Criteria		Criteria met	Criteria defined (if applicable)
RCTs			
1.	Was the method used to assign participants to the treatment groups really random?	Yes	Computer-generated random numbers, random number tables, random permuted blocks, sealed assignment, sequentially numbered sealed opaque envelopes
		No	Use of alternation, case record numbers, date of birth or days of the week
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
2.	Was the allocation of treatment concealed?	Yes	Allocation to each group performed adequately (e.g. centrally) and group assignment revealed after provision of consent
		No	Group assignment revealed prior to subject consent, non-opaque sealed envelopes, case record numbers, date of birth or days of the week, open random number lists
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
3.	Were the outcome assessors/ data analysts blinded to the treatment allocations (it was not considered plausible that patients could be blinded to these types of interventions)?	Yes	Independent outcome assessors and data analysts were blinded to which group patients belonged to
		No	Outcomes assessed and data analysed by those involved in the intervention, or those who are aware of group membership
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
4.	Were the eligibility criteria for study entry specified including confirmation of diagnosis of HF?	Yes	Eligibility criteria for study entry specified *and* diagnosis of HF (systolic or preserved) recorded and confirmed using clinical criteria, echocardiography or BNP
		No	Eligibility criteria for study entry not specified *or* diagnosis of HF not defined
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
5.	Was baseline comparability achieved for the most important prognostic indicators?	Yes	The baseline characteristics of each study group (in particular age, NYHA class and/or LVEF) were clearly outlined and any differences identified were accounted for
		No	The baseline characteristics (in particular, age, NYHA class and/or LVEF) of each study group were not outlined or differences were not accounted for
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
6.	Adequate follow-up of patients (at least 80%)	Yes	Proportion and characteristics of those participants lost to follow-up (≤20%) clearly reported for each group and outcome. A clear outline is provided as to how losses of participants were handled
		No	Proportion and characteristics of those participants lost to follow-up >20%. No clear outline is provided as to how losses of participants were handled
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement

Criteria		Criteria met	Criteria defined (if applicable)
7.	Were the reasons for withdrawal stated?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
8.	Was an intention-to-treat analysis included?	Yes	All patients randomly assigned to one of the treatments are analysed together, regardless of whether or not they completed or received that treatment
		No	All patients randomly assigned to one of the treatments are not analysed together, regardless of whether or not they completed or received that treatment, e.g. per protocol
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
9.	Was the study powered to detect differences in outcomes?	Yes	A power calculation was performed and reported. The study was adequately powered to detect differences in outcomes
		No	A power calculation was not performed; a power calculation was performed and reported but the study was not adequately powered to detect differences in outcomes; or a power calculation was performed but not reported – the study states that it was adequately powered to detect differences in outcomes
		Unclear	Insufficient detail to make judgement
Observational studies			
1.	Was the sample representative of the average HF patient?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	
2.	Were the intervention and control cohort drawn from the same community?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	
3.	Were groups comparable in terms of major confounding/ prognostic factors?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	
4.	Was the attrition rate acceptable (≤20%)?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	
5.	Was the length of follow-up sufficiently long for the outcome to occur?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	
6.	Were all potential confounding factors and outcomes measured accurately and objectively?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	
7.	Was an attempt made to control for confounders in the analysis (e.g. regression or stratification)?	Yes	
		No	
		Unclear	

BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide.