	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only						
	Question	RCTs						
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
I. Did the research	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
questions and inclusion	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
criteria for the review	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
nclude the components of	Timeframe for followup							
the PICO?	(optional)							
	Overall	YES						
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit statement that the review	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
nethods were established		partial yes						
prior to the conduct of the	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n	У
review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the	Has it specified a meta- analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n	У
protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	n	n	n	n	У
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	n	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES					
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	n	У	У	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only						
	-	RCTs						
in the review?	Did the review provide an							
	explanation for including							
	both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	У	У	У	n	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
lis 4. Did the review authors in-	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	У	У	У		n	n	n
use a comprenensive literature search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	У		n	У	У
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n		n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	У	n		n	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У		У	n	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	n	У	n	n	У	У

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only						
IIEM	Question	RCTs						
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n	n		n	У		
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У	У	n	n	У	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.				n	У		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
studies and justify the		no						
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?							
	Overall	NO						
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	n	У	У

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only						
IEM	Question	RCTs						
	Did it describe the		N			n		
	interventions?	У	У	У	У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	n	У	У
. Did the review authors	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	n	У	У
escribe the included		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
tudies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		У	У
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	У	У	n		У	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	У	У	n		У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	n	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У		n	У	У

ess selection of the results from among measurements or of a specified ? RCTs) Is ess confounding? ess selection bias?	Includes only RCTs y YES	Includes only RCTs n PARTIAL YES	Includes only RCTs n PARTIAL YES	Includes only RCTs NO	Includes only RCTs n PARTIAL YES	Includes only RCTs y YES	Includes only RCTs y YES
ess selection of the results from among measurements or of a specified ? RCTs) Is ess confounding?	y YES	n PARTIAL YES	n		n	У	У
results from among measurements or of a specified ? RCTs) Is ess confounding?	YES	PARTIAL YES		NO			
<b>ls</b> ess confounding?	Includes only		PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
ess confounding?		La pluden en lu					
ess selection bias?						1	
		ling also and set					
	RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
ess methods used to exposures and s?							
ess selection of the result from among measurements or of a specified ?							
NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
uthors report on the if funding for I studies included in	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
N of	IRSIs) Ithors report on the funding for studies included in ? if the reviewers	IRSIs) Includes only RCTs thors report on the funding for studies included in /? YES	IRSIs) Includes only RCTs Includes only RCTs Ithors report on the funding for studies included in /? if the reviewers this information	Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs       ithors report on the funding for studies included in r?     Free to the report on the funding for     Free to the report on the report on the studies included in r?     Free to the report on the re	Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs       ithors report on the funding for studies included in /?     YES     YES       YES     YES     YES	Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs     Includes only RCTs       ithors report on the funding for studies included in (? if the reviewers this information     YES     YES     YES     YES	Includes only RCTs       ithors report on the funding for studies included in (? if the reviewers this information     YES     YES     YES     YES     YES     YES     YES     YES     YES

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
	FOR RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta	-	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted
	analysis AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			У				
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity			У				
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta- analysis AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data							

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	authors performed analyses	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	n	n	n	n	У	n
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	Y	У	У	Υ	У	Υ
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs			Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	-	and NRSIs	and NRSIs	and NRSIs	-	·····	
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the components		У	У	У	У	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	У
of the review and did the report		n	n	n	У	n	У
justify any significant deviations	3 1 ( 11 )				3		, 
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	n	Υ	n	У
	Has it specified justification for any	n	n	n	n	n	У
	deviation from the protocol?						
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?				n	У	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?	n	n	n			
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	У	n	У	У	У
		no	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		У		У	У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?		n		n	n	n
search strategy:	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n		n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		n		n	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		n		n	n	У
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	У	У	n	У
. Did the review authors perform tudy selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.					n	
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У	n	У	n	n
i. Did the review authors perform lata extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.			n		n	n

