				Infla	mmatory bowel di	sease		
	Review ID	Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopou lou 2018	lqbal 2018
	Quartier	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
IIEM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	n	У	У	У	У	n
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
nd inclusion criteria for the eview include the components of the PICO? Did the report of the eview contain an explicit catement that the review nethods were established rior to the conduct of the eview and did the report ustify any significant eviations from the protocol? Did the review authors xplain their selection of the cudy designs for inclusion in	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	у	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	y	n	n	y	n
prior to the conduct of the	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
justify any significant	Has it specified a plan for investigating	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
deviations from the protocol?	Has it specified justification for any	У	У	n	n	n	у	У
	deviation from the protocol? Overall						YES	NO
7 8 44	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	PARTIAL YES	n	PARTIAL YES	n	n	n
explain their selection of the	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

				Inflar	nmatory bowel di	sease		
	Review ID	Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopou lou 2018	lqbal 2018
4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /				5	5		5
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?	У	У	У	n	n	У	n
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n	n	n	У	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	У	У	n	n	У	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	n	n	У	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	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 OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one	У	У	У	У	У	у	у
	reviewer.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	у	у	у	у	у	у
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	У	n	У	У	n	n	n
provide a list of excluded		partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	NO

				Inflar	nmatory bowel di	sease		
	Review ID	Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopou lou 2018	lqbal 2018
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	У		У	У			
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	n	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
. Did the review authors escribe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	У	У	У	У
tudies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	n	n	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	У	У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	n	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
	FOR RCTs						. 20	. 20
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У	n
	Did it assess lack of blinding of							
	patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	n
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У	
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple							
. Did the review authors use satisfactory technique for	measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	n	n	У	У	У	n	
ssessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs			. 20				
hat were included in the	Did it assess confounding?							
eview?	Did it assess selection bias?							

				Inflar	nmatory bowel di	sease		
	Review ID	Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopou lou 2018	lqbal 2018
		Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
		RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	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?	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
	Overall (NRSIs)	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Did the authors report on the sources							
10. Did the review authors	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?			NG		VEC	VEC	VEC
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
included in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors)							
	FOR RCTs			No meta-				
	The authors justified combining the	У	У	analysis	У	У	У	У
	data in a meta-analysis			conducted				
	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study	У	У		У	У	У	У
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity	5	5		3	5	2	5
	(where present)							
	The authors investigated the causes of	У	У		У	У	У	У
	any heterogeneity			No meta-				
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES
		123	125	conducted	123	123	125	123
	FOR NRSIs							
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the							
performed, did the review	data in a meta-analysis							
authors use appropriate	AND the authors used an approriate							
methods for statistical	weighted technique to combine study							
combination of results?	results and adjusted for heterogeneity							
combination of results:	(where present)							

				Inflai	mmatory bowel di	sease		
	Review ID	Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopou lou 2018	lqbal 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
	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	У	У	n	n	n
12. If meta-analysis was	RCIS							
performed, did the review	OR, if the pooled estimate was based							
authors assess the potential	on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB,							
impact of RoB in individual	the authors performed analyses to	n	У			n	n	n
studies on the results of the	investigate possible impact of RoB on							
meta-analysis or other	summary estimates of effect.							
evidence synthesis?	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
	the SR included only low risk of bias							
13. Did the review authors	RCTs	n	У	У	У	n	n	n
account for RoB in individual	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high							
studies when	RoB, or NRSI were included the review	RCTs n n NO						
interpreting/discussing the	provided a discussion of the likely	n				n	n	n
results of the review?	impact of RoB on the results							
	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

				Inflar	nmatory bowel di	sease		
	Review ID	Liu 2021	Chadan 2020	Coelho 2020	Goulart 2020	Zheng 2020	Grammatikopou lou 2018	lqbal 2018
provide a satisfactory	OR if heterogeneity was present the							
explanation for, and	authors performed an investigation of							
discussion of, any	sources of any heterogeneity in the	У	У	n	n	У	У	n
heterogeneity observed in	results and discussed the impact of							
the results of the review?	this on the results of the review							
	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У	n
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							n
review?	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)

		Infla	mmatory bowel d	isease				Irritable bowel
	Review ID	Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
	Quanting	Includes only	Includes only	Includes both	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
ITEM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs and NRSIs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	У	У	n	n	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion							
2. Did the report of the	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
rior to the conduct of the eview and did the report		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	У	n	n	n	У	n	У
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/	t? y partial yes par y y y						
	synthesis plan (if approriate)?		У	n	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified a plan for investigating							
deviations from the protocol?	heterogeneity?	У	У	n	У	У	У	Y
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Has it specified justification for any							
	deviation from the protocol?	У	n	n	n	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
	Did the review provide an explanation							
3. Did the review authors	for including only RCTs ?	У	n		У	n	У	У
	Did the review provide an explanation							
explain their selection of the	for including only NRSIs?							
study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation							
the review?	for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			n				
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant)	У	У	у	У	у	У	У
	databases?							
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	()) -) -) -)	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

	bibliographies of included studies? Did it search trial/study registries? Did it include/consult content experts in the field? Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature? Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review? Overall at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include 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 at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract	Inflar	nmatory bowel o	lisease				Irritable bowel s
	Review ID	Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /							
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
earch strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	У	n	У	n	n	У
		У	У	n	n	n	n	У
		У	У	У	У	У	n	У
		У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
. Did the review authors	agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
erform study selection in uplicate?	eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one							
		YES	YES	VEC	YES	YES	VEC	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	YES У	y y	YES y	y y	y y	YES У	y y
Did the review authors erform data extraction in uplicate?	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	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded	У	n	У	n	n	n	У
provide a list of excluded	from the review?	partial yes	NO	partial yes	NO	NO	NO	partial yes
tudies and justify the		partial yes	NU	partial yes	NU	NU	NU	partial yes

