utilization, and daily life in SFBT group; +* rehabilitation exercise and emotion management in TAU Between-group: +* on hope and daily life activities Process: Not applicable
Zhang & Froerer	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1 SJR = 0.36 h5 = 13	Country: USA Setting: Medical/Healthcare Characteristics: Cancer patients	Type: Outcome Methodology: Quantitative Design: Case-study Measurement: Mixed	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 4 Modality: Adapted for cancer patients Fidelity: Protocol	Within-group: + psychological distress and hope at post-test and 2-weeks follow-up. Statistical information NA. Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable

Zhang et al.	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.8 SJR = 1.03 h5 = 34	N = 1 Age group: Adults % female: 100 % SF dropout: Not applicable % Control dropout: Not applicable Country: USA; China Setting: Medical/Healthcare Characteristics: Cancer survivors N = 14 Age group: Mixed % female: 57 % SF dropout: NR % Control dropout: NR	positive-and-problem focused Control group: Not applicable Type: Process Methodology: Qualitative Design: Thematic analysis Measurement: Semi-structured interviews Control group: Not applicable	Core elements: 7 Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 4 Modality: Tailored for the cancer population Fidelity: Manual based on SFBTA Core elements: 6	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: Three themes specifically investigated: (1) general experience: positive, unique and different compared to traditional treatments. Appreciated for being brief, conversational, less formal; (2) strengths: collaborative, co-constructive inviting the client to be an equal partner, reinforcing positive emotions and hope, less-victimizing and more searching for opportunities despite cancer; and (3) weaknesses: having the between-session assignment checked produced guilt, implied positive intention for the reasons behind being in therapy as a mandated client was not appropriate.
--------------	--	---	---	---	--

Notes. IF = Impact Factor from Journal Citation Reports by Clarivate based on 2023 data; SJR = SCImago Journal Rank indicator by Scopus based on 2023 data; h5 = index from Google Scholar based on 2019-2023 data; NI = Not Indexed; NA = information not available; NR = information not reported; + = positive outcomes associated to the SFP in within-group comparison or results in favor of the SFP group for between-group comparison; - = negative outcomes associated to the SFP in within-group comparison or results in favor of the control group for between-group comparison; \emptyset = no change in outcomes associated to the SFP in within-group comparison or no significant difference in results for between-group comparison; * = results reached statistical significance level.