Research on the Solution-Focused Approach in 2022: A Scoping Review, Andreea M Żak, Rytis Pakrosnis, Evgeniya Kuminskaya,

Journal of Solution Focused Practices 7(1), 2023

Table S1. Summary of se	lected characteristics of the reviewed ar	ticles published in 2022
-------------------------	---	--------------------------

Author(s)	Publication characteristics	Sample characteristics	Methodology	Intervention characteristics	Main findings
(A/P Mahendran & Joo Siang, 2022)	Language: Malay Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 12	Country: Malaysia Setting: Educational N= 33 Age group: Adolescents % female: 67%	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Mixed (quasi- experiment and observation of video-sessions and transcript analysis) Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group, hybrid Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on self-esteem in the SFP group, no change in the control group Between-group: +*on self-esteem Process: Not applicable
(Aivalioti et al., 2023)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR = 0.41 h5 = 17	Country: Greece Setting: Medical/ health care N= 30 Age group: Adults % female: 40	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experiment Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem-focused Control group: TAU	Format: NR Nr. of sessions: 5 Modality: Combined with TAU	Within-group: +* in family environment and psychiatric symptoms in the SFP group, no change in the control group. Between-group: Not explored Process: Not applicable
(Akbaş & Yiğitoğlu, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.3 SJR = 0.65 h5 = 41	Country: Turkey Setting: Educational N= 48 Age group: Adolescents % female: NA	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: NA	Format: NA Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: NA	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: +* for SFP on anger management and violent behavior Process: Not applicable
(Akgül- Gündoğdu & Selçuk-Tosun, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.4 SJR = 0.57 h5 = 45	Country: Turkey Setting: Educational N= 128 Age group: Adolescents % female: 36	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +*on internet addiction, nutrition-exercise attitudes and behavior Between-group: +*on internet addiction, nutrition-exercise attitudes and behavior Process: Not applicable
(Akinyemi & Aremu, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI	Country: Nigeria Setting: Medical/ health care	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment	Format: NR Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on distress Between-group: +* vs placebo on distress

	SJR: NI h5: NI	<b>N</b> = 40 <b>Age group</b> : Adults <b>% female</b> : NR	Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: Active (placebo - conversations on health)		Process: Not applicable
(Bagheriniya et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: Medical/ health care N= 60 Age group: Adults % female: 28	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Mixed passive (waiting list) and active (other approach, i.e., emotion-focused therapy)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: +* on spiritual health for both the SFP and emotion-oriented therapy vs. waiting list. Ø on spiritual health between treatment groups. Process: Not applicable
(Beauchemin et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Educational N= 27 Age group: Adults % female: 78	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Mixed methods Design: pre-test post-test and qualitative semi-structured interviews (thematic analysis) Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem-focused Control group: Active (general intervention)	Format: Group, online Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Combined with wellness themes	<b>Within-group</b> : +* on well-being, mental health, and perceived wellness in both the SFP and comparison groups. Thematic analysis revealed increased awareness of needs related to wellness, benefit of peer support, and understanding of wellness as a multidimensional construct. <b>Between-group</b> : +* on well-being ( $\eta_p^2$ = .521) and perceived wellness ( $\eta_p^2$ = .105). <b>Process</b> : Not applicable
(Bruehlman, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Educational N= 146 (consisting in 73 dyads of parent and young adult) Age group: Adults % female: 86	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Mixed method Design: cross-sectional and thematic analysis Measurement: Mixed solution- and-positive focused Control group: None	Format: Solution- focused activity Nr. of sessions: not applicable Modality: Pure	Within-group: Thematic analysis indicated five themes following the solution-focused activity referring to open and honest communication, quality time/togetherness, Laughter as a form of being connected, and No judgement/Assumptions as what the dyad want to do differently. Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Bustan et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI	<b>Country</b> : Indonesia <b>Setting</b> : NR <b>N=</b> 7 <b>Age group</b> : Adults	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology:</b> Mixed methods <b>Design</b> : Experiment and descriptive case studies	Format: NR Nr. of sessions: 3 Modality: Pure	Within-group: + on distress Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable