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did the SR provided a list of all						
	potentially relevant studies that were						
	read in full-text form but excluded	n	n	У	n	n	n
7. Did the review authors provide	from the review?						
a list of excluded studies and		no	no	partial yes	no	no	no
justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from						
	the review of each potentially relevant			n			
	study?						
	Overall	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	n	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У
1	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors	Did it describe the populations IN						
describe the included studies in	DETAIL?	n		n	n	У	У
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN						
	DETAIL?	n		У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN						
	DETAIL?	n		n	n	У	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n		n	n	У	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow						
	up?	n		n	У	У	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	n	n	У	У	У
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?						
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients						
	and assessors (for subjective	У	n	n	У	У	У
	outcomes)?						
		partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У			У	У	У
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n			n	n	У
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
in individual studies that were	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?	n	n	n			
included in the review?	Did it assess selection bias?	У	n	n			
		NO	NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple						
	measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?						
	Overall (NRSIs)	NO	NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)				У		У

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity				У		У
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted			
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available						
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	n

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted		No meta-analysis conducted	У
synthesis?	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	У	n	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	n	У		У	У
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n	n	У	n	У
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	NO

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwe 2019	Margenfield 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Question	and NRSIs	includes only iters
	Population	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)		
	Overall	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/	y .	n
justify any significant deviations		<b>,</b>	
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	У	n
	Has it specified justification for any	n	n
	deviation from the protocol?	11	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?		n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?		
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?	n	
	Overall	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	n
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies? Did it search trial/study registries? Did it include/consult content experts in the field? Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	no	no
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		
	Overall	NO	NO
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		
	Overall	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У
6. Did the review authors perforr data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n	

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
	Overall	NO	YES
	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	У
a list of excluded studies and		no	partial yes
justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		n
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	n
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У
		partial yes	no
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	n	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	NO
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	n	У
		NO	partial yes

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		У
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a		У
satisfactory technique for	specified outcome?	NO	YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	Overall (RCTs) FOR NRSIs	NU	YES
in individual studies that were included in the review?	Did it assess confounding?	n	
Included in the review?	Did it assess selection bias?	n	
		NO	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?		
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		
	Overall (NRSIs)	NO	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	YES
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available	n	
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review	n	
	Overall (NRSIs)	NO	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	n	
	Overall	NO	YES
13 Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	
	Overall	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	Υ
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
	Overall	YES	YES

	REVIEW ID	Cao 2009	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Sarris 2011	Yeung 2012	Tan 2015
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	n
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion						
	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review							
contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/						
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	n	n	n	У	У
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	n	n	У	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n		у	n	у
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			n			
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Cao 2009	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Sarris 2011	Yeung 2012	Tan 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	У	У	n	У	n
		no	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	no
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		У	У		У	
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	n		n	
search strategy.	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n	n		n	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		n	n		n	
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		У	n		n	
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	NO
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	n	У	n	У	У
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n	n		n		
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У	У	n	У	n
	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.				n		n

	REVIEW ID	Cao 2009	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Sarris 2011	Yeung 2012	Tan 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	У	n	n	n	n	n
provide a list of excluded		partial yes	no	no	no	no	no
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	У					
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	n
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	n	n	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	no	no	partial yes	no
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n			n	
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n			n	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n			n	
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n			n	
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	n	n			n	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	NO
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	n	n	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	n	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У			У	У

	REVIEW ID	Cao 2009	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Sarris 2011	Yeung 2012	Tan 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У			n	n
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	FOR NRSIs						
in individual studies that were included in the review?	Did it assess confounding?			n			
	Did it assess selection bias?			n			
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
-	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted
A vv re	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	n					
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	n					

	REVIEW ID	Cao 2009	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Sarris 2011	Yeung 2012	Tan 2015
ТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC <sup>-</sup>
	Overall (RCTs)	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis			No meta-analysis conducted			
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available						
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted
performed, did the review authors assess the potential	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	n	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analys conducted

