

Petrou, S (2011)	7	4	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3
Eddama, O (2010)	7	0	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	0	0	8	0
Jit, M (2010)	0	0	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	0	0	8	3
Round, JA (2011)	7	0	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	7	0	8	3
Schroeder, E (2012)	7	0	0	1	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	0	0	8	3
Essex, HN (2015)	7	4	8	0	0	6	0	7	8	6	7	8	7	0	8	3
Total (Max 100)																
Overall assessment																

1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N)

2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc) and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N)

3. Were variable estimates used in the analysis from the best available source (i.e randomized control trial - best, expert opinion - worst)? (Y/N)

4. If estimates came from a subgroup analysis, were the groups prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N)

5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)

6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)

7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)

8. Did the analytic horizon allow time for all relevant and important outcomes? Were benefits and costs that went beyond 1 year discounted (3%-5%) and justification given for the discount rate? (Y/N)

9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)

10. Were the primary outcome measure (s) for the economic evaluation clearly stated and did they include the major short-term. Was justification given for the measures/scales used? (Y/N)

11. Were the health outcomes measures/scales valid and reliable? If previously tested valid and reliable measures were not available, was justification given for measures and scales used? (Y/N)

12. Were the economic model (including structure), study methods and analysis, and the components of numerator and denominator displayed in a clear, transparent manner? (Y/N)

13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)

14. Did the author (s) explicitly discuss direction and magnitude of potential biases? (Y/N)

15. Were the conclusions/recommendations of the study justified and based on the study results? (Y/N)

16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)

Supplemental material	Coomar asamy, A (2016)	7	0	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	95	High
	Carolann -Rees, G (2015)	7	0	0	0	9	0	0	7	8	6	0	8	0	0	8	3	56	Medium
	Lain, SJ (2017)	7	0	8	0	9	6	0	7	8	6	7	8	0	0	8	3	77	High
	Parisaei , M (2016)	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	7	8	0	7	8	0	0	8	3	47	Low
	Ussher, M (2015)	7	4	8	0	9	6	0	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	94	High
	Walker, KF (2017)	7	0	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	95	High
Overall assessment																			

van der Nelson, H (2017)	7	4	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	99	High
Bick, D (2017)	7	0	8	0	9	6	5	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	95	High
Campbell, H, HE (2018)	7	4	0	0	9	0	0	0	8	6	0	8	7	6	8	3	66	Medium
Duckworth, S (2016)	7	4	0	1	9	6	0	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	87	High
Orlovic, M (2017)	7	0	8	0	9	0	0	7	8	6	7	8	7	6	8	3	84	High
Vatish, M (2016)	7	4	0	0	9	6	0	7	8	6	7	8	7	0	8	0	77	High
Total (Max 100)																		
Overall assessment																		
1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N) 2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc) and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N) 3. Were variable estimates used in the analysis from the best available source (i.e randomized control trial - best, expert opinion - worst)? (Y/N) 4. If estimates came from a subgroup analysis, were the groups prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N) 5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N) 6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N) 7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N) 8. Did the analytic horizon allow time for all relevant and important outcomes? Were benefits and costs that went beyond 1 year discounted (3%-5%) and justification given for the discount rate? (Y/N) 9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N) 10. Were the primary outcome measure (s) for the economic evaluation clearly stated and did they include the major short-term. Was justification given for the measures/scales used? (Y/N) 11. Were the health outcomes measures/scales valid and reliable? If previously tested valid and reliable measures were not available, was justification given for measures and scales used? (Y/N) 12. Were the economic model (including structure), study methods and analysis, and the components of numerator and denominator displayed in a clear, transparent manner? (Y/N) 13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N) 14. Did the author (s) explicitly discuss direction and magnitude of potential biases? (Y/N) 15. Were the conclusions/recommendations of the study justified and based on the study results? (Y/N) 16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)																		



Wastlund  
d, D  
(2019 -  
BJOG)  
Wastlund  
d, D  
(2019 -  
PLOS  
Med)

1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N)

7

7

2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc) and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N)

0

0

3. Were variable estimates used in the analysis from the best available source (i.e randomized control trial - best, expert opinion - worst)? (Y/N)

0

0

4. If estimates came from a subgroup analysis, were the groups prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N)

0

0

5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)

9

9

6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)

6

6

7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)

5

5

8. Did the analytic horizon allow time for all relevant and important outcomes? Were benefits and costs that went beyond 1 year discounted (3%-5%) and justification given for the discount rate? (Y/N)

7

7

9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)

8

8

10. Were the primary outcome measure (s) for the economic evaluation clearly stated and did they include the major short-term. Was justification given for the measures/scales used? (Y/N)

6

6

11. Were the health outcomes measures/scales valid and reliable? If previously tested valid and reliable measures were not available, was justification given for measures and scales used? (Y/N)

7

7

12. Were the economic model (including structure), study methods and analysis, and the components of numerator and denominator displayed in a clear, transparent manner? (Y/N)

8

8

13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)

7

7

14. Did the author (s) explicitly discuss direction and magnitude of potential biases? (Y/N)

6

0

15. Were the conclusions/recommendations of the study justified and based on the study results? (Y/N)

8

8

16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)

3

3

Total (Max 100)

87

81

High

High

Overall assessment