	h5 = 11	% female: 100	Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: None		
(Cahyanti et al., 2022)	Language: Indonesian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: NA <i>N</i> = 3 Age group: Adults % female: 100	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: None	Format: NA Nr. of sessions: 4 Modality: Combined with understanding the problem, exploring the dynamics of the crisis experienced	Within-group: + on self-competence and worthiness Between-group: Not applicable. Process: Not applicable
(Christiansen, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Educational N= 3 Age group: Mixed % female: 0	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Qualitative Design: Case study Measurement: Not applicable Control group: None	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Combined with REBT, CBT, reality therapy, dialectical behavior therapy, psychoeducation	Within-group: + on emotional, behavioral, cognitive functioning Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Erdoğan & Demir, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.1 SJR = 0.54 h5 = 32	Country: Turkey Setting: NA N= 39 Age group: NA % female: NA	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem focused Control group: NA	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: Combined with psychoeducation	Within-group:+* on internalized stigma of mental illness and self- esteem <b>Between-group</b> : +*on recovery assessment <b>Process</b> : Not applicable
(Fiana et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 11	Country: Indonesia Setting: Counselling service N= 7 Age group: Adolescents % female: NR	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: None	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on social anxiety Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Firth & Tripathi, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: UK Setting: Medical/ health care N= 1 Age group: Adults % female: 100	<b>Type</b> : Process-outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Mixed (quantitative and qualitative) <b>Design</b> : Case study	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 10 Modality: Pure	Within-group: + on mood and anxiety; 10-point scale Between-group: Not applicable Process: Useful elements identified were best hopes and exploring what's working.

(Froerer et al., 2023)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1.3 SJR = 0.36 h5 = 21	Country: USA Setting: Private practice <i>N</i> = 6 Age group: Mixed (5 adults, 1 adolescent) % female: 67	Measurement: Solution- focused Control group: Not applicable Type: Process research Methodology: Qualitative Design: microanalysis Measurement: Not applicable Control group: Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: * higher rates of overall (50.3% vs. 20.6%) and conditional (81% vs. 24.3%) presupposition; *more use of relationship-oriented presuppositional questions (62.1% vs. 29.1%), and *less action-orientated language in presuppositional questions
(Garba & Tanko, 2022)	<b>Language</b> : English <b>Journal's metrics:</b> IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Nigeria Setting: Educational N= 18 Age group: Adults % female: NR	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Quasi-experimental <b>Measurement</b> : Problem- focused <b>Control group</b> : Passive (no intervention)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Pure	(8.8% vs. 24.3%) by SFBT 2.0 vs. 1.0 therapists; Ø in type of presupposition used across the session, i.e., both therapists use more directing than redirecting or continuous types. Within-group: +* on procrastination Between-group: NR Process: Not applicable
(Ghari Saadati et al., 2022)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: Outpatient community counseling clinic N= 90 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Mixed passive (no treatment) and active (other approach: compassion- focused therapy)	Format: Couple Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: +* on interpersonal communication vs. no treatment for both intervention groups; -* on interpersonal communication vs. compassion-focused therapy Process: Not applicable
(Ghorbani et al., 2022a)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: University counseling center N= 60 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experimental Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem focused	Format: Couple group therapy Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not explored. Between-group: +* on marital conflicts, sexual intimacy and marital harmony and disharmony vs. no treatment; -* on all aspects vs. behavioral couple therapy