	REVIEW ID	Cao 2009	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Sarris 2011	Yeung 2012	Tan 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
Synthesis:	Overall	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	У	У
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	n	n	n		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	У	n	У	n	n	У
of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations		У	n	У	n	n	У
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	У	n	У	n	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	У	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n		У	n	n	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		n				
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	У	У	n	n	n
		no	partial yes	partial yes	no	no	no
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		n	У			
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	У			
search strategy:	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n	n			
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		n	У			
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		n	n			
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	NO	NO
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	У	У	У	У
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У	У	n	У	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80	n			n		
aupicate.	percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.						

	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	n	У	n
studies and justify the		no	no	no	no	partial yes	no
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		n			n	
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	n	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	n		n
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	n	У	n		n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	У	n	У		n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	n	n	n	n		n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n	n	n	У	У	n
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	FOR NRSIs						
in individual studies that were	Did it assess confounding?		n				
included in the review?	Did it assess selection bias?		У				
		Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a						
	specified outcome? Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity		У	У		У	У
	(where present)						

	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		No meta-analysis conducted				
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted		No meta-analysis conducted		

	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
ITEM syntnesis:	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
synthesis.	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У	У	n	У	У
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n			n		
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	У	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n		n	У	n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	NO
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	n	У	У
	OR the authors described their funding				n		
any funding they received for conducting the review?	sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						

	REVIEW ID	Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs				
	Population	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)					
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes				
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	У	У	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/	n	n	V	n	n
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?		11	У	11	11
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	У	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES				
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	У	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?					
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?					
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs				
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	n	У	У	n
		no	no	partial yes	partial yes	no
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			У	У	
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?			У	n	
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?			n	n	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?			У	n	
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			У	n	
	Overall	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
5 Didaha mujawa sakhara	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	У	У	n	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n			n	
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У	У	n	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n			n	
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES

	REVIEW ID	Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	У	n	У
		no	no	partial yes	no	partial yes
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			У		n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	n
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	У	
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	У	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	У	
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	У	У	У	
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	n	У	У	У	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	У	n	У
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?					
included in the review?	Did it assess selection bias?					
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?					
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?					
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		У	У		У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		У	У		У

REVIEW ID		Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis					
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)					
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available					
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review					
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	У		No meta-analysis conducted	
synthesis?	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES

	REVIEW ID	Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	У	n	У
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	У		У	
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	У	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review		У	У	n	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest					
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Population	У	У
<ol> <li>Did the research questions</li> </ol>	Intervention	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)		
	Overall	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion		
	criteria?	У	У
2. Did the report of the review			
contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/		
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	n	n
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating		
	heterogeneity?	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any		
	deviation from the protocol?	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation		
		У	n
	for including only RCTs ?		
3. Did the review authors	Did the review provide an explanation		
explain their selection of the	for including only NRSIs?		
study designs for inclusion in	for including only incose?		
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation		
	for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		
	for including both RCTs and NRSIS?		
	Overall	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant)	V	N/
		У	У
	databases?		
	did it provide key word and/or search	у	У

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	У	n
		partial yes	no
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	
scalen strategy.	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	n	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	NO
5 Did the region outbors	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		
	Overall	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	У
•		no	partial yes
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		n
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES
	Did it describe the populations? Did it describe the interventions? Did it describe the comparators? Did it describe the outcomes?	y y y y	y y n y
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У
		partial yes	no
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	У	
	Overall	YES	NO
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias?		
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?		
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	YES	YES
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		У
	The authors investigated the causes of		У

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available		
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	У
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.		
synthesis?	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	YES

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	У
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results		
	Overall	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	У
	Overall	NO	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and		
adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the	discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication	•	YES Y
publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias The authors reported no competing	conducted	
publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for	discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias The authors reported no competing interests OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed	conducted	