		Infla	mmatory bowel di	sease				Irritable bowel s
	Review ID	Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	У		У				У
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	n	n	У	У	У	У
tudies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	n	n	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	n	n	У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	У	n	У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	·	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
). Did the review authors use	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	specified outcome?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Overall (RCTs)	TES	YES	TES	TES	TES	YES	YES
(RoB) in individual studies that were included in the	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?			n				
review?	Did it assess selection bias?			n				

		Inflar	nmatory bowel di	sease				Irritable bowel s	
	Review ID	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 The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	No meta- analysis conducted	У	No meta- analysis conducted	У	У	У	У	
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)		У		У	У	У	У	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity		У		У	У	У	У	
	Overall (RCTs)	No meta- analysis conducted	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 approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)			No meta- analysis conducted					

		Inflar	nmatory bowel di	sease				Irritable bowel s
	Review ID	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	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	No meta- analysis conducted	n	No meta- analysis conducted	n	na	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.		У		У	У	У	У
evidence synthesis?	Overall	No meta- analysis conducted	YES	No meta- analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	У	n	n	n	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results		У		У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	У	У	n	n	n	У	У

		Inflar	nmatory bowel	disease				Irritable bowel s
	Review ID	Kafil 2017	Kim 2017	Langhorst 2015	Black 2020	Hawrelak 2020	Tan 2020	Alammar 2019
provide a satisfactory	OR if heterogeneity was present the							
explanation for, and	authors performed an investigation of							
discussion of, any	sources of any heterogeneity in the			n	У	У		
heterogeneity observed in	results and discussed the impact of							
the results of the review?	this on the results of the review							
	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	n	n	У	У
of conflict of interest,	OR the authors described their							
including any funding they	funding sources and how they				У	У		
received for conducting the review?	managed potential conflicts of interest							
icticit.	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

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

		ndrome			GORD	
	Review ID	Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020	
	Quanting	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	
ITEM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	
	Population	У	У	У	У	
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	
. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	
statement that the review		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	
prior to the conduct of the	Has it specified a meta-analysis/					
review and did the report	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	n	У	
justify any significant	Has it specified a plan for investigating					
deviations from the protocol?		У	У	n	У	
-	Has it specified justification for any					
	deviation from the protocol?	У	n	n	n	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	
3. Did the review authors	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	n	n	У	n	
	Did the review provide an explanation					
explain their selection of the	for including only NRSIs?					
study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation					
the review?	for including both RCTs and NRSIs?					
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	
	(partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	

		ndrome			GORD	
	Review ID	Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020	
4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /			-		
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?		У	n	У	
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?		n	У	У	
	Did it include/consult content experts		n	n	n	
	in the field?				11	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey		У	n	n	
	literature?		y			
	Did it conduct search within 24		У	У	n	
	months of completion of the review?		y	y		
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	
	at least two reviewers independently					
	agreed on selection of eligible studies	У	У	У	У	
	and achieved consensus on which	5	5	5		
b. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	studies to include					
	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	
	at least two reviewers achieved					
	consensus on which data to extract	У	У	У	У	
	from included studies					
6. Did the review authors	OR two reviewers extracted data from					
perform data extraction in	a sample of eligible studies and					
duplicate?	achieved good agreement (at least 80					
	percent), with the remainder					
	extracted by one reviewer. Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	Did the SR provided a list of all	TES	TES	TES	TES	
	potentially relevant studies that were					
	read in full-text form but excluded	n	У	n	n	
7. Did the review authors	from the review?					
provide a list of excluded	excluded from the review?		partial yes	NO	NO	
studies and justify the		NO	partial yes	NU	NU	

		ndrome			GORD
	Review ID	Hong 2018	Ng 2018	Anheyer 2017a	Sadeghi 2020
	Did the SR justify the exclusion from				
exclusions?	the review of each potentially relevant		У		
	study?				
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	n	У
describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	У	n	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN	n	n	n	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for				
	follow-up?	У	У	n	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	у	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У
9. Did the review authors use	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple	У	У	У	У
a satisfactory technique for	Theasurements of analyses of a		-		-
• •	specified outcome.		VEC	VEC	VEC
assessing the risk of bias			YES	YES	YES
(RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs				
that were included in the	Did it assess confounding?				
review?	Did it assess selection bias?				

		ndrome			GORD
	Review ID	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
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	У	No meta- analysis conducted	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У		У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У		У
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	No meta- analysis conducted	YES
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)				

		ndrome			GORD
	Review ID	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	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	No meta- analysis conducted	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У	У		У
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	YES	No meta- analysis conducted	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	У	n	У
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	У	n	n	n

		ndrome			GORD
	Review ID	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 Overall	YES	y YES	n NO	y 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 OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES

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

				MEN	STRUAL CONDIT	IONS		
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Population		У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
eview contain an explicit tatement that the review nethods were established	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	У	У	n
prior to the conduct of the	Has it specified a meta-analysis/			.,	5	.,		
	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У	n	У	У	У
justify any significant	Has it specified a plan for investigating	V	У	У	n	У	N	N
deviations from the protocol?	heterogeneity?	У	У	у		у	У	У
	Has it specified justification for any	n	N	N/	V		N/	N
	deviation from the protocol?		У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
3. Did the review authors	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
explain their selection of the	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
study designs for inclusion in the review?	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?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	n	n	У	n	У	У	У
		NO	NO	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

