

	Inglis <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁸	Klersy <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁸
<p>1. <i>Was an 'a priori' design provided?</i></p> <p>The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>2. <i>Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?</i></p> <p>There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>3. <i>Was a comprehensive literature search performed?</i></p> <p>At least two electronic sources should be searched. The report must include years and databases used [e.g. Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), EMBASE and MEDLINE]. Key words and/or medical subject heading (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, specialised registers or experts in the particular field of study, and by reviewing the references in the studies found</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>✓ No</p> <p>Did not report consulting current contents, reviews, specialised registers or experts in field</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>4. <i>Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>✓ No</p> <p>Authors searched for full-text peer-reviewed publications only</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>5. <i>Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?</i></p> <p>A list of included and excluded studies should be provided</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>6. <i>Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?</i></p> <p>Data from the original studies on the participants, interventions and outcomes should be provided in an aggregated form such as a table. The ranges of characteristics in all of the studies analysed, e.g. age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity or other diseases, should be reported</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>

	Inglis et al. ⁴⁸	Klersy et al. ⁵⁸
<p>7. <i>Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?</i></p> <p>'A priori' methods of assessment should be provided [e.g. for effectiveness studies if the author(s) chose to include only randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled studies, or allocation concealment as inclusion criteria]; for other types of studies alternative items will be relevant</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>8. <i>Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?</i></p> <p>The results of the methodological rigour and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>✓ No</p> <p>Authors did not consider recommendations in light of the quality of included trials</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>✓ No</p> <p>Authors did not refer to study quality when discussing implications for practice</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>9. <i>Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?</i></p> <p>For the pooled results a test should be carried out to ensure that the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e. chi-squared test for homogeneity, I^2). 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?)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>✓ No</p> <p>'Owing to differences in patient populations programme characteristics and length of follow-up, all meta-analyses were performed using a fixed-effects model' (p. 8)</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>10. <i>Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?</i></p> <p>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)</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>11. <i>Was the conflict of interest stated?</i></p> <p>Potential sources of support should be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the included studies</p>	<p>✓ Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>✓ No</p> <p>Authors listed their own sources of sponsorship but not those of the included trials</p> <p>Can't answer</p> <p>Not applicable</p>