	REVIEW ID	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Kim 2012	Chen 2014	Yuan 2015	Yeganeh 2017
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes both RCTs			Includes only RCTs	Includes only DCT
IIEM	Question	RCTs	and NRSIs	Includes only RCTS	Includes only RCTS	Includes only RCTS	Includes only RCT
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)			n		n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review							
contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/						
justify any significant deviations		n	n	n	n	n	n
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any						
	deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n		n	n	n	У
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		n				
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Kim 2012	Chen 2014	Yuan 2015	Yeganeh 2017
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	у	у	У	n	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	У	У	У		У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	У		У	У
search strategy:	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n		У	У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	У		У	У
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	n	У		У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	У	У	У	У	n
b. Did the review authors perform tudy selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n					n
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У	У	n	У	У
	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted				n		
	by one reviewer.						

	REVIEW ID	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Kim 2012	Chen 2014	Yuan 2015	Yeganeh 2017
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes both RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
		RCTs	and NRSIs	includes only iters	Includes only iters	includes only iters	includes only iter
		n	n	n	n	n	n
	A       Question       Includes only RCTs       Includes both R and NRSIs         Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?       n       n         of excluded studies and fy the exclusions?       Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?       no       NO         Overall       NO       NO       NO         Did to describe the populations?       y       y         Did to describe the comparators?       y       y         Did to describe the research designs?       y       y         Did to describe the comparators?       y       y         Did to describe the populations IN Erribe the included studies in guate detail?       Did to describe the comparators IN DETAIL?       n         Did to describe the comparators IN DETAIL?       n       1       1         Did to describe the study's setting?       n       1       1         DID to describe the study's setting?       n       1       1         DID to describe the timeframe for follow up?       n       1       1         Did to describe the study's setting?       n       1       1       1         DID to tosses lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?       y       n       1 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
describe the included studies in	from the review?						
		no	no	no	no	no	no
justify the exclusions?							
	3						
				NO	NO		NO
		-		У	У		У
			-	У	У	-	У
		-		У	У	-	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in		n		У	n	У	У
adequate detail?		n		У	n	У	У
		n		У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n		У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-						
	up?	n		У	n	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	NO	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO y y y y y y partial yes y y y y y	YES
		У	n	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients						
		У	n	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У		У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Kim 2012	Chen 2014	Yuan 2015	Yeganeh 2017
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У		У	n	У	У
satisfactory technique for	Överall (RCTs)	YES	NO	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias?		n				
		Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes? Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a						
	specified outcome? Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	<b>FOR RCTs</b> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			У		У	У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity			У		У	У

	REVIEW ID	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Kim 2012	Chen 2014	Yuan 2015	Yeganeh 2017
ТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		No meta-analysis conducted				
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available						
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	No meta-analysis conducted		

	REVIEW ID	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Kim 2012	Chen 2014	Yuan 2015	Yeganeh 2017
ITEM synunesis :	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
synthesis.	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	У
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	n	n	n	n	
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n	n	n	У	n
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	YES	YES	YES
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	n	У	n
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				n		n

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Population	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion	N	N/
	criteria?	У	У
2. Did the report of the review	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	n	У
contain an explicit statement			y
that the review methods were		no	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	У
of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations		n	У
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating	n	У
	heterogeneity? Has it specified justification for any		
	deviation from the protocol?	n	У
	Overall	NO	YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?		
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		
	Overall	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search		

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	У
		no	partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?		У
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		У
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		У
	Overall	NO	YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		
	Overall	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n	
	Overall	NO	YES

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
7. Did the review authors provide	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n
a list of excluded studies and		no	no
Did the review authors provide list of excluded studies and stify the exclusions? <b>Did the review authors</b> escribe the included studies in	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		
	Overall	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	n	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	n	У
		NO	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		У

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		У
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	Overall (RCTs)	NO	YES
	FOR NRSIs		
in individual studies that were included in the review?	Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias?		
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?		
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		У

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available		
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	n