				MEN	STRUAL CONDITI	ONS		
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /			У	У	У	У	n
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?			У	У	У	у	11
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?			n		У	У	n
	Did it include/consult content experts			n		n	У	n
	in the field?						3	
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey			n	n	У	n	n
	literature?				••	5		
	Did it conduct search within 24			У		У	у	n
	months of completion of the review?						-	
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently							
	agreed on selection of eligible studies	У	У	У	У	У	у	У
	and achieved consensus on which	5	5	3	5	3	5	5
5. Did the review authors	studies to include							
perform study selection in	OR two reviewers selected a sample of							
duplicate?	eligible studies and achieved good							
adphoater	agreement (at least 80 percent), with							
	the remainder selected by one							
	reviewer.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved							
	consensus on which data to extract	У	У	У	У	У	У	n
	from included studies							
6. Did the review authors	OR two reviewers extracted data from							
perform data extraction in	a sample of eligible studies and							
duplicate?	achieved good agreement (at least 80							
	percent), with the remainder							
	extracted by one reviewer.							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
	Did the SR provided a list of all							
	potentially relevant studies that were	n	n	У	n	У	У	n
7. Did the review authors	read in full-text form but excluded	. 1		У		У	У	
provide a list of excluded	from the review?							
studies and justify the		NO	NO	partial yes	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO

				MEN	STRUAL CONDITI	ONS		
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			У		У	У	
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
. Did the review authors	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	У	У	У	У
describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	У	У	У	У	У	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 YE
	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation? Did it assess lack of blinding of	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	,	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
. Did the review authors use	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
satisfactory technique for	specified outcome?							
ssessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs							
hat were included in the	Did it assess confounding?							
eview?	Did it assess selection bias?							

				MEN	STRUAL CONDIT	IONS		
	Review ID	Negi 2021	Xu 2020	Mollazadeh 2019	Pellow 2018	Chen 2016	Pattanittum 2016	Daily 2015
		Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
		RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	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	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	
	Did the suther ware to the second	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
10. Did the review authors	Did the authors report on the sources							
	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for							
included in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors) FOR RCTs				No meta-			
	The authors justified combining the	У	y	V	analysis	У		У
	data in a meta-analysis	у	У	У	conducted	У	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate				conducted			
	weighted technique to combine study							
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity	У	У	У		У	У	У
	(where present)							
	The authors investigated the causes of							
	any heterogeneity	У	У	У		У	У	У
					No meta-	1		
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	analysis	YES	YES	YES
					conducted			
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the							
performed, did the review	data in a meta-analysis							
authors use appropriate	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study							
methods for statistical	results and adjusted for heterogeneity							
combination of results?	(where present)							

				MEN	STRUAL CONDIT	IONS		
	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	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	No meta- analysis conducted	n	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У	У	n	No meta- analysis conducted	У	У	n
evidence synthesis?	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	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	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	У	n	n	n

				MEN	STRUAL CONDITI	ONS		
	Review ID	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	У	у	У		У	У	У
	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У	n
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							n
review?	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)

			PREME	NSTRUAL DISTUR	BANCES			
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
ІТЕМ	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
	Population	У		У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	у	n			n	У
-	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	y y	y	У	У	y y	n	y
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion							_
2. Did the report of the	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	y	У	У	У	У	y
statement that the review		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	у	n	У	n	n
rior to the conduct of the Feview and did the report s	Has it specified a meta-analysis/			5		5		
	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified a plan for investigating							
deviations from the protocol?		У	У	У	У	У	У	У
deviations nom the protocol:	Has it specified justification for any							
	deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation	PARIAL ILS	PARTIAL TES	PARIALIES	PARHALIES	PARIAL ILS		PARIAL ILS
	for including only RCTs ?	У		У	У	У		У
3. Did the review authors	Did the review provide an explanation							
explain their selection of the	for including only NRSIs?							
study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation							
the review?			У				У	
	for including both RCTs and NRSIs? Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
		TES	TES	TES	TES	TES	TES	TES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	databases? did it provide key word and/or search							
		У	У	У	У	У	n	У
	strategy							
	did it justify publication restrictions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	(e.g. langauge, date?)			and the first second second			NO	
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO	partial yes

			PREME	NSTRUAL DISTURI	BANCES			
	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	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	У	n	n	У	У		У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n	У	n		У
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	n		У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	У	n		n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У	n		У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	n	У	У	У	n	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.		n				n	
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	n	У	У	У	n	У
Did the review authors erform data extraction in uplicate?	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	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	У	У	n	n	У
provide a list of excluded		NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes

			PREMEI	NSTRUAL DISTUR	BANCES			
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			У	У			У
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У	У	n	У
lescribe the included tudies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У	У	n	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	У	У	У	У	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	У	n	У	У	У	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	,	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple					, v		
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for	measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
assessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
(RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs		n				2	
that were included in the	Did it assess confounding?		n				n	
review?	Did it assess selection bias?		n				n	

			PREME	NSTRUAL DISTUR	BANCES			
	Review ID	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
	Did the authors report on the sources							
10. Did the review authors	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for							
cluded in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors)							
	FOR RCTs	N.	N.			N.		
	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study							
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	(where present)							
	The authors investigated the causes of							
	any heterogeneity	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs		No meta-				No meta-	
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the		analysis				analysis	
performed, did the review	data in a meta-analysis		conducted				conducted	
authors use appropriate	AND the authors used an approriate							
methods for statistical	weighted technique to combine study							
combination of results?	results and adjusted for heterogeneity							
	(where present)							

			PREME	NSTRUAL DISTURI	BANCES			
	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
I2. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	У	n	n	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.		У		У	У	У	У
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	У	n	n	n	n
count for RoB in individual dudies when terpreting/discussing the terpreting/discussing	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results		У		У	У	У	У
	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

			PREMEN	NSTRUAL DISTUR	BANCES			
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Csupor 2019	Verkaik 2017	van Die 2013	Castelo-Branco 2021	Firoozeei 2021
provide a satisfactory	OR if heterogeneity was present the							
explanation for, and	authors performed an investigation of							
discussion of, any	sources of any heterogeneity in the	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
heterogeneity observed in	results and discussed the impact of							
the results of the review?	this on the results of the review							
	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	n	У	n	n	У
f conflict of interest, ncluding any funding they eceived for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest			У		У	У	
review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

