1.	Was	an	'a	nriori'	design	provided?
	vv a 3	an	a	priori	ucsign	provincu.

The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review.

-				
Xes Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer D Not applicable		
	at least two indepe	ction and data extraction? endent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements		
Xes Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
At least two elect (e.g. Central, EM feasible the searc current contents,	ronic sources show IBASE, and MEDI ch strategy should	re search performed? uld be searched. The report must include years and databases used LINE). Key words and/or MESH terms must be stated and where be provided. All searches should be supplemented by consulting s, specialized registers, or experts in the particular field of study, the studies found.		
Xes Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer D Not applicable		
The authors shou authors should st	ld state that they s	i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? searched for reports regardless of their publication type. The t they excluded any reports (from the systematic review), based on etc.		
Yes	🖾 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
		and excluded) provided? dies should be provided.		
Xes Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer 🗌 Not applicable		
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? In an aggregated form such as a table, data from the original studies should be provided on the participants, interventions and outcomes. The ranges of characteristics in all the studies analyzed e.g. age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity, or other diseases should be reported.				
'A priori' method chose to include	ls of assessment sl only randomized, o	Can't answer Not applicable e included studies assessed and documented? hould be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s) double-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment es of studies alternative items will be relevant.		
🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? The results of the methodological rigor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review, and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations.				
Yes	🗌 No	🛛 Can't answer 🗌 Not applicable		

9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?

For the pooled results, a test should be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e. Chi-squared test for homogeneity, I²). If heterogeneity exists a random effects model

should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e. is it sensible to combine?).

 \Box Yes \Box No \Box Can't answer \Box Not applicable

10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?

An assessment of publication bias should include a combination of graphical aids (e.g., funnel plot, other available tests) and/or statistical tests (e.g., Egger regression test).

 \Box Yes \Box No \Box Can't answer \Box Not applicable

11. Was the conflict of interest stated?

Potential sources of support should be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the included studies.

 \Box Yes \Box No \Box Can't answer \Box Not applicable

OVERALL RATING (tick one box):

- High quality
- Medium quality
- Low quality

Rating (by criteria fulfilled, i.e. 'yes' response): 9 to 11 high quality; 5 to 8 medium quality; 0 to 4 low quality

Name of first reviewer: Alexander Tsertsvadze **Name of second reviewer:** Paul Sutcliffe **First author surname year of publication:** Smith 2010¹⁴⁰

1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?

The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review.

🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer	Not applicable
-------	------	--------------	----------------

2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?

There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place.

🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer	Not applicable
-------	------	--------------	----------------

3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?

At least two electronic sources should be searched. The report must include years and databases used (e.g. Central, EMBASE, and MEDLINE). Key words and/or MESH terms must be stated and where feasible the search strategy should be provided. All searches should be supplemented by consulting current contents, reviews, textbooks, specialized registers, or experts in the particular field of study, and by reviewing the references in the studies found.

e
9

4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?

The authors should state that they searched for reports regardless of their publication type. The authors should state whether or not they excluded any reports (from the systematic review), based on their publication status, language etc.

🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer	Not applicable
-------	------	--------------	----------------

5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?

A list of included and excluded studies should be provided.

	🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer	Not applicable
--	-------	------	--------------	----------------

6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?

In an aggregated form such as a table, data from the original studies should be provided on the participants, interventions and outcomes. The ranges of characteristics in all the studies analyzed e.g. age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity, or other diseases should be reported.

🛛 Yes	No	Can't answer Not applicable
7. Was the scienti	fic quality of the	e included studies assessed and documented?
'A priori' methods	of assessment sh	ould be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s)
chose to include or	nly randomized, a	louble-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment
as inclusion criteri	a); for other type	es of studies alternative items will be relevant.
🛛 Yes	No	Can't answer Not applicable
	fic quality of the	included studies used appropriately in formulating
conclusions?		
conclusions? <i>The results of the m</i>	nethodological ri	gor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and
conclusions? <i>The results of the m</i>	nethodological ri	
conclusions? The results of the m the conclusions of t	nethodological ri the review, and e.	gor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and xplicitly stated in formulating recommendations.
conclusions? The results of the m the conclusions of the m Yes	nethodological ri the review, and e.	gor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and

For the pooled results, a test should be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e. Chi-squared test for homogeneity, I²). If heterogeneity exists a random effects model

should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e. is it sensible to combine?).

🗌 Yes	🖂 No	Can't answer Not applicable			
An asses	10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? An assessment of publication bias should include a combination of graphical aids (e.g., funnel plot, other available tests) and/or statistical tests (e.g., Egger regression test).				
🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer Not applicable			
Potentia	the conflict of interest st l sources of support should l studies.	ated? d be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the Can't answer Not applicable			
OVERA	ALL RATING (tick one b	ox):			
\boxtimes	High quality				
	Medium quality				
	Low quality				

Rating (by criteria fulfilled, i.e. 'yes' response): 9 to 11 high quality; 5 to 8 medium quality; 0 to 4 low quality

Name of first reviewer: Alexander Tsertsvadze Name of second reviewer: Paul Sutcliffe First author surname year of publication: Springer 2009¹⁴¹

1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?

The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review.

🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? <i>There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place.</i>				
🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
At least two elect (e.g. Central, EM feasible the searc current contents,	ronic sources shoi IBASE, and MEDL ch strategy should	e search performed? <i>uld be searched. The report must include years and databases used</i> <i>LINE). Key words and/or MESH terms must be stated and where</i> <i>be provided. All searches should be supplemented by consulting</i> <i>s, specialized registers, or experts in the particular field of study,</i> <i>the studies found.</i>		
Yes	🖾 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
The authors shou authors should st	ld state that they s	i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? tearched for reports regardless of their publication type. The t they excluded any reports (from the systematic review), based on tc.		
Yes	🖾 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? <i>A list of included and excluded studies should be provided.</i>				
🛛 Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer Not applicable		
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? In an aggregated form such as a table, data from the original studies should be provided on the participants, interventions and outcomes. The ranges of characteristics in all the studies analyzed e.g. age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity, or other diseases should be reported.				
'A priori' method chose to include	ls of assessment sh only randomized, d	Can't answer Not applicable e included studies assessed and documented? nould be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s) double-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment es of studies alternative items will be relevant.		
Yes	🗌 No	Can't answer 🗌 Not applicable		
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? The results of the methodological rigor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review, and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations.				
For the pooled re	esults, a test should	Can't answer Not applicable bine the findings of studies appropriate? <i>d be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their</i> <i>for homogeneity, 1²). If heterogeneity exists a random effects model</i>		

should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e. is it sensible to combine?).

Yes Yes	🖾 No	Can't answer Not applicable
An asses	· ·	tion bias assessed? hould include a combination of graphical aids (e.g., funnel plot, ical tests (e.g., Egger regression test).
🗌 Yes	🖾 No	Can't answer INot applicable
		ated? I be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the
OVERA	ALL RATING (tick one be	ox):
	High quality	
	Medium quality	
\boxtimes	Low quality	

Rating (by criteria fulfilled, i.e. 'yes' response): 9 to 11 high quality; 5 to 8 medium quality; 0 to 4 low quality