

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?</b>	Population	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)							
<b>2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n	y
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	n	n	n	n	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	n	y
<b>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	n	y	y	n
	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	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	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
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	y	y		n	n	n
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	y		n	y	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n		n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	y	n		n	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y		y	n	y
	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	y	n	n	y	y

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only 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	y		
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	n	n	y	y
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	y		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	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	n	n	n	n	n	n
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	n	y	y

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</b>	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	n	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	y	y	n		y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	y	y	n		y	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y		n	y	y

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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 satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	n	n		n	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
	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 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	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	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	<b>FOR RCTs</b>							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			y				
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity			y				
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis							
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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							

	Review ID	Lee 2011c	Ling 2014	Duong 2017	Arring 2019	Calcagni 2019	Harvie 2019	Liu 2020
ITEM	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
<b>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?</b>	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
	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	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
<b>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</b>	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	y	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 RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</b>	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>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?</b>	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-analysis conducted
	The authors reported no competing interests	y	Y	y	y	Y	y	Y
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>



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

	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
<b>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</b>	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	y	n	y	y	y
		no	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		y		y	y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?		n		n	n	n
	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	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
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	y	y	y	y	n	y
	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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	n	y	n	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	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
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
	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	y	n	n	n
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	no	no	partial yes	no	no	no
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n		n	n	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n		y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n		n	n	y	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n		n	n	y	y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n		n	y	y	n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	n	n	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	n	n	y	y	y
		partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwwe 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
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y			y	y	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n			n	n	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>						
	Did it assess confounding?	n	n	n			
	Did it assess selection bias?	y	n	n			
		<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	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?						
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	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)	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)				y		y

	Review ID	Lee 2011a	Robinson 2011	Strom 2016	Liu 2018	Hmwwe 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
<b>11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</b>	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity				y		y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted			
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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						
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
<b>12. If meta-analysis was</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y	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
<p>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?</p>	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	y
	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
<p>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	y	n	n
	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	y	n	y		y	y
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
<p>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p>	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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	y	n	y
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
<p>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?</p>	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
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
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

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



	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
<b>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</b>	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	n
		no	no
	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?		
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
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	y	y
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	y
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	

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

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>		
	Did it assess confounding?	n	
	Did it assess selection bias?	n	
		<b>NO</b>	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?		
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
	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)	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
<b>11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</b>	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	
	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	
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
<b>12. If meta-analysis was</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	y

	Review ID	O'Caoimh 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
<p>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?</p>	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	y
<p>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</p>	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	y	
	Overall	YES	YES
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n
<p>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</p>	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	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES
<p>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?</p>	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
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	The authors reported no competing interests	y	Y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

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

	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
<b>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</b>	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	y	y	n	y	n
		no	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	no
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		y	y		y	
	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	n		n	
	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?		y	n		n	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</b>	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	n	y	n	y	y
	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		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</b>	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	n	y	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>



	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
<b>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</b>	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	y	n	n	n	n	n
		partial yes	no	no	no	no	no
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	y					
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</b>	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	n	n	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	no	no	partial yes	no
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n			n	
	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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	n	n	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	n	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y			y	y

	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
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y			n	n
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	YES	YES	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>			n			
	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 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?						
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	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
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis			No meta-analysis conducted			
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	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
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-analysis 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
<b>Synthesis:</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>
<b>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	y	y
	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		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</b>	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>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?</b>	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	<b>YES</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

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

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

ITEM	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</b>	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	y	n
		no	no	no	no	partial yes	no
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		n			n	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</b>	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	n		n
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	n	y	n		n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	y	n	y		n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	n	n	n		n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y	y	y

ITEM	REVIEW ID	Wang 2017	Capezuti 2018	Waits 2018	Shang 2019	Chen 2020a	Samara 2020
	<b>Question</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n	n	n	y	y	n
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>						
	Did it assess confounding?		n				
	Did it assess selection bias?		y				
		Includes only RCTs	<b>NO</b>	Includes only RCTs	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?						
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
	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)	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		y	y		y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		y	y		y	y



	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
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs		No meta-analysis conducted				
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y
	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	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
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	y	y	n	y	y
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
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	y	n	n	n
	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	y	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?	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
	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 conducting the review?	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	y	n	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				n		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	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
<b>1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?</b>	Population	y	y	y	y	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)					
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y	y	y	y	y
<b>2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</b>	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	n	n	y	n	n
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	n	y	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	y	n
<b>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</b>	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?					
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?					
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y	y

	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
<b>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</b>	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	n	y	y	n
		no	no	partial yes	partial yes	no
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			y	y	
	Did it search trial/study registries?			y	n	
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?			n	n	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?			y	n	
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			y	n	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</b>	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	y	y	n	y
	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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	y	y	n	y
<b>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</b>	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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>

