

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease						
		Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopoulou 2018	Iqbal 2018
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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	y
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	n	y	y	y	y	n
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
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 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	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	y	n	n	y	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	y	n	n	n	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	NO
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?	n	y	n	n	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?							
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease						
		Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopoulou 2018	Iqbal 2018
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	y	y	n	n	y	n
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	y	y	n	n	y	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL 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	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.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	y	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.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	y	y	n	n	n
		partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	NO

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease						
		Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopoulou 2018	Iqbal 2018
Studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	y		y	y			
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	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	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	n	n	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	y	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
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?	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y	y	y	
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n	n	y	y	y	n	
	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
	FOR NRSIs							
	Did it assess confounding?							
	Did it assess selection bias?							

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease						
		Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopoulou 2018	Iqbal 2018
		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)	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
	FOR RCTs			No meta-analysis conducted				
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y		y	y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y		y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y		y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)							

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease						
		Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopoulou 2018	Iqbal 2018
	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	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	n	y	y	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.	n	y			n	n	n
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
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	y	y	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	n	n
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease						
		Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopoulou 2018	Iqbal 2018
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	y	n	n	y	y	n
Overall		YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	NO	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	NO	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	y	y	y	n
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008)

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease			Irritable bowel syndrome			
		Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	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	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)	n	n	y	y	n	n	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 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?	y	n	n	n	y	n	y
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	n	n	n	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
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	n		y	n	y	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			n				
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease			Irritable bowel syndrome			
		Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	y	y	n	y	n	n	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	y	y	n	n	n	n	y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	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	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.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	y	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.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	y	n	n	n	y
		partial yes	NO	partial yes	NO	NO	NO	partial yes

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease			Irritable bowel syndrome			
		Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
Studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	y		y				y
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	n	n	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	y	y	n	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
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?	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	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	y
		partial yes	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	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs							
	Did it assess confounding?			n				
	Did it assess selection bias?			n				

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease			Irritable bowel syndrome			
		Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
		Includes only RCTs	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?							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
	FOR RCTs	No meta-analysis conducted	y	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y	y	y
	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)		y		y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		y		y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs			No meta-analysis conducted				
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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)							

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease			Irritable bowel syndrome			
		Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
	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	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	No meta-analysis conducted	n	na	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.		y		y	y	y	y
	Overall	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	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	y	n	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		y		y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	y	y	n	n	n	y	y

	Review ID	Inflammatory bowel disease			Irritable bowel syndrome			
		Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review			n	y	y		
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	No meta-analysis conducted	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	yes	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	n	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				y	y		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/)

	Review ID	ndrome			GORD
		Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
ITEM	Question	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
	Intervention	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 a review question?	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	n	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	n	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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 ?	n	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?				
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	Review ID	ndrome			GORD
		Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		y	n	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	y	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		y	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		y	y	n
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	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	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	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.				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	n	n
		NO	partial yes	NO	NO

	Review ID	ndrome			GORD
		Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		y		
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	y	n	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	n	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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?	FOR RCTs				
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	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	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs				
	Did it assess confounding?				
	Did it assess selection bias?				

	Review ID	ndrome			GORD
		Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
		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
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	YES	NO	NO	NO
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR RCTs			No meta-analysis conducted	
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	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
	Overall (RCTs)	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)				

	Review ID	Indrome			GORD
		Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
	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
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	n	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.	y	y		y
	Overall	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	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	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	y	y	n	y
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	y	n	n	n

	Review ID	ndrome			GORD
		Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
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	n	y
	Overall	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	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	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	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/

		MENSTRUAL CONDITIONS						
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 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	y	y	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
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	y	y	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	n	n	y	n	y	y	y
		NO	NO	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		MENSTRUAL CONDITIONS						
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			y	y	y	y	n
	Did it search trial/study registries?			n		y	y	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?			n		n	y	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?			n	n	y	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			y		y	y	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	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.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	y	y	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.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	y	n
		NO	NO	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO

		MENSTRUAL CONDITIONS						
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			y		y	y	
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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?	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	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	y
		partial yes	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	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs							
	Did it assess confounding?							
	Did it assess selection bias?							