			<b>Control group</b> : Mixed passive (no treatment) and active (other approach: behavioral couple therapy)		Process: Not applicable
(Ghorbani et al., 2022b)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 33	Country: Iran Setting: University counseling center N= 60 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Mixed (no intervention and behavioral	Format: Couple group therapy Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Combined with psychoeducation	Within-group: Not reported Between-group: +* vs passive control on marital relationship and Ø vs active control Process: Not applicable
(Gilley, 2022a)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Medical/ health care N= 1 Age group: Adults % female: 100	couple therapy) <b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Case study <b>Measurement</b> : Problem- focused <b>Control group</b> : Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Combined with psychoeducation	Within-group: + on addiction issues, health and functioning Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Gilley, 2022b)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Outpatient community private foundation N= 1 Age group: Adult % female: 100	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Qualitative Design: Observational retrospective case-study Measurement: Problem- focused	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Combined with psychoeducation	Within-group: + self-management skills for substance addiction Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Hamdi et al., 2022)	Language: Indonesian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 7	Country: Indonesia Setting: Workplace (Local Government Institutions) N= 12 Age group: Adults % female: NR	Control group: None Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: None	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: NR	Within-group: +* on understanding of the main tasks and functions of changing government regulations. Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Hashemi Saraj et al., 2022)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: Outpatient clinical N= 45 Age group: Adults % female: 100	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Quasi-experiment <b>Measurement</b> : Problem- focused	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: +* on turbulence tolerance and uncertainty intolerance vs. no treatment; Ø on turbulence tolerance and uncertainty intolerance vs. schema therapy Process: Not applicable

(Himmelberge r et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Outpatient community counseling clinic N= 2 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Control group: Mixed passive (waiting list) and active (other approach: schema therapy) Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Case study Measurement: Mixed Control group: Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on psychopathology symptoms and hope Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Hsu et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Taiwan Setting: Community N= 6 Age group: Adults % female: 100	Type: Process-outcome research Methodology: Mixed Design: pre-test post-test and interview Measurement: Positive focused Control group: Absent	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	<ul> <li>Within-group: +* on overall postbreakup adjustment and pleasure, flow, and hope both at post-test and follow-up; +* on optimism and personal growth only at follow-up; Ø on forgiveness and gratefulness; Ø between post-test and follow-up on the above mentioned aspects; + on perceived adjustment abilities and confidence in abilities to adjust at posttest and follow-up.</li> <li>Between-group: Not applicable</li> <li>Process: 3 main themes of perceived effect of the solution-focused group: Warm, safe, and trustworthy atmosphere; Group support, learning and universality of feelings; and Benefits of the group design and activates.</li> </ul>
(Johnson et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 14	Country: USA Setting: Medical/ health care N= 53 Age group: Mixed % female: 62	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental (practice- based evidence approach) Measurement: Mixed Control group: Active (CBT; Client-centered; spiritual interventions)	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 3 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on spiritual distress and clinical adaptation Between-group: +* vs spiritual interventions and client-centered; Ø to CBT Process: Not applicable

(Kaya & Guler, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.3; SJR = 0.72 h5 = 43	Country: Turkey Setting: Medical/ health care N= 119 Age group: Adults % female: 100	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: Mixed (NA &	Format: online Nr. of sessions: NA Modality: combined (SF psychoeducation)	<ul> <li>Within-group: + on fear of childbirth and self-efficacy in both the SFP and control groups. Full info NA.</li> <li>Between-group: NR in the abstract.</li> <li>Full info NA.</li> <li>Process: Not applicable</li> </ul>
(Keshavarz Afshar et al., 2022)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF = 5.0 SJR = 2.16 h5 = 52	Country: Iran Setting: Educational N= 30 Age group: Adolescents % female: 100	childbirth preparation training) <b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Experimental <b>Measurement</b> : Problem- focused <b>Control group</b> : Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Combined with work on resistance	<b>Within-group</b> : Not examined. <b>Between-group</b> : $+^*$ on social anxiety, performance anxiety, and state anxiety vs. no treatment, $\eta = .74, 73, .69$ <b>Process</b> : Not applicable.
(Khosravi et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: Community counseling center <i>N</i> = 30 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem-focused Control group: type NR	Format: Group couple therapy Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: Combined with psychoeducation, reframing, not blaming	Within-group: Not explored. Between-group: + on marital compatibility vs. control group. Process: Not applicable.
(J. Kim et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Social care N= 92 Age group: Adults % female: 0	Type: Process-outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Mixed solution- and-positive focused Control group: TAU	Format: Group, online and hybrid Nr. of sessions: 15 Modality: combined with TAU (fatherhood curriculum) applied either online only or hybrid	Within-group: +* on in fathers' parenting attitude when SFP was applied in online format ( $g$ = 0.61), yet Ø SFP was applied in hybrid format ( $g$ = 0.32). Between-group: -*on solution-building skills ( $g$ = -0.58) and father's involvement in caregiving activities ( $g$ = -0.54), and - on father involvement in cognitive activities vs. SFP applied in hybrid format; Ø vs. SFP applied online; Ø on parenting attitude. Process: +* on solution-building skills when SFP was applied in online vs. hybrid format; Ø on father's