TEM       Question       Includes only RCTS       Includes only RCTS         Synthesis f       Overall       No meta-analysis conducted       No         13. Did the review authors account for ROB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?       N, If RCTS with moderate or high ROB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely interpreting/discussing the results of the review?       NO       NO         14. Did the review authors for any heterogeneity observer explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observer in the results of the review?       NO       NO         15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review?       Overall       NO       VES         15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review?       The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication interests       No       VES         16. Did the review authors orgon any potential sources for the results of the review?       The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication interests       No       VES         17. Did the review authors report any potential sources for the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discusse it he likelihood and magnitude of interest.       No       VES         16. Did the review authors report any potential sources for the review authors dinterest.       No       VE <th></th> <th>REVIEW ID</th> <th>Godley 2020</th> <th>Li 2021</th>		REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
No meta-analysis conductedNo13. Did the review authors account for ROB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?NONO14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussionNONO15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small studies)NONO15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss to the review?NOVES16. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed, in the resultsNOVES16. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss to the review inserved to the inpact of publication biasNoVES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?NoVES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?NoVES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conflicts of interestNoNo17. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conflicts of interestNo	ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
IS. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?RCTsnn14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observer in the results of the review?NONO15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review?OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results of the review?NOY15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the reviewNoYES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?NoYES16. Did the review?OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed putnital conflicts of interest.ny	synthesis?	Överall	-	NO
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review? 14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed; in the results of the review? 15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources 17. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussed the results of the review 18. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources 16. Did the review authors 16. Did the review au	13. Did the review authors	•	n	n
I.A. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?Interesultsn15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?NoYES16. Did the review authors review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?NoYES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?NoYES16. Did the review?The authors described their funding surces and how they managed out conflicts of interest, output al conflicts of interestNoYES	account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the	or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely	n	n
IA. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review?ONY15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?NOYES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?No emeta-analysis conducted nNO16. Did the review?The authors reported no competing interestsny		Overall	NO	NO
provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review?ny15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?NOYES16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?Ne authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interestny			n	n
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication biasNo meta-analysis conductedNo16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interestNoy	provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed	authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this	n	У
quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication biasNo meta-analysis conductedNo16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of 		Overall	NO	YES
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?interestsnyOR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interestnImage: Conflict of interestImage: Conflict of interest	quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the	statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication	•	NO
conflict of interest, including     OR the authors described their funding       any funding they received for     sources and how they managed     n       conducting the review?     potential conflicts of interest     n			n	У
Overall NO YES	conflict of interest, including any funding they received for	sources and how they managed	n	
		0	NO	VEC

	REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT				
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions and	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
inclusion criteria for the review	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У
include the components of the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У
PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)				0		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion						
	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review							
contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	n	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/						
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating						
	heterogeneity?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any						
	deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	n	n	У
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?						
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant)						
	databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	У	У	У	У	У	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	У	n	У	У	
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	У	n	n	n	
search strategy:	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	n	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	У	n	n	n	
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У	n	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	У	n	n	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n		n	n		
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	ial yespartial yespartial yespartial yespartial yespartial yesnynyypnynnnnnynnnnnynnnnyyyynnyyyynnnyyynnnyyynnnyyyyynynnynynnynynnynynnynynnynynnynynnynynnynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynynyynyyyynyny	У			
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n		n	0	0	
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES

	REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs					
	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	n	n	n
		no	no	no	no	no	no
justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?				0		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	n	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		У
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	У	У	n		У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	У	У	n		У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	У	У	n		У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	У	У	У	n	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	n	У	У	У	n	У
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		У	У	У		У

	REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs				
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		У	У	У		n
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	FOR NRSIs						
in individual studies that were included in the review?	Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias?				0		
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCT
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?				0		
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a				0		
	specified outcome? Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	У				
A vv re	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity						У

	REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only R				
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES				
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available						
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	Includes onl RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n				
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	У				

	REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs				
syntnesis <i>:</i>	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	YES				
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	У
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	У	n	n	n	
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	У	n	У	У	У	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review		У				У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	YES				
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	n	У	У	У
conflict of interest, including any funding they received for	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest			n			
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES

	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT				
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions and	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
inclusion criteria for the review	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У
include the components of the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У
PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	у	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion						
	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review							
contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes				
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/						
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating						
·	heterogeneity?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any						
	deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES				
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	n	n	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?						
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant)						
	databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs					
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	У	У	n	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	У		n	У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	У		n	У	У
search strategy:	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n		n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n		n	У	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У		У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	У	У	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У	n	У	У	У
	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted			n			
	by one reviewer.						

	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT				
	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	У	n	n
a list of excluded studies and		no	no	no	partial yes	no	no
justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?				У		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	n
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	no				
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У	n	У	n	
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У	n	У	n	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У	n	У	n	
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	У	n	У	n	
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	У	У	n	У	n	
	Overall	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes				
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	n	У	У	У
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias?						
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a						
	specified outcome? Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	У	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У	No meta-analysis conducted
A v r	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У		У	У	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У		У	У	

	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RC
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	No meta-analys conducted
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	No meta-analysis conducted	n	n	No meta-analy conducted
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.		n	No meta-analysis conducted	У	n	No meta-analy conducted

	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
synthesis?	Overall	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	n
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	n	n	У	n	n
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	У	У	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	NO	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	n	У	У	У
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest			n			
		YES	YES				

	REVIEW ID	Tan 2015	Abaraogu 2016	Smith 2016	Armour 2019	Harvie 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCT and NRSIs
	Population	n	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions and	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У
inclusion criteria for the review	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У
include the components of the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У
PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)					
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes				
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	У	У	n	n
of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations		У	У	У	n	n
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	У	У	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	У	У	У	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	У	У	У	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?					
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?					
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Tan 2015	Abaraogu 2016	Smith 2016	Armour 2019	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	n	У	У	У
		no	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			У	У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?			У	У	n
Scalen Strategy.	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?			n	n	У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?			У	У	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			У	У	У
	Overall	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	У	У	n
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.					У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У	У	У	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n				0
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES

	REVIEW ID	Tan 2015	Abaraogu 2016	Smith 2016	Armour 2019	Harvie 2019
ТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCT and NRSIs
7. Did the review authors provide	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	У	n	n
a list of excluded studies and		no	no	partial yes	no	no
justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			У		
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	n	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
B. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?		У	У	У	У
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?		У	У	У	n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?		У	У	У	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?		У	У	У	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?		У	У	У	n
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes				
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У

	REVIEW ID	Tan 2015	Abaraogu 2016	Smith 2016	Armour 2019	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n	У	У	У	n
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
in individual studies that were	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?					n
included in the review:	Did it assess selection bias?					n
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?					
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?					
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У	У	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		У	У	У	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		У	У	У	

	REVIEW ID	Tan 2015	Abaraogu 2016	Smith 2016	Armour 2019	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCT and NRSIs
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis					No meta-analysis conducted
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)					
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available					
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review					
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysi conducted
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n	n	n	No meta-analysis conducted
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	n	У	n	No meta-analysis conducted

	REVIEW ID	Tan 2015	Abaraogu 2016	Smith 2016	Armour 2019	Harvie 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
Synchesis.	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	n	n	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results		n	У	n	n
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n	У	n	n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	У	n	У	У	У
conflict of interest, including any funding they received for	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		n			
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	Population	У	n	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	n	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	n	У	У	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	n	У	У	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)						
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	n	У	У	У	У	У
that the review methods were		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	у	У	n	n
of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/						
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	n	n	Y	У	У	n
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	Y	У	У	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	У	n	n
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?			n	У	n	
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?	n	У				n
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	n	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	n	У	У	У	n	У
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		У	У	У		У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	n	У		n
search strategy?	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n	n	У		У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		n	n	n		n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		n	n	У		У
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	n	У	У	У	n
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n	n				У
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	n	У	У	У	У