	Review ID	MENSTRUAL CONDITIONS						
		Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
		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	NO
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR RCTs				No meta-analysis conducted			
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	y		y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y	y		y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y		y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	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)							

		MENSTRUAL CONDITIONS						
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
	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	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	n	n	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.	y	y	n	No meta-analysis conducted	y	y	n
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	NO
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	n	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	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	y	n	n	n

	Review ID	MENSTRUAL CONDITIONS						
		Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
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	y	y		y	y	y
Overall		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	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	y	y	y	n
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008)

		PREMENSTRUAL DISTURBANCES						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	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	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	y	n			n	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 a review question?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y	n	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	NO	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	y	n	y	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
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		y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?		y				y	
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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	n	y
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes

		PREMENSTRUAL DISTURBANCES						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	n	n	y	y		y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n	y	n		y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	n		y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	y	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	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	n	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				n	
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	n	y	y	y	n	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	
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	y	n	n	y
		NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes

	Review ID	PREMENSTRUAL DISTURBANCES						
		Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			y	y			y
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	y	y	y	y	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	n	y	y	y	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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?	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	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	y
		partial yes	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	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRIS							
	Did it assess confounding?		n				n	
	Did it assess selection bias?		n				n	

	Review ID	PREMENSTRUAL DISTURBANCES						
		Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
		Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?							
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis		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)							

		PREMENSTRUAL DISTURBANCES						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
	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	No meta-analysis conducted	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	y	n	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.		y		y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	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	y	n	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		y		y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n

	Review ID	PREMENSTRUAL DISTURBANCES						
		Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
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	y	n	y	y	y	y
Overall		YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	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	n	y	n	n	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest			y		y	y	
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/

		SYMPTOMS OF MENOPAUSE						
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Chaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohammadi 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	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	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)	y	n	y	n	n	n	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 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	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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	y	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			y				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		SYMPTOMS OF MENOPAUSE						
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Chaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohammadi 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	y	n	n	y	n	n
	Did it search trial/study registries?	y	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	y	n	n	y	n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	n	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		
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	n	n	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	n			
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	y	n
		partial yes	NO	NO	NO	NO	partial yes	NO

		SYMPTOMS OF MENOPAUSE						
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Chaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohammadi 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	y					y	
	Overall	YES	NO	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	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	n	n	n	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	n	n	n	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	n	n	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	y	n	y	n	n	y	y
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
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?	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	n	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	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y		y	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	y	n	n	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs							
	Did it assess confounding?			n				
	Did it assess selection bias?			n				

		SYMPTOMS OF MENOPAUSE						
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Chaderi 2020	Shinjo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohammadi 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
		Includes only RCTs	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?							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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)							

		SYMPTOMS OF MENOPAUSE						
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Chaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohammadi 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
	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	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	y	n	n	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.	y		y	n	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	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	y	n	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	y		y	y	n	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n

	Review ID	SYMPTOMS OF MENOPAUSE						
		Kanadys 2021	Chaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohammadi 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
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	y	y	y	y	y	y
Overall		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	YES	YES	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	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/

		ANXIETY						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	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	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)	n	n	y	n	n	n	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 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	y	y	y	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
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	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			y	y			
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		ANXIETY						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	n	n	n	y	n	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	y	n	y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	n	y	n	y
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	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	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
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	y	n	y	y	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
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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
		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

		ANXIETY						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?							
	Overall	NO	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	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	n	y	y	y	n	n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	n	y	n	y	n	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	y	y	y	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	n	y	n	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	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	y
		partial yes	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	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	n	y	y	n	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES

		ANXIETY						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
(RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs			n	n			
	Did it assess confounding?			n	n			
	Did it assess selection bias?			n	n			
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?							
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR RCTs		No meta-analysis conducted					
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y		y	y	y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y		y	y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y		y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs			No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted			
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis							

		ANXIETY						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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	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	y	No meta-analysis	n	n	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	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	YES	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	y	y	n	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			y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

		ANXIETY						
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
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	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	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	YES	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	y	y	y	n
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008)

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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	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)	y	y	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 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	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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	y	y	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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 search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	y	y	y	n	y	n	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	y	y	n	y	y	y	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	y	n	n	n	y	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	y	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	n	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.			n				
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	n	n	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.	y	n	n				
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	y	y	n	n	n	n	n
		partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	y	y					
	Overall	YES	YES	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	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	n	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	n	y	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	n	n	y	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	n	y	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	NO	PARTIAL YES	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y		y	y	y	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y		y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
(RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs							
	Did it assess confounding?							
	Did it assess selection bias?							
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only 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	NO	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis							