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

			SYM	TOMS OF MENOP	AUSE			
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohamma di 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
ITEN4	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes both	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
II EM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs and NRSIs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
TEM Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the eview include the components of the PICO? Did the report of the eview contain an explicit tatement that the review nethods were established prior to the conduct of the eview and did the report ustify any significant leviations from the protocol? Did the review authors explain their selection of the tudy designs for inclusion in he review?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	У	n	У	n	n	n	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion						-	
2. Did the report of the	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
statement that the review		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
rior to the conduct of the eview and did the report ustify any significant eviations from the protocol?	Has it specified a meta-analysis/							
	synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified a plan for investigating							
		У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified justification for any							
	deviation from the protocol?	У	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation							
	for including only RCTs ?	У	У		У	У	У	У
	Did the review provide an explanation							
•	for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation							
the review?	for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			У				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant)							
	databases?	PARTIAL YES I on y I on y I on I I on I I	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search							
	strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions?							
	(e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
(1	(0.9.1	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

			SYMP	TOMS OF MENOF	AUSE			
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohamma di 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
	Did it search the reference lists /	N.	N.	n	n		n	n
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?	У	У	11	11	У	11	11
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	n	n	У	У	У	У
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	У	n	n	У	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?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
Did the review authors erform study selection in uplicate?	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	n	n	n	У	У
	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good							
	agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one			n	n	n		
	reviewer. Overall	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved	TES	TES	NO	NO	NO	TES	TES
	consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	n	n	n	У	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.			n	n			
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded	У	n	n	n	n	У	n
provide a list of excluded	from the review?	partial yes	NO	NO	NO	NO	partial yes	NO

			SYMP	TOMS OF MENOP	PAUSE			
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Chorbani 2019	Shahmohamma di 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?	У					У	
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	n	n	n	У
lescribe the included itudies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	n	n	n	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	n	n	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	n	У	n	n	У	У
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	n	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	no	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У		У	У
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	У	У	n	n	У
assessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	YES
(RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs							
that were included in the	Did it assess confounding?			n				
review?	Did it assess selection bias?			n				

			SYMF	PTOMS OF MENOF	PAUSE			
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohamma di 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
		Includes only	Includes only	NO	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
		RCTs	RCTs	NO	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	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
	Did the authors report on the sources							
10. Did the review authors	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
cluded in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors)							
	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	data in a meta-analysis							
	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	(where present)							
	The authors investigated the causes of	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	any heterogeneity							
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs			No meta-				
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the			analysis				
performed, did the review	data in a meta-analysis			conducted				
authors use appropriate	AND the authors used an approriate							
methods for statistical	weighted technique to combine study							
combination of results?	results and adjusted for heterogeneity							
combination of results:	(where present)							

			SYMP	TOMS OF MENOP	AUSE			
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohamma di 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	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У	n	n	n	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У		У	n	У	У	У
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У	n	n	n	n	n
ccount for RoB in individual (tudies when hterpreting/discussing the p	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У		У	У	n	У	У
	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

			SYMP	TOMS OF MENOP	AUSE			
	Review ID	Kanadys 2021	Ghaderi 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Ghorbani 2019	Shahmohamma di 2019	Najafi 2018a	Franco 2016
provide a satisfactory	OR if heterogeneity was present the							
explanation for, and	authors performed an investigation of							
discussion of, any	sources of any heterogeneity in the	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
heterogeneity observed in	results and discussed the impact of							
the results of the review?	this on the results of the review							
	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
f conflict of interest, ncluding any funding they eceived for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

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

							ANXIETY	
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjyo 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
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	У	n	n	n	У
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	у	У
statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	n	у	У	У	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	n	У	У	У	у	У
justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating	У	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	У			У	у	у
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?							
study designs for inclusion in the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?			У	У			
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

							ANXIETY	
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjyo 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	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	У	n	n	n	У	n	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n	y	У	У	У
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	У	n	У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	n	n	У	n	У
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES
5. Did the review authors	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	n	У	У	У	n
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.			n				n
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У	n	У	У	У	n
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.			n				n
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
provide a list of excluded		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

							ANXIETY	
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019
ІТЕМ	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
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?							
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	n	У	У	У	У	У
studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	n	У	У	У	n	n
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	n	У	n	У	n	n
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	У	У	У	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	n	У	n	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	PARTIAL YES	partial yes	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
9. Did the review authors use	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a	У	У	n	У	У	n	У
a satisfactory technique for	specified outcome?							
assessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES

							ANXIETY	
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjyo 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	FOR NRSIs			n	n			
that were included in the	Did it assess confounding?			11				
review?	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
	Did the authors report on the sources							
10. Did the review authors	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for							
included in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors)							
	FOR RCTs		No meta-					
	The authors justified combining the	У	analysis	У	У	У	У	У
	data in a meta-analysis		conducted					
	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study	У		У	У	У	У	У
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity							
	(where present) The authors investigated the causes of							
	any heterogeneity	У		У	У	У	У	У
	any neterogeneity		No meta-					
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
		. 20	conducted	. 20	. 20	. 20	. 25	.20
			conducted	No meta-	No meta-			
	The authors justified combining the			analysis	analysis			
11. If meta-analysis was	data in a meta-analysis			conducted	conducted			
performed, did the review								

							ANXIETY	
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjyo 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
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	No meta- analysis conducted	No meta- analysis conducted	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	No meta- analysis	n	n	n	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.		No meta- analysis conducted	У	У	У	У	У
meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	No meta- analysis conducted	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	У	n	n	n	n	n
ccount for RoB in individual cudies when reterpreting/discussing the p	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely			У	У	У	У	У
results of the review?	impact of RoB on the results							