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n	n				
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	У	n	n
studies and justify the exclusions?		no	no	no	partial yes	no	no
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant			n	У	У	У
	study? <b>Overall</b>	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	y y		y	y Y		
	Did it describe the interventions?	y y	У У	y V	y y	У У	У У
	Did it describe the comparators?	n	y y	y y	y y	y y	y y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	y	y	y	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	n	У	У	У	n	У
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?		n	У	У		У
ndequate detail? C	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?		n	У	У		n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?		n	У	У		n
	Did it describe the study's setting?		n	n	У		n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?		n	n	У		n
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCT and NRSIs
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	У	У	У	n	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	n	У
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		У	У	У		У
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		У	n	У		n
assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	Overall (RCTs)	NO	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
in individual studies that were	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?	n	n				n
Included in the review?	Did it assess selection bias?	У	У				n
		NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?						
	Overall (NRSIs)	NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO
-	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У	У	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			У	У	У	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity			У	У	У	
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted				No meta-analysis conducted
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available						
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	Overall (NRSIs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	n	n	No meta-analysis conducted
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	У	У	n	No meta-analysis conducted
synthesis?	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	У	n	n	n
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	n		У	У	n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	У	n	У	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	n	n		У		n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO

	Review ID	Direkvand- Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	n	У	Υ	У	У	У
report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	n					
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs
	Population	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У
review include the components	Outcome	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	
	Overall	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У
that the review methods were		partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	У
of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations	Has it specified a meta-analysis/	У
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	У
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	У
	Overall	YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?	
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?	
	Overall	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	У
		partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У
search strategy:	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES
5. Did the review authors	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У
perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	
	Overall	YES
	Overall at least two reviewers achieved	YES

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	
	Overall	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	У
studies and justify the		partial yes
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	У
	Overall	YES
	Did it describe the populations?	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У
		partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	У
	Overall	YES

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У
		partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У
satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB)	Overall (RCTs)	YES
in individual studies that were	FOR NRSIs	
included in the review?	Did it assess confounding?	
included in the review:	Did it assess selection bias?	
		Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?	
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	YES

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs
	<b>FOR RCTs</b> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	YES
	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available	
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately	

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n
<ul> <li>12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?</li> <li>13. Did the review authors</li> </ul>	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У
	Overall	YES
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У
	Overall	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	У
	Overall	YES

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES
10 Distails and the seather seather sea	The authors reported no competing interests	У
conflict of interest, including any funding they received for	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	
	Overall	YES

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Population	У	У
I. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У
review include the components	Outcome	У	У
of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)		
	Overall	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion	У	У
	criteria?	5	5
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У
that the review methods were		partial yes	partial yes
established prior to the conduct	Is the protocol registered?	n	У
of the review and did the report		n	y
justify any significant deviations	synthesis plan (if approriate)?		y
from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	У
	Has it specified justification for any		
	deviation from the protocol?	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?		
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		
	Overall	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	did it justify publication (e.g. langauge) restrictions?	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	У
Search Stategy.	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	У	У
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
5 Didaha aminya shkara	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У
. Did the review authors erform study selection in uplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		
	Overall	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.		

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	У	У
provide a list of excluded		partial yes	partial yes
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У
adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow- up?	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
9. Did the review authors use a	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У
satisfactory technique for	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES
assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias?		
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?		
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	YES
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У
	<b>T</b> I II I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		
	AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available		
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	n	
	Overall	NO	YES
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У

13. Did the review authors

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	
	Overall	NO	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	У	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review		У
	Overall	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	NO	YES
16. Did the review authors	The authors reported no competing interests	n	У
report any potential sources of	OR the authors described their funding		
conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	n	