

Appendix 5 - Quality Assessment of Included Studies using the AMSTAR tool

1st Author	Year	A priori design provided	Duplicate study selection and data extraction carried out	Comprehensive literature search performed	Status of publication used as inclusion criterion	List of included and excluded studies provided	Characteristics of included studies provided	Quality of included studies assessed and documented	Quality of included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions	Appropriate methods used to combine study findings	Likelihood of publication bias assessed	Conflict of interest included
Aggarwal A.	2013	No	Can't answer	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Albrow R.	2014	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Andresen		Can't answer	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Arditi	2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Asongan yi E	2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
Azami-Aghdash S.	2015	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	can't answer	No	No

Azeem E.	2016	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Bailey TM.	2005	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Baron RC.	2008	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
Baron RC.	2010	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Black	2002	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Bonfill	2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Briss P.	2004	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
Bromley EG.	2015	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	Can't answer	No	Yes
Brouwers MC.	2011	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Camilloni L.	2013	Can't answer	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Chorley AJ.	2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
de los Monteros,	2011	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Dinnes J.	2001	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	Yes	No	No
Donnelly TT.	2015	no	Can't answer	Can't answer	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Edwards	2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Everett	2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Escoffery C.	2014	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Fung-Kee-Fung M.	2010	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	No	No
Genoff MC.	2016	No	Can't answer	Can't answer	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No

Gibbons MC.	2007	No	Yes	Can't answer	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer
Glick SB.	2012	No	No	Can't answer	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
Guessous I.	2010	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Hendry M.	2012	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	Yes
Holden DJ.	2010	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
Honein-AbouHaidar GN.	2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Hou SI.	2011	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Hurtado-de-Mendoza A.	2014	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Javanparast S.	2010	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Jepson R.	2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

Jerome-D'Emilia B.	2015	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Johnson CE.	2008	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Khalid-De Bakker C.	2011	No	Can't answer	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Khan-Gates JA.	2015	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Kim K.	2016	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
Lee HY.	2010	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Lu M.	2012	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mann L.	2015	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Masi CM.	2017	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No

May FP.	2016	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Can't answer	No	No
McLachlan S.	2009	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Mitchell AJ.	2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Morrow JB.	2010	No	Can't answer	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Mullen PD.	2006	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Naylor K.	2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	Can't answer	No	No
O'Connor	2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
O'Brien M.	2007	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	Yes	No	No
Oh KM.	2014	no	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Oh KM.	2017	no	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No

O'Malley AS.	2003	no	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Pannikottu J.	2017	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	Yes	Can't answer	Yes	No	No
Peterson EB.	2016	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Plourde N.	2016	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Powe BD.	2010	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Pozz A.	2016	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Racey CS.	2011	No	Can't answer	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Riemsma RP.	2002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Sabatino SA.	2012	Can't answer	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	No	No
Schoueri-Mychasiw N.	2013	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No

Wells KJ.	2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Can't answer	Yes	No	No
Winawer SJ.	2011	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer
Wools A.	2016	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Yabroff KR.	2013	No	Can't answer	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Yabroff KR.	2003	Can't answer	Can't answer	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Can't answer	No	No
Yedjou CG.	2017	No	Can't answer	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Can't answer	No	No

Bryant-Lukosius DE.	2015	Abstract
Clarke AR.	2012	Abstract
Deng SX.	2010	Abstract
Dreier, M.	2012	Abstract
Ekwueme DU.	2009	Abstract
Geng ZZ.	2013	Abstract
Giorgi Rossi P.	2012	Abstract
Giorgi Rossi P.	2013	Abstract
Keihanian T.	2015	Abstract
Kizior AM.	2014	Abstract
Marquez E.	2016	Abstract
Sheldon LK.	2015	Abstract

Ward JE.	2012	Abstract
Holden DJ.	2010	Abstract
Kien C.	2015	In German

AMSTAR – a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews.

1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?

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

2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?

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

3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?

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

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

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

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

A list of included and excluded studies should be provided.

6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?

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

7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?

'A priori' methods of assessment should be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s) chose to include only randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment as inclusion criteria); for other types of studies alternative items will be relevant.

8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?

The results of the methodological rigor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review, and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations.

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

For the pooled results, a test should be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e., Chi-squared test for homogeneity, I²). If heterogeneity exists a random effects model should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e., is it sensible to combine?).

10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?

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

11. Was the conflict of interest included?

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

Answer scale for all questions:

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

Ref in: Shea et al. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2007 7:10 doi:10.1186/1471-2288-7-10