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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	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	n	n	n	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.	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	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	n	n	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	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
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	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	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	YES	YES	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	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/

		DEPRESSION						
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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	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)	n	n	y	n	n	n	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 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?	y	n	n	y	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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	y	y	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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 restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		DEPRESSION						
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	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 search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	y	y	n	n	y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	y	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	n	n	y
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	y	n	y	n	n	n	y
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	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	y	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		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	n	n	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		
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	n
		NO	NO	NO	NO	partial yes	NO	NO

		DEPRESSION						
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Chaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?					y		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	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	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	y	n	n	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	y	n	n	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	y	n	n	y	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	y	n	y	n	y	y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	y	y	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	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	y
		partial yes	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	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES

		DEPRESSION						
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
(RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs							
	Did it assess confounding?							
	Did it assess selection bias?							
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only 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)	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs							
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis							

		DEPRESSION						
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Chaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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	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	y	n	n	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.	y		y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	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	y	n	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	y		y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

		DEPRESSION						
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
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	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	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	YES	YES	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	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/

ITEM	Review ID	INSOMNIA			
		Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San-Martin 2010
	Question	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
	Intervention	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	y	n	y	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
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 a review question?	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	y	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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	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?				
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y	y
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y	y
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		INSOMNIA			
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San-Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	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 search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	y	y	y
	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	y	y	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	y	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	n	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.	n			
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	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.				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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
		NO	NO	NO	NO

		INSOMNIA			
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San-Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?				
	Overall	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
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y	y
		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	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	y	y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	FOR RCTs				
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	n	y	y	y
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	y
	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	INSOMNIA			
		Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San-Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
(RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs				
	Did it assess confounding?				
	Did it assess selection bias?				
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	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
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	YES	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs				
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	y	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
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs				
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis				

		INSOMNIA			
	Review ID	Shinryo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San-Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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
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	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.	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	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	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	y	y	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES

	Review ID	INSOMNIA			
		Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San-Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
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
	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	y	y
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	NO	NO	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
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	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	n	n	n
	Outcome	y	y	y	n	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
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 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?	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y	y
		NO	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	y	y	y	y	y
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	n	y	n	y
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	y	n	n	n
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
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	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?				n		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
	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
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	n	y	y	n	n	y
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	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	y			n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		n	y			n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		y	y			y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	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
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	y	y	y	n	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	
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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
		NO	NO	NO	partial yes	NO	NO

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?				y		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions?	n	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators?	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	n	y	y	y	n
	Did it describe the research designs?	n	y	y	y	y	n
	Overall	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?			y	y	y	
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?			y	y	y	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?			y	y	y	
	Did it describe the study's setting?			n	n	n	
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?			n	n	n	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies	FOR RCTs						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	partial yes	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y	y	
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	y	y	y	
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs				y		
	Did it assess confounding?				y		
	Did it assess selection bias?				y		
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	partial yes	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?				y		
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?				y		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	YES	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	y	n	No meta-analysis conducted	y	No meta-analysis conducted	n
	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
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	NO
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis				y		

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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				y		
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review				n		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	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	n	n	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	n	n	n	
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	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	y	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	y	
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results			n	n	n	

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review			n	y	n	
	Overall	#N/A	#N/A	NO	YES	NO	#N/A
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	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	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
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	n	y	n	n	y	y
	Outcome	y	y	n	y	y	y
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	y	y	n	n
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
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 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	y	n	n	y
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y	y	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
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	y	y
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	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
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	n	n	y	n	n	y
		NO	NO	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
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 search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			y			n
	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?			n			n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			y			y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	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		
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	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			
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?						
	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?	n	y	y	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
	Overall	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?		y	n		y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?		y	y		y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?		y	y		n	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?		y	n		y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?		n	y		n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies	FOR RCTs						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	n	y
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	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	y		y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs						
	Did it assess confounding?						
	Did it assess selection bias?						
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only 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
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs						No meta-analysis conducted
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	n	n	y	n	n	
	AND the authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	y	y	y	y	y	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y	y	
	Overall (RCTs)	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs						
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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	n	n	n	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.	n	n	n	n	n	No meta-analysis conducted
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	#N/A
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	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	y	y	n	n	y	No meta-analysis conducted
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	#N/A
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results		n	n	n	n	n