							ANXIETY		
	Review ID	Ghaderi 2020	Janda 2020	Shinjyo 2020	Donelli 2019	Hieu 2019	Marx 2019	Moller 2019	
ІТЕМ	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	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	
provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	У	n	У	У	У	У	У	
	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У	n	
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							У	
review?	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
	Quantian	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only				
ITEM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	У	У	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include inclusion/exclusion							
2. Did the report of the	criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report ustify any significant		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 approriate)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified a plan for investigating							
deviations from the protocol?	heterogeneity?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified justification for any							
	deviation from the protocol?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES				
	Did the review provide an explanation							
3. Did the review authors	for including only RCTs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
explain their selection of the	Did the review provide an explanation							
study designs for inclusion in	for including only NRSIs?							
	Did the review provide an explanation							
the review?	for including both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant)							
	databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search							
	strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions?							
	(e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		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						
4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /							
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?	У	У	У	n	У	n	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	У	n	У	У	У	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	У	n	n	n	У	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	У	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one			n				
	reviewer. Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	n	n	y	n	y	у
5. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	У	n	n				
	Overall	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	У	У	n	n	n	n	n
provide a list of excluded		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
	o	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only				
ITEM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
studies and justify the	Did the SR justify the exclusion from							
exclusions?	the review of each potentially relevant	У	У					
	study?							
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes				
8. Did the review authors	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	n	У	У	У
escribe the included udies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	n	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	n	У	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	n	n	У	n	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs							
	Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of							
	patients and assessors (for subjective	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	outcomes)?							
		PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO	PARTIAL YES	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that	N.						
	was not truly random?	У	У		У	У	У	У
	Did it assess selection of the reported							
	results from among multiple	N.	<i>.</i>		<i>\</i>	<i>\</i>		
9. Did the review authors use	measurements or analyses of a	У	У		У	У	У	У
a satisfactory technique for	specified outcome?							
assessing the risk of bias	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
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs						
(RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs							
that were included in the	Did it assess confounding?							
review?	Did it assess selection bias?							
		Includes only						
		RCTs						
	Did it assess methods used to							
	ascertain exposures and outcomes?							
	Did it assess selection of the reported							
	result from among multiple							
	measurements or analyses of a							
	specified outcome?							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs						
	Did the authors report on the sources							
10. Did the review authors	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for	TES	TES	TES	NO	NO	NO	NO
included in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors)							
	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	data in a meta-analysis							
	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity	y	y	y	J	y	J	J
	(where present)							
	The authors investigated the causes of	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	any heterogeneity	y	y	y	y	y	3	y
	Overall (RCTs)	YES						
	FOR NRSIs							
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the							
n. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	data in a meta-analysis							

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs						
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs						
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У	У	n	У	У	У	У
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES						

	Review ID	Baric 2018	Ooi 2018	Smith 2018	Brondino 2013	Firoozeei 2021	Wang 2021	Dai 2020
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs						
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Overall	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						
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
review?	Overall	YES						

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

			DEPR	ESSION				
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs						
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	У	n	n	n	У
	Overall	YES						
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes						
	Is the protocol registered?	у	n	n	У	n	n	n
	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	У	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
7 Dilahan ing akar	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs? Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?							
	Overall	YES						
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes						

			DEPR	ESSION				
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs						
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	У	У	n	n	У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	У	n	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n	n	n	У
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	У	n	У	n	n	n	У
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES					
	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	У	У	n	У	У
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.					n		
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	n	n	У	n	У	У
•	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder					n		
	extracted by one reviewer.	VEC	NO	NO	VEC	NO	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors	Overall Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	YES	n	n	YES	у	n	n
provide a list of excluded		NO	NO	NO	NO	partial yes	NO	NO

			DEPR	ESSION				
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs						
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?					У		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes						
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У	n	n	У
studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У	n	n	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У	n	n	У	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	У	n	У	n	У	У	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	У	У	У	n	n	n
	Overall	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes						
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	У	n	У	У	У
assessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES

			DEPR	ESSION				
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs						
(RoB) in individual studies	FOR NRSIs							
that were included in the	Did it assess confounding?							
review?	Did it assess selection bias?							
		Includes only RCTs						
	Did it assess methods used to							
	ascertain exposures and outcomes?							
	Did it assess selection of the reported							
	result from among multiple							
	measurements or analyses of a							
	specified outcome?							
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs						
	Did the authors report on the sources							
10. Did the review authors	of funding for individual studies							
report on the sources of	included in the review ?	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
funding for the studies	(including if the reviewers looked for	NO	NO	NO	TES	NO	NO	NO
included in the review?	this information but it was not							
	reported by study authors)							
	FOR RCTs							
	The authors justified combining the	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	data in a meta-analysis							
	AND the authors used an approriate							
	weighted technique to combine study	У	У	у	У	У	У	У
	results and adjusted for heterogeneity	J	5	5	5	5	5	5
	(where present)							
	The authors investigated the causes of	У	У	у	У	У	У	У
	any heterogeneity	, ,	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Overall (RCTs)	YES						
	FOR NRSIs							
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the							
performed, did the review	data in a meta-analysis							

			DEPR	ESSION			÷	
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs						
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review							
c	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs						
12. If moto analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У	n	n	n	n	n
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У		у	У	У	У	У
	Overall	YES						
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	У	n	n	n	n	n
studies when interpreting/discussing the	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely	У		У	У	У	У	У
results of the review?	impact of RoB on the results							

			DEPR	ESSION				
	Review ID	Fusar-Poli 2020	Ghaderi 2020	Khaksarian 2019	Marx 2019	Toth 2019	Yang 2018	Apaydin 2016
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs						
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Overall	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						
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У	У
of conflict of interest, including any funding they	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest							
review?	Overall	YES						

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

			INSO	MNIA	
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San- Martin 2010
	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
ITEM	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	Population	У		У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	У	У	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	У	n	У	n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У
statement that the review		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	У	У	n	n
prior to the conduct of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У	У
justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating	У	У	У	У
deviations from the protocol:	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	У	У	n	n
	Overall	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
7 Dilahan ing dia	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	n	У	n
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?				
study designs for inclusion in the review?	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?	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