					involvement by online vs. hybrid format.
(J. S. Kim et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 0.5 SJR: NI h5 = NI	Country: USA Setting: Social care N= 123 Age group: Adults % female: 77%	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem-focused Control group: Active (other approach: cognitive-behavioral therapy CBT alone or mixed with motivational interviewing )	Format: Individual and reading materials Nr. of sessions: 1 + manuals and books Modality: Pure	<ul> <li>Within-group: +*on hope agency (.37), pathways (.35), positive emotions (.54); + on negative emotions (.19)</li> <li>Between-group: Ø on hope and positive and negative emotions vs. other known treatment; significant more pronounce association between positive emotions and SFBT vs. CBT Process: Not applicable</li> </ul>
(Koorankot et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.0 SJR = 0.73 h5 = 24	Country: India Setting: Outpatient medical care N= 60 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Process-outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive- and-negative Control group: Mixed passive (waiting list) and active (problem-focused questions)	Format: Activity, exposure to solution-focused questions Nr. of sessions: NR Modality: Pure	<ul> <li>Within-group: +* on symbol search and coding; +* on positive and negative affect only in the solution- focused questions group.</li> <li>Between-group: +* on symbol search vs. waiting list;</li> <li>Process: +* on coding vs. problem- focused question group.</li> </ul>
(McDowell et al., 2023)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1.5 SJR = 0.68 h5 = 23	Country: USA Setting: Medical/ health care N= 2 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Process-outcome research Methodology: Qualitative Design: Case study Measurement: Mixed solution- and-problem-focused Control group: Not applicable	Format: Couple/Family Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure	Within-group: + on family communication Between-group: Not applicable Process: Solution talk increased; Problem talk decreased
(Medina et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 3.3 SJR = 0.97 h5 = 75	Country: Spain Setting: Child protection service N= 468 Age group: Mixed % female: 87	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Mixed solution- and-problem-focused Control group: Active (TAU)	Format: Mixed individual and family Nr. of sessions: 14.48 Modality: Pure	<ul> <li>Within-group: +* on mental health, wellbeing, goal attainment</li> <li>Between-group: +* on mental health, wellbeing, goal attainment, smaller number of sessions, smaller recidivism.</li> <li>Ø on length of treatment</li> <li>Process: Not applicable</li> </ul>
(Mohiti et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR = 0.29	Country: Iran Setting: Medical N= 110 Age group: Adults	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : RCT	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 1 Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: +* on anxiety and labor pain vs. TAU Process: Not applicable

	h5 = 13	<b>% female</b> : 100	Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: Active (TAU, i.e. heat water bags and aromatherapy)		
(Mulawarman et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational (University) N= 11 Age group: Adults % female: NR	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Mixed Design: Comparison (pre-to- post) Measurement: Problem focused Control group: None	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 4 Modality: Pure	Within-group: + on online gaming addiction; qualitative reports of positive changes (not specified) Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Nader Pilehroud et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: NGO counseling center N= 32 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Problem focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 7 Modality: Combined with CBT and psychoeducation	Within-group: +* on marital adjustment and irrational beliefs Between-group: +* on marital adjustment and irrational beliefs Process: Not applicable
(Najimi et al., 2022)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 15	Country: Iran Setting: Educational N= 30 Age group: Adolescents % female: 100	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Quasi-experiment Measurement: Mixed positive- and- problem-focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Pure (miracle question, exceptions, scaling, homework,	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: +* on depression, stress, anxiety, and academic adjustment Process: Not applicable
(Naseriniya & Smkhani Akbarinejhad, 2022)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: Educational N= 45 Age group: Adolescents % female: 100	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Experimental Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: Mixed passive (no treatment) and active (mindfulness-based CBT)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: Pure	Within-group: +* on psychological well-being and sense of mental coherence Between-group: +* vs passive control and Ø vs active control on psychological well-being and sense of mental coherence Process: Not applicable
(Oaikhena & Igbineweka, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI	Country: Nigeria Setting: Educational N= 72	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Quasi-experiment	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 12	Within-group: +* on social maladjustment Between-group: +* vs passive control on social maladjustment