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

ITEM	REVIEW ID	Hmwe 2016	Sibbritt 2018	Waits 2018	Hmwe 2019	Chen 2020a
	<b>Question</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	n	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>					
	Did it assess confounding?					
	Did it assess selection bias?					
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?					
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?					
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	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)	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>					
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		y	y		y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		y	y		y

	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
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
	FOR NRSIs					
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis					
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	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	y		No meta-analysis conducted	
	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 account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	y	n	y
	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	y		y	
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	y	n	n	n	n
	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		y	y	n	y
	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
	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest					
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES



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

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</b>	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	y	n
		partial yes	no
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	
	Did it search trial/study registries?	y	
	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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</b>	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	y	y
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y
<b>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</b>	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.		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

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

ITEM	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
	<b>Question</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>		
	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?		
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
	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)	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		y

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
	FOR NRSIs		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	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.		
	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	YES

	REVIEW ID	Harvie 2019	Chen 2020a
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	y	y
	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
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n
	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	y
	Overall	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
	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	Overall	YES	YES

	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
<b>1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?</b>	Population	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)			n		n	n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y	y
<b>2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</b>	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
<b>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</b>	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n		n	n	n	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		n				
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y	y	y

	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
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	y	y	y	n	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	y	y		y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	y		y	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n		y	y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	y		y	y
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	n	y		y	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
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	y	y	y	y	n
	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	n	y	y
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		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>



	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
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	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
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?						
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n		y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n		y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n		y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n		y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n		y	n	y	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	n	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y		y	y	y	y

	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
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y		y	n	y	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	YES	NO	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>						
	Did it assess confounding?		n				
	Did it assess selection bias?		n				
		Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	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?						
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	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)	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	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			y		y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity			y		y	y

	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
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs		No meta-analysis conducted				
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y
	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	n	No meta-analysis conducted		

	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
synthesis?	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	y
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	
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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	y	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?	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
	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 report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	y	n	y	n
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				n		n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO

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

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	y
		no	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		y
	Did it search trial/study registries?		y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		y
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		y
	Overall	NO	YES
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	y	y
	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	y
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 a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	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
		no	no
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		
	Overall	NO	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n
	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	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
		FOR RCTs	
Did it assess unconcealed allocation?		n	y
Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?		n	y
		NO	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		y

ITEM	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
	<b>Question</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>		
	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?		
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
	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)	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		y



	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
	FOR NRSIs		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n
	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

	REVIEW ID	Godley 2020	Li 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>synthesis:</b>			
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>NO</b>
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n
<b>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</b>	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n
<b>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</b>	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	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>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?</b>	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>NO</b>
	The authors reported no competing interests	n	y
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	n	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>

	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 RCTs
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?	Population	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)				0		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y	y
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	n	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	n	n	n	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
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 both RCTs and NRSIs?						
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y	y	y

	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 RCTs
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	y	y	y	y	y	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	y	n	y	y	
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	y	n	n	n	
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	n	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	y	n	n	n	
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	n	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
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	y	n	n	y	y
	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		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	y	n	y	y	y
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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

	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 RCTs
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	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
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	no	no	no	no	no	no
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	y	y	n		y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	y	y	y	n		y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	y	y	n		y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	YES
	FOR RCTs						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	n	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes

	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 RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		y	y	y		n
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>				0		
	Did it assess confounding?				0		
	Did it assess selection bias?				0		
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs
	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 specified outcome?				0		
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	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	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)						y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity						y

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
<b>11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</b>	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis					
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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					
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted
<b>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?</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n
	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	y

REVIEW ID	White 2003	Cho 2010	Lathe 2011	Lee 2011c	Robinson 2011	Chung 2012
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>Question</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>Synthesis:</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	y
	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	y	n	n	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?</b>	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	y	n	y	y	n
	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		y			y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>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?</b>	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	n	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest			n		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>



	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
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?	Population	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)						
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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	n	n
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?						
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y	y	y

	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
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	y	y	n	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	y		n	y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	y	y		n	y	y
	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	y	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y		y	y	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
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	y	y	y	y	y	y
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.						
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	n	y	y	y
	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			
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

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
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	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	y	n
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	no	no	no	partial yes	no
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	y	n	y	n
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	y	n	y	n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	y	n	y	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	y	y	n	y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	n	y	n
	Overall	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs					
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y	y

ITEM	REVIEW ID	Chen 2013	Jiang 2013	Chen 2014	Kannan 2014	Abaraogu 2015	Song 2015
	<b>Question</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	n	y	y	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>						
	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 RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?						
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	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	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y		y	y	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y		y	y	