			INSO	MNIA	
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San- Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
		RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?	n	У	У	У
search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	У	У	n
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?	n	n	n	n
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?	n	n	У	n
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
. Did the review authors	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	У	У	У
perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n			
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	У	У	У	У
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	n
provide a list of excluded		NO	NO	NO	NO

			INSO	MNIA	
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San- Martin 2010
ITEM	Question	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from				
exclusions:	the review of each potentially relevant study?				
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	y v	y v	y y	v v
	Did it describe the interventions?	y y	y y	y y	y y
	Did it describe the comparators?	y y	y y	y y	y y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	y 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
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У
aescribe the included studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	У	У	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	n	У	У	У
9. Did the review authors use	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a	У	У	У	У
a satisfactory technique for	specified outcome?				
assessing the risk of bias	Overall (RCTs)	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES

			INSO	MNIA	
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San Martin 2010
ТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
RoB) in individual studies					
hat were included in the	Did it assess confounding?				
eview?	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	У	У	У	У
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У	У	У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У	У	У
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES
	FOR NRSIs				
11. If meta-analysis was	The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis				

		INSOMNIA					
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San- Martin 2010		
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs		
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs		
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n		
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.	У	У	У	У		
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES		
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n		
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	У	У	У		

			INSO	MNIA	
	Review ID	Shinjyo 2020	Hieu 2019	Leach 2015	Fernandez-San- Martin 2010
ITEM	Ouestion	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only	Includes only
	Question	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs	RCTs
	There was no significant	n	n	n	n
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory	heterogeneity in the results		11		11
	OR if heterogeneity was present the				
explanation for, and	authors performed an investigation of				
discussion of, any	sources of any heterogeneity in the	У	У	У	У
heterogeneity observed in	results and discussed the impact of				
the results of the review?	this on the results of the review				
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES
I5. 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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	n
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest				n
review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	NO

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

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

				DIAE	ETES		
R	eview ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ITEM Q	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 \Box	oid it search the reference lists /		N/	N/			N
a comprehensive literature bi	ibliographies of included studies?		У	У			У
	oid it search trial/study registries?		n	n			n
	oid it include/consult content experts In the field?		n	У			n
	id it (where relevant), search for grey terature?		n	У			n
	id it conduct search within 24 nonths of completion of the review?		У	У			У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
aç ar	t least two reviewers independently greed on selection of eligible studies nd achieved consensus on which tudies to include	У	У	У	У	У	n
perform study selection in duplicate?	DR two reviewers selected a sample of ligible studies and achieved good greement (at least 80 percent), with ne remainder selected by one eviewer.						n
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
at	t least two reviewers achieved onsensus on which data to extract rom included studies	n	У	У	У	n	У
perform data extraction in a duplicate? ac	DR two reviewers extracted data from sample of eligible studies and chieved good agreement (at least 80 ercent), with the remainder xtracted by one reviewer.	n				n	
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
7. Did the review authors	bid the SR provided a list of all otentially relevant studies that were ead in full-text form but excluded rom the review?	n	n	n	У	n	n
provide a list of excluded		NO	NO	NO	partial yes	NO	NO

				DIAE	BETES		
	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
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study?			NC	У		
	Overall	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations? Did it describe the interventions? Did it describe the comparators?	n n n	y y n	y y y	y y y	y y y	y y y
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	n	У	y	y	n
	Did it describe the research designs?	n	У	y	y	y	n
	5	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	NO
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?			У	У	У	
studies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?			У	У	У	
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?			У	У	У	
	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
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	n
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	
). Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	У	У	У	
(RoB) in individual studies	Överall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO

				DIAE	BETES		
	Review ID	Altobelli 2021	Asbhagi 2021	Barzkar 2020	Durg 2020	Giannoulaki 2020	Jamali 2020
ІТЕМ	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 Did it assess confounding? Did it assess selection bias? 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?	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	y y partial yes y y	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs
	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	У	n	No meta-analysis conducted	У	No meta-analysis conducted	n
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У		У		У
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У		У		У
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	NO	No meta-analysis conducted	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	NO
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis				У		

				DIAE	BETES		
	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
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review				y y n		
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT:
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	n	n	n	У
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other ouidoneo curtheric?	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	
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	n	n	n	У
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results		n	У	n	У	
	Overall	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
14. Did the review authors	There was no significant heterogeneity in the results			n	n	n	

				DIAB	ETES		
	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	У	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs					
	Population	У	У	У	У	У	У
1. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У	У	У	У
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	n	У	n	n	У	У
review include the	Outcome	У	У	n	У	У	У
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	n	У	У	n	n
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У	У	У	У
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	У	У	У	У	У
review contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	У	У	У	У	У	У
statement that the review		partial yes					
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	У	n	n	У
prior to the conduct of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У	У	У	n
justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating heterogeneity?	У	У	У	У	У	n
	Has it specified justification for any deviation from the protocol?	n	n	n	n	n	n
	Overall	PARTIAL YES					
7 8 14	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?	У	У	У	У	У	У
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
the review?	Did the review provide an explanation for including both RCTs and NRSIs?						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Did it search at least 2 (relevant) databases?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У	У	У	У
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	n	n	У	n	n	У
		NO	NO	partial yes	NO	NO	partial yes