	h5: NI	Age group:	Measurement: Problem-	Modality:	Process: Not applicable
		adolescents	focused	Combined with	
		% female: NR	<b>Control group</b> : Passive (no treatment)	psychoeducation	
(Oktava et al.,	Language: English	Country: Indonesia	Type: Outcome research	Format: Group	Within-group: +* on academic
2022)	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Educational	Methodology: Quantitative	Nr. of sessions: 3	resilience in both SFP and control
	IF: NI	<b>N</b> = 16	Design: RCT	Modality: Pure	group
	SJR: NI	Age group:	Measurement: Positive-focused		Between-group: Ø on academic
	h5 = 11	Adolescents	Control group: Active (other		resilience
		% female: NR	approach, i.e., narrative therapy)		Process: Not applicable
(Pavandi &	Language: English	Country: Iran	Type: Outcome research	Format: Group	Within-group: Not explored
Elmimanesh,	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Educational	Methodology: Quantitative	Nr. of sessions: 8	Between-group: +* on coronavirus
2022)	IF: NI	(University)	Design: Quasi-experiment	Modality: Pure	anxiety and mental toughness vs. no
	SJR: NI	<b>N</b> = 32	Measurement: Mixed positive-		treatment
	h5: NI	Age group: Adults	and-problem focused		Process: Not applicable
		% female: 100	<b>Control group</b> : Passive (no treatment)		
(Pérez	Language: English	Country: Bolivia	Type: Outcome research	Format: Training	Within-group: +* on resourcefulness,
Lamadrid &	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Social care	Methodology: Quantitative	video and group	recognition of spirituality, and self-
Froerer, 2022)	IF: NI	<b>N</b> = 48	Design: Quasi-experimental	training	awareness only in the SFP group, not in
	SJR: NI	Age group: Adults	Measurement: Positive focused	Nr. of sessions: 1	the TAU group; + on inspired hope and
	h5: NI	% female: NR	Control group: Active (TAU)	Modality: Pure	increased consciousness in the SFP group.
					<b>Between-group</b> : in the TAU group Ø on
					resourcefulness, recognition of
					spirituality, self-awareness, hope, and
					increased consciousness.
					Process: Not applicable
(Pujowati et	Language: English	Country: Indonesia	Type: Outcome research	Format: Group	Within-group: +* on optimism
al., 2022)	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Educational	Methodology: Quantitative	Nr. of sessions: NR	Between-group: +* vs passive control
. ,	IF: NI	<b>N</b> = 16	Design: Quasi-experiment	Modality: Pure	on optimism
	SJR: NI	Age group:	Measurement: Mixed positive-	•	Process: Not applicable
	h5 = 11	Adolescents	and-problem-focused		
		% female: NR	<b>Control group</b> : Passive (no treatment)		
(Rafie et al.,	Language: English	Country: Iran	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research	Format: NA	Within-group: +* on stress, anxiety
2022)	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Medical	Methodology: Quantitative	Nr. of sessions: 6	and diabetes management self-efficacy