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
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	y	n	y	n
	Overall	#N/A	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	YES	YES	NO	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	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	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			
	Intervention	y	y	y			
	Comparator group	n	y	y			
	Outcome	y	y	n			
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	y	n			
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
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 a review question?	y	y	y			
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y			
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	n	y			
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	n	y	y			
		NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	y			
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y			
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y			
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n			
	Overall	NO	NO	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES
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			
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?	n					
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	y	y	y			
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	y	y	y			
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	n	y	y			
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?		y	y			
	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	n			
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?		n	n			
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?		n	n			
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?		y	y			
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	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	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	YES	YES	YES	YES
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	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					
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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			
		NO	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?						
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the populations?	y	y	y			
	Did it describe the interventions?	y	y	y			
	Did it describe the comparators?	y	y	y			
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y	y	y			
	Did it describe the research designs?	y	y	y			
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	y	y	y			
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	n	y			
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	y			
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	y	y			
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	n	y			
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies	FOR RCTs						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	n	y	y			
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	n	y	y			
		NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?		y	y			
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?		y	y			
	Overall (RCTs)	NO	YES	YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs	n					
	Did it assess confounding?	n					
	Did it assess selection bias?	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?						
	Overall (NRSIs)	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	Did the authors report on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review ? (including if the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors)	NO	NO	NO			
	FOR RCTs	n	y	y			
	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)	y	y	y			
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y			
	Overall (RCTs)	NO	YES	YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	FOR NRSIs	n					
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	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	y					
	AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review	n					
	Overall (NRSIs)	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
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	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.	n	n	n			
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
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	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	n			
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n			

		DIABETES					
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
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	y	y			
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	The authors performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	YES	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			
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

ITEM	Review ID	Fatigue conditions			Acne	Acne	Acne
		Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICO?	Population	y	y		y	y	n
	Intervention	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Comparator group	y	y	y	n	n	n
	Outcome	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
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 a review question?	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it include a search strategy?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	y	y	y	n	y	n
	Did it include a risk of bias assessment?	y	y	y	y	y	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes	NO
	Is the protocol registered?	n	y	n	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/synthesis plan (if appropriate)?	y	y	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	y	y	y	y	n	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	y	y	y	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	NO
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 ?	n	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	n
	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
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. language, date?)	y	y	y	n	y	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes	NO

	Review ID	Fatigue conditions			Acne	Acne	Acne
		Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	n	y		n	
	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?	y	y	y		y	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL 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	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
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	y	y	y	y	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
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the	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	n	y	n	n
		NO	partial yes	NO	partial yes	NO	NO

ITEM	Review ID	Fatigue conditions			Acne	Acne	Acne
		Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
studies and justify the exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?		y		y		
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	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	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	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	y	y	y
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	y	y	y	n	y	y
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	n	n	y	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	y	n	n	y	y	y
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
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?	FOR RCTs						
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	y	y	y	y	y	n
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	y	y	y	y	y	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	y	y	y	y	y	
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	y	y	n	y	n	
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
	FOR NRSIs						
	Did it assess confounding?					n	n

	Review ID	Fatigue conditions			Acne	Acne	Acne
		Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
review :	Did it assess selection bias?					y	n
		Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	NO
	Did it assess methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes?						
	Did it assess selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	NO
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for individual 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	NO	NO
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR RCTs					No meta-analysis conducted	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)	y	y	y	y		
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y		
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	FOR NRSIs					No meta-analysis conducted	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)						

ITEM	Review ID	Fatigue conditions			Acne	Acne	Acne
		Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	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	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	y	n	y	n	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.		y		y	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	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	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		y		y	y	n
	Overall	YES	YES	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	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	y	y	n	n

	Review ID	Fatigue conditions			Acne	Acne	Acne
		Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	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	YES	YES	NO	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	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	n	y	y	y	y
	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		y				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source: Shea et al 2017. BMJ 358: j4008 doi:10.1136 (https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008)