		DIABETES							
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019		
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs							
	Did it search the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies?			У			n		
	Did it search trial/study registries?			У			n		
	Did it include/consult content experts in the field?			n			n		
	Did it (where relevant), search for grey literature?			n			n		
	Did it conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review?			У			У		
	Overall	PARTIAL YES							
. Did the review authors	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	n	n	У	n	У	У		
perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.	n	n		n				
	Overall	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES		
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	у	у	n	у	У	У		
perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.			n					
	Overall	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES		
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n	n	n	n		
provide a list of excluded		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		
exclusions?	Did the SR justify the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study? Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO		
	Did it describe the populations? Did it describe the interventions? Did it describe the comparators?	y y n	y y y y	y y y y	y y n	y y y y	y y y y		
	Did it describe the outcomes? Did it describe the research designs?	y y NO	y y partial yes	y y partial yes	y y NO	y y partial yes	y y partial yes		
8. Did the review authors describe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL? Did it describe the interventions IN		y	n		y	y		
studies in adequate detail?	DETAIL? Did it describe the comparators IN		УУ	У		y n	У		
	DETAIL? Did it describe the study's setting? Did it describe the timeframe for		y	n		У	n		
	follow-up? Overall	PARTIAL YES	n PARTIAL YES	y PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	n PARTIAL YES	n PARTIAL YES		
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	n	У		
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	У		
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	PARTIAL YES Y	PARTIAL YES y	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES Y	NO	PARTIAL YES y		
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias	Did it assess selection of the reported	У	n	У	У		У		
(RoB) in individual studies	Overall (RCTs)	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	NO	YES		

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	Includes only RCTs					
that were included in the							
review?	Did it assess confounding?						
	Did it assess selection bias?						
	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?	Includes only RCTs					
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCT				
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	n	n	У	n	n	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У	У	У	У	
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У	У	У	У	
	Overall (RCTs)	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	No meta-analysis conducted
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis						

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs					
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
	Overall (NRSIs)	Includes only RCTs					
12. If meta-analysis was	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	n
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	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
evidence synthesis?	Overall	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	#N/A
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n	n	n	n
tudies when nterpreting/discussing the	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	У	У	n	n	У	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

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Tabrizi 2020	Xu 2020	Denyo 2019	Huang 2019	Namazi 2019	Rocha 2019
ITEM	Question	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		У	У	n	У	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	У	У	У	У	У
of conflict of interest, including any funding they	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest						
review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

				DIABE	ETES		
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
	Population	У	У	У			
. Did the research questions	Intervention	У	У	У			
and inclusion criteria for the	Comparator group	n	У	У			
review include the	Outcome	У	У	n			
components of the PICO?	Timeframe for followup (optional)	n	У	n			
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
	Did it include a review question?	У	У	У			
	Did it include a search strategy?	У	У	У			
2. Did the report of the	Did it include inclusion/exclusion criteria?	У	n	У			
eview contain an explicit	Did it include a risk of bias asessment?	n	У	У			
statement that the review		NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
methods were established	Is the protocol registered?	n	n	У			
prior to the conduct of the review and did the report	Has it specified a meta-analysis/ synthesis plan (if approriate)?	У	У	У			
ustify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Has it specified a plan for investigating	У	У	У			
	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	Did the review provide an explanation for including only RCTs ?		У	У			
explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in	Did the review provide an explanation for including only NRSIs?						
he review?	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?	У	У	У			
	did it provide key word and/or search strategy	У	У	У			
	did it justify publication restrictions? (e.g. langauge, date?)	n	У	У			
		NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /						
a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?		У	У			
search strategy?	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?		У	У			
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	YES	YES
5 Did the review authors	at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include	У	У	У			
perform study selection in duplicate?	OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with						
	the remainder selected by one						
	reviewer.						
	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies	n	У	У			
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.	n					
	Overall	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
7. Did the review authors	Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review?	n	n	n			
provide a list of excluded		NO	NO	NO	partial yes	partial yes	partial yes
ctudiec and inctify the							

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

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ІТЕМ	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
that were included in the review?	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?	n					
	Did it assess selection bias?	n					
	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?	NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
	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 The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	n	У	У			
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У	У			
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У	У			
	Overall (RCTs)	NO	YES	YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
11. If meta-analysis was	FOR NRSIs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	n					

		DIABETES							
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018					
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs					
authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present) AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available AND they reported separate summary octimates for DCTs and NPSI	У							
	estimates for RCTs and NRSI separately when both were included in the review Overall (NRSIs)	n NO	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A		
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n					
authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	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					
evidence synthesis?	Overall	NO	NO	NO	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A		
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	n	n	n					
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results	n	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					

				DIAB	ETES		
	Review ID	Shabani 2019	Ziaei 2019	Zhu 2018			
ITEM	Question	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs			
provide a satisfactory	OR if heterogeneity was present the						
explanation for, and	authors performed an investigation of						
discussion of, any	sources of any heterogeneity in the	У	У	У			
heterogeneity observed in	results and discussed the impact of						
the results of the review?	this on the results of the review						
	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	The authors reported no competing interests OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest	У	У	у			
review?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