	IF = 2.1	<b>N</b> = 56	Design: RCT	Modality: NA	<b>Between-group</b> : in TAU group Ø on
	SJR = 0.43	Age group: Adults	Measurement: Mixed positive-		stress and anxiety
	h5 = 35	% female: 100	and-problem focused		Process: Not applicable
			Control group: Active (TAU)		
(Sadeghi &	Language: Persian	Country: Iran	Type: Outcome	Format: Group	Within-group: +* on academic
Farahbakhsh,	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Educational	Methodology: Qualitative	Nr. of sessions: 6	buoyancy
2022)	IF: NI	<b>N</b> = 34	Design: Quasi-experiment	Modality: Pure	<b>Between-group</b> : +* vs passive control
·	SJR: NI	Age group:	Measurement: Positive-		on academic buoyancy
	h5: NI	Adolescents	focused		Process: Not applicable
		% female: 100	<b>Control group</b> : Passive (no- treatment)		
(Sagar &	Language: English	Country: Turkey	Type: Process-outcome	Format: Group	Within-group: Explored in relation to
Özabaci,	Journal's metrics:	Setting: Educational	research	Nr. of sessions: 6	control groups.
2022)	IF: NI	(University)	Methodology: Mixed	Modality:	Between-group: +* on problem
	SJR: NI	<b>N</b> = 39	quantitative and interview	Combined with	Internet use vs. no treatment; Ø on
	h5 = 18	Age group: Adults	Design: Quasi-experiment	various elements	problem Internet use vs. guidance.
		% female: 56	Measurement: Problem	(e.g., time	Process: 5 themes related to
			focused	management,	experienced process: Awareness,
			Control group: Mixed passive	procrastination,	Ability to use the Internet healthily,
			(no treatment) and active	problem-solving)	Increased auto-control of Internet use,
			(other intervention: guidance)		and Positive change.
(Şermet Kaya	Language: English	Country: Turkey	Type: Outcome research	Format: Individual	Within-group: +* on internet
et al., 2023)	Journal's metrics: IF = 1.9	<b>Setting:</b> Educational <b>N</b> = 44	Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT	Nr. of sessions: 9 Modality:	addiction, sleep quality; Ø on school achievement
	SJR = 0.61	Age group:	Measurement: Problem-	Combined with	Between-group: +* vs passive control
	h5 = 34	Adolescents	focused	psychoeducation	on internet addiction, sleep quality; Ø
		% female: 59	Control group: Passive (no-		on school achievement
			treatment)		Process: Not applicable
(Solms et al.,	Language: English	Country: The	Type: Process-outcome	Format: Online self-	Within-group: Not explored.
2022)	Journal's metrics:	Netherlands	research	coaching exercise	Between-group: Not applicable.
	IF = 3.8	Setting: Coaching	Methodology: Quantitative	Nr. of sessions: not	<pre>Process: +* positive affect, negative</pre>
	SJR = 0.89	<b>N</b> = 183	Design: RCT	applicable	affect, and goal orientation in both
	h5 = 169	Age group: Adults	Measurement: Mixed positive-	Modality: Pure	solution-focused conditions vs.
		% female: 79	and- problem-focused	(selected element	problem-focused one; $ ot\!\! {f \emptyset}$ on self-
			Control group: Various	either miracle	efficacy, avoidance goal orientation,
			questions (problem-focused	questions or	goal attainment, quality action
			questioning vs. two groups of	exception question)	planning. Ø at 24-days follow-up on
					goal attainment and actual or reported

(Wang et al., 2023)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 1.8	Country: China Setting: NA N= 290	<b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Cluster RCT	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 12 Modality: NA	Within-group: +* on depressive symptoms in the SFP group, not in the control group, Ø on cognitive
(Turns et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 0.5 SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: USA Setting: Training clinic N= 10 Age group: Adults % female: 50	Type: Process research Methodology: Qualitative Design: Multiple case-study Measurement: Not applicable Control group: Not applicable	Format: Couple Nr. of sessions: 6 Modality: NR	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: 6 themes related to the experience of receiving therapy: Therapy as a blessing, Positive experience with the therapist, Helpful conversations, Reactions to the miracle question, Clarifying the couple and co- parent identity, and Growth of the parent-child relationship.
(Takagi et al., 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 3.7 SJR = 0.89 h5 = 212	Country: Taiwan Setting: Job recruitment online platform <i>N</i> = 94 Age group: Adults % female: 51	Type: Process-outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed solution- and-positive focused Control group: Active (different combinations of solution- focused questions used in three groups: exception questions; exceptions and miracle questions; exceptions, miracle and time-machine questions)	Format: Exercise online Nr. of sessions: Not applicable Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not applicable Between-group: Not applicable Process: +* on solution-building, positivity, and ideal level of life in all three conditions; +* time-oriented attitudes increased with the combined use of all three solution-focused questions.
(Song, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 3.82 SJR = 0.40 h5 = 56	Country: China Setting: Medical N= 80 Age group: Adults % female: 69	solution-focused questioning, i.e., miracle vs. success) <b>Type</b> : Outcome research <b>Methodology</b> : Quantitative <b>Design</b> : Quasi-experimental <b>Measurement</b> : Mixed positive- and-problem focused <b>Control group</b> : Active (TAU)	Format: Group online Nr. of sessions: not applicable (online chat group) Modality: Combined with family involvement and TAU	problem-solving actions; Ø on self- efficacy between the two solution- focused conditions. Within-group: + on anxiety and depression, self-care abilities, hope, and quality of life. Between-group: +* on anxiety and depression, self-care abilities, hope, and quality of life vs. TAU Process: Not applicable