	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
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted
	FOR NRSIs						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	y	n	No meta-analysis conducted	n	n	No meta-analysis conducted
	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	y	n	No meta-analysis 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
	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	y	n	n	y	n	n
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n
	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	y	y	n	n	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?	Overall	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
	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 report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	The authors reported no competing interests	y	y	n	y	y	y
	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	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
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?	Population	n	y	y	y	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)					
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	y	y	n	n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
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 RCTs ?	y	y	y	y	n
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?					
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?					
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y	y

	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
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	n	y	y	y
		no	no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			y	y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?			y	y	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?			n	n	y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?			y	y	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			y	y	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
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	y	y	y	y	n
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.					y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	y	y	y	y
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
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>



	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
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	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	y	n	n
		no	no	partial yes	no	no
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			y		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?		y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?		y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?		y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?		y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?		y	y	y	n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>					
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y	y

	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
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n	y	y	y	n
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>					
	Did it assess confounding?					n
	Did it assess selection bias?					n
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	<b>NO</b>
	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?					
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>NO</b>
	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)	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>					
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y	y	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		y	y	y	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		y	y	y	

	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
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted
	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis					No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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
	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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	n	n	n
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	y	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
synthesis?		No meta-analysis conducted	NO	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	y	n	n	n	n
	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	y	n	n
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n
	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	y	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
	The authors reported no competing interests	y	n	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		n			
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?		YES	NO	YES	YES	YES

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

	Review ID	Direkvand-Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ITEM	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
<b>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</b>	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	n	y	y	y	y	y
	did it justify publication (e.g. language) restrictions?	n	y	y	y	n	y
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		y	y	y		y
	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	n	y		n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n	n	y		y
	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	y		y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
<b>5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</b>	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	n	y	y	y	n
	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				y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	n	y	y	y	y

	Review ID	Direkvand-Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ITEM	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
<b>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</b>	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				
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	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	y	n	n
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	no	no	no	partial yes	no	no
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</b>	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	n	y	y	y	n	y
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?		n	y	y		y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?		n	y	y		n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?		n	y	y		n
	Did it describe the study's setting?		n	n	y		n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?		n	n	y		n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
<b>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</b>	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	n	y	y	y	n	y
		no	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?		n	y	y		y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?		n	y	y		n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?		n	y	y		n
	Did it describe the study's setting?		n	n	y		n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?		n	n	y		n
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>

	Review ID	Direkvand-Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ITEM	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
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	<b>FOR RCTs</b>						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	n	y
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		y	y	y		y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		y	n	y		n
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	NO	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>						
	Did it assess confounding?	n	n				n
	Did it assess selection bias?	y	y				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?						
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO
	<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>						
	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
ITEM	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
<b>11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</b>	<b>FOR RCTs</b> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y	y	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			y	y	y	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity			y	y	y	
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>No meta-analysis conducted</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b> The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted				No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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
ITEM	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 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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	n	n	n	No meta-analysis conducted
	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	y	y	n	No meta-analysis conducted
	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	y	n	n	n
	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		y	y	n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	y	n	y	n
	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		y		n
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO

	Review ID	Direkvand-Moghadam 2013	Mollart 2015	Makvandi 2016	Smith 2017	Najafi 2018	Harvie 2019
ITEM	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
<b>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?</b>	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
	The authors reported no competing interests	n	y	Y	y	y	y
<b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	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
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
<b>1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?</b>	Population	y
	Intervention	y
	Comparator group	y
	Outcome	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y
<b>2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</b>	Did it include a search strategy?	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y
		partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	y
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y
<b>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</b>	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?	
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y

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

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
<b>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</b>	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.	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</b>	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	y
		partial yes
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</b>	Did it describe the populations?	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y
		partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>

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

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	<b>FOR RCTs</b>	
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>	
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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	Smith 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs
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?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n
	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.	y
	Overall	YES
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n
	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	y
	Overall	YES
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n
	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	y
	Overall	YES

	Review ID	Smith 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs
<b>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?</b>  <b>16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?</b>	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES
	The authors reported no competing interests	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	
	Overall	YES

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?</b>	Population	y	y
	Intervention	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y
	Outcome	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)		
<b>2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	Did it include a review question?	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	y
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	n	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	n	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n
<b>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>	<b>PARTIAL YES</b>
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	y	n
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?		
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y

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

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

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</b>	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>		
	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?		
<b>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</b>	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
	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)	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FOR RCTs</b>		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y
	<b>Overall (RCTs)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>

ITEM	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
<b>11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?</b>	<b>FOR NRSIs</b>		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		
	AND the authors used an appropriate 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		
	<b>Overall (NRSIs)</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>	<b>Includes only RCTs</b>
<b>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?</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	y
	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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>13. Did the review authors</b>	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	y

	Review ID	Hewitt 2009	Waits 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	y	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		y
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>
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	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
	The authors reported no competing interests	n	y
16. Did the review authors 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	
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>