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

A. bid the review authors use Did it search the reference lists/ a comprehensive liteature n </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Fatigue conditions</th> <th></th> <th>Acne</th> <th>Acne</th> <th>Acne</th>				Fatigue conditions		Acne	Acne	Acne
TIPM Question Includes only RC18		Review ID	Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	-	
a comprehensive literature search strategy?bibliographies of included studies?nnYImage: Comprehensive literature nnn <td>ІТЕМ</td> <td>Question</td> <td>Includes only RCTs</td> <td>Includes only RCTs</td> <td>Includes only RCTs</td> <td>Includes only RCTs</td> <td></td> <td></td>	ІТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs		
a comprehensive literature search strategy? biblic graphies of included studies? In the field? Dick is note without search strategy? Dick is note without search within 24 months of completion of the review? A least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include does not be served? A least two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. Overall A least two reviewers selected a targent a least two reviewers selected a targent agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. Overall A least two reviewers selected a targent a least two reviewers selected a targent agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. Overall A least two reviewers selected a targent a sample of eligible studies D R two reviewers settrated data from a sample of eligible studies D R two reviewers extrated data from a sample of eligible studies D R two reviewers Percent), with the remainder percent, with the remainder percent, with the remainder achieved good argenement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder achieved good argenement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder percent, with the remainder percent, with the remainder achieved good argenement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder achieved good argenement (at lea	4. Did the review authors use	Did it search the reference lists /						
bit is include/consult content experts in the field? n n n Did is (where relevant), search for grey literature? n n n n Did is (where relevant), search for grey literature? n n n n Did is (where relevant), search for grey literature? y y y y y Did is conduct search within 24 months of completion of the review? PARTIAL YES PARTIAL YES PARTIAL YES PARTIAL YES A least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved oppoet estimates selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. NO VES VES VES VES NO Correlation of versive stated data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. NO VES VES VES VES NO Coreal NO VES VES VES VES NO NO A ti least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies Y Y Y Y NO Of two reviewers or acted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer. VES VES VES VES NO Did the Stip provide a list of all potentially relevan	a comprehensive literature	bibliographies of included studies?	n	n	У		n	
s. Did the review authors in the field? n <t< td=""><td>search strategy?</td><td>Did it search trial/study registries?</td><td>n</td><td>n</td><td>n</td><td></td><td>n</td><td></td></t<>	search strategy?	Did it search trial/study registries?	n	n	n		n	
Iterature? n y y y y y p			n	n	n		n	
Months of completion of the review? Y Y Y Y Overail PARTIAL YES PARTIAL Y			n	n	n		n	
at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OF two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.yyyyyyn6. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?NOYESYESYESYESNO6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?NOYESYESYESYESNO6. Did the review authors perform data extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted data from achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent)YESYESYESYESYESNO7. Did the review?NONOpetiti			У	У	У		У	
Agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OPR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. ANO 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 OR two reviewers. NO 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 OR two reviewers. NO YES YES YES YES YES NO 7. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? Did the SR provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review? YES YES YES YES NO		Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES
OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer. ONO YES YES YES NO A tile ast two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies NO YES YES YES YES NO 6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? NO YES YES YES YES NO 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded from the review? NO YES YES YES YES NO 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded NO YES YES YES YES YES NO 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded NO YES YES YES YES YES NO 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded NO NO PES YES YES YES YES NO NO NO NO NO NO NO PES YES YES YES NO NO NO NO NO NO NO PES NO NO <td>5 Did the review authors</td> <td>agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which</td> <td>n</td> <td>У</td> <td>У</td> <td>У</td> <td>У</td> <td>n</td>	5 Did the review authors	agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which	n	У	У	У	У	n
At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies 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 <	perform study selection in duplicate?	eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.						
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?consensus on which data to extract from included studies 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.yyyyn7. Did the SR provided a list of all portially relevant studies that were ead in full-text form but excluded provide a list of excludedVESVESVESVESNO7. Did the review?NOpartial yeesNOpartial yeesNONO			NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
perform data extraction in duplicate?a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.Image: Comparison of the second of the review?YESYESYESYESYESNO7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded from the review?Did the second of		consensus on which data to extract	У	У	У	У	У	n
Overall YES YES YES YES YES NO 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 n n	perform data extraction in	a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder						n
potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review? n y n y n n		Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
provide a list of excluded NO partial yes NO Dartial yes NO NO	7. Did the review authors	potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded	n	У	n	У	n	n
	provide a list of excluded		NO	partial yes	NO	partial yes	NO	NO

			Fatigue conditions		Acne	Acne	Acne
	Review ID	Jin 2020	Kim 2020	Bach 2016	Kim 2021	Vaughn 2016	Ernst 2002
ТЕМ	Question	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes only RCTs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs	Includes both RCTs and NRSIs
tudies and justify the	Did the SR justify the exclusion from						
exclusions?	the review of each potentially relevant study?		У		У		
	Overall	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
	Did it describe the populations?	у	У	у	У	у	У
	Did it describe the interventions?	У	У	у	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the outcomes?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the research designs?	У	У	У	У	У	У
		partial yes	partial yes				
. Did the review authors escribe the included	Did it describe the populations IN DETAIL?	n	n	У	У	У	У
tudies in adequate detail?	Did it describe the interventions IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	У	У	У
	Did it describe the comparators IN DETAIL?	У	У	У	n	У	У
	Did it describe the study's setting?	n	n	n	n	У	n
	Did it describe the timeframe for follow-up?	У	n	n	У	У	У
	Overall	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES
	FOR RCTs Did it assess unconcealed allocation?	У	У	У	У	У	n
	Did it assess lack of blinding of patients and assessors (for subjective outcomes)?	У	У	У	У	У	n
		partial yes	no				
	Did it assess allocation sequence that was not truly random?	У	У	У	У	У	
. Did the review authors use satisfactory technique for ssessing the risk of bias	Did it assess selection of the reported results from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome?	У	У	n	У	n	
RoB) in individual studies	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	YES	PARTIAL YES	NO
hat were included in the	FOR NRSIs Did it assess confounding?					n	n

			Fatigue conditions		Acne	Acne	Acne
	Review ID	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?					У	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 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	NO	NO
	FOR RCTs The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	У	У	У	У	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
	AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)	У	У	У	У		
	The authors investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	У	У	У	У		
	Overall (RCTs)	YES	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	FOR NRSIS The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis AND the authors used an approriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity (where present)					No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted

			Fatigue conditions		Acne	Acne	Acne
	Review ID	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
	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	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	У	n	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other	OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of RoB on summary estimates of effect.		У		У	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
evidence synthesis?	Overall	YES	YES	YES	YES	No meta-analysis conducted	No meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors	the SR included only low risk of bias RCTs	У	n	У	n	n	n
account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results		У		У	У	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	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	У	У	У	У	n	n

			Fatigue conditions		Acne	Acne	Acne
	Review ID	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	The authors reported no competing interests	У	n	У	У	У	У
of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the	OR the authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest		У				
review?	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)