	SJR = 0.59 h5 = 34	Age group: Adults % female: NA	Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: NA		functioning in both the SFP and control groups. Between-group: Not explored Process: Not explored
(Wardhani et al., 2022)	<b>Language</b> : Indonesian <b>Journal's metrics:</b> IF: NI SJR: NI h5 = 36	Country: Indonesia Setting: Educational N= 5 Age group: Adolescents % female: NR	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Mixed (quantitative and qualitative) Design: Counseling guidance action research Measurement: Positive-focused Control group: None	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 2 Modality: Pure	Within-group: + on self esteem Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Widodo & Nurjannah, 2022)	Language: Indonesian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Indonesia Setting: Medical/ health care N= 2 Age group: Adults % female: 100	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Qualitative Design: Case study Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: Not applicable	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: 3 Modality: Pure	Within-group: + on maternal anxiety Between-group: Not applicable Process: Not applicable
(Yildirim & Aylaz, 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF = 2.3 SJR=0.72 h5=43	Country: Turkey Setting: Counselling (community life and sports center) N= 76 Age group: Adults % female: 78	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: RCT Measurement: Mixed positive- and-problem focused Control group: Passive (no treatment)	Format: Group Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Combined with psychoeducation	<ul> <li>Within-group: +* on trait anxiety, mean weight, BDI, number of snacking, healthy lifestyle</li> <li>Between-group: in the control group +* only on healthy lifestyle scores and weekly hours of exercising.</li> <li>Process: Not applicable</li> </ul>
(Zafarghandi et al., 2022)	Language: Persian Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI h5: NI	Country: Iran Setting: Educational N= 60 Age group: Adolescents % female: 0	Type: Outcome research Methodology: Quantitative Design: Pre-test post-test design with 3 months follow-up Measurement: Problem- focused Control group: Mixed passive (no treatment) and active (other known treatment, i.e., mindfulness-based therapy)	Format: Pure (goals, exceptions, miracle question, scaling) Nr. of sessions: 8 Modality: Group	Within-group: Not explored Between-group: -* on educational stress vs mindfulness and +* vs no treatment Process: Not applicable
(Żak <i>,</i> 2022)	Language: English Journal's metrics: IF: NI SJR: NI	<b>Country</b> : Poland <b>Setting:</b> Private practice <b>N</b> = 346	Type: Process research Methodology: Mixed Design: Thematic analysis Measurement: Positive focused	Format: Individual Nr. of sessions: range 1-29 Modality: Pure	Within-group: Not applicable. Between-group: Not applicable Process: Thematic analysis revealed 11 elements specific to the solution-

h5: NI	Age group: Adults % female: 74	Control group: Not applicable	focused approach to be perceived as helpful from clients' perspective, with the co-construction of Aim and Action perceived as the most helpful. The perceived helpfulness of specific elements varied significantly with the				
client's level of engagement. Notes. IF = Impact Factor from Journal Citation Reports by Clarivate based on 2022 data; SJR = SCImago Journal Rank indicator by Scopus based on 2022 data;							
h5 = index from Google Scholar based on 2018-2022 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; Ø = 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.							