	HN (2015)	er, E (2012) Fssey	JA (2011) Schroed	Jit, M (2010) Round:	, O (2010)	Petrou, S (2011) Eddama		Supplement
	7	7	7	0	7	7	1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N)	ary materia
	4	0	0	0	0	4	2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc) and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N)	ฆ 4 - Resul
	œ	0	∞	∞	<b>∞</b>	∞	3. Were variable estimates used in the analysis from the best available source (i.e randomized control trial - best, expert opinion - worst)? (Y/N)	ts of the qu
Supplemental material			BMJ Pub	olishing Gro	oup Limited	l (BMJ) discla	aims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance ned:। पिल्डामान्यस्क came गणा वे subgroup analysis, were the groups	Jality BMJ Open
<u> Биррешений шистин</u>	0	ь	0	0	0	0	prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N)	asse.
	0	9	9	9	9	9	5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)	Ope Ope BM BM Supplementary material 4 - Results of the quality assessments on primary research articles
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)	rimary resec
	0	G.	б	И	б	ъ	7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)	яrch artic
	7	7	7	7	7	7	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)	les
	<b>∞</b>	∞	œ	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	∞	9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)	
	6	6	6	6	6	6	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	
	7	7	7	7	7	7	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)	
	7	0	7	0	0	7	13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)	
	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	
	<b>∞</b>	∞	∞	∞	8	∞	based on the study results? (Y/N) hph S, et al. BMJ Open 2020; 10:e040022. doi: 10.1136/b	omjopen-2020-040022
	ω	ω	ω	ω	0	ω	16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)	
	79 Hi	75 Hi	89 Hi	75 Hi	79 Hi	99 Hi	Total (Max 100)	
	High	High	High	High	High	High		

Overall assessment

	High	High	Low	High	Medium	High	Overall assessment	
	95 H	94 H	<b>47</b> L	77	56 N	95 H		
	ω	ω	ω	ω	ω	ω	16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)	
	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	15. Were the conclusions/recommendations of the study justified and based on the study results *(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{N}) t al. BMJ Open 2020; 10:e040022. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020	0-040022
	<b>o</b>	6	0	0	0	6	14. Did the author (s) explicitly discuss direction and magnitude of potential biases? (Y/N)	
	7	7	0	0	0	7	13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)	
	<b>∞</b>	∞	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	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)	
	7	7	7	7	0	7	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)	
	6	6	0	6	6	6	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)	
	<b>∞</b>	∞	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	∞	∞	9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)	
	7	7	7	7	7	7	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)	
	б	0	0	0	0	л	7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)	
	6	6	6	6	0	6	6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)	
	9	9	0	9	9	9	5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)	
Supplemental material	0	0	0	placed	on this st	upplementa	processified in the beginning of the study (V/AI)	MJ Open
	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	O BMJ Pı	<b>∞</b> ublishing Gr	O roup Limit	<b>∞</b>	source (i.e randomized control trial - best, expert opinion - worst)? (Y/N)	
	0	4	0	0	0	0	<ul><li>2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc) and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N)</li><li>3. Were variable estimates used in the analysis from the best available</li></ul>	
	7	7	0	7	7	7	1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N)	
	Walker, KF (2017)	M (2015)	, M (2016) Ussher,	Lain, SJ (2017) Parisaei	-Rees, G (2015)	(2016) Carolan	Coomar asamy,	

	High	High	High	Medium	High	High	Overall assessment
	77 +	84 -	87 F	<mark>66</mark> 7	95 +	99 +	Total (Max 100)
ı	0	ω	ω	ω	ω	ω	16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)
-	<b>∞</b>	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	15. Were the conclusions/recommendations of the study justified and based on the study results *{\formula / N} t al. BMJ Open 2020; 10:e040022. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040022
	0	6	б	6	6	6	14. Did the author (s) explicitly discuss direction and magnitude of potential biases? (Y/N)
	7	7	7	7	7	7	13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)
	∞	∞	<b>∞</b>	∞	<b>∞</b>	∞	analysis, and the components of numerator and denominator displayed in a clear, transparent manner? (Y/N)
	7	7	7	0	7	7	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
	6	6	6	6	6	6	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)
	<b>∞</b>	∞	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	<b>∞</b>	∞	9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)
	7	7	7	0	7	7	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)
	0	0	0	0	ъ	O	7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)
	6	0	6	0	6	6	6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)
	9	9	9	9	9	9	<ol> <li>Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)</li> </ol>
Supplemental material	0	0	Ъ	placed o	on this supple	emental ma	laims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance attend which half restimates teamer from a subgroup analysis, were the groups  prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N)
	0	∞	O BMJ Pt	Oublishing Grou	<b>∞</b> up Limited (I	<b>∞</b> BMJ) discl	source (i.e randomized control trial - best, expert opinion - worst)?  (Y/N)  laims all Jiability and responsibility arising from any reliance
	4	0	4	4	0	4	and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N)  3. Were variable estimates used in the analysis from the best available
	7	7	7	7	7	7	measurable manner? (Y/N)  2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc)
	<b>.</b>		ς, )	5	g O	,	1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and
	M (2016)	M (2017)	rth, S (2016) Orlovic,	II, HE (2018)	Bick, D (2017) Campbe	(2017)	van der Nelson,

	Xydopo ulos, G (2019)	PB (2017)	(2019) Jacklin,	J (2017) Jones,	(2018)	(2017) Khan, KS	Luni, Y	Bowers, J (2016)	
	7	7	7	7	7	7	1 (	0	1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N)
	0	0	0	0	4	0	<b>.</b>	0	2. Were the perspective of the analysis (societal, third-party payer, etc) and reasons for its selection stated? (Y/N)
	0	∞	<b>∞</b>	∞	∞	0	<b>)</b>	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)
			RMI	Publishing G	roun Lin	nited (BMI)	) disclai	ms all li	iability and responsibility arising from any reliance
Supplemental material	0	1	0	place	d on this	supplemen			iability and responsibility arising from any reliance  A half estimates came from a subgroup analysis, were the groups  BMJ Open  prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N)
	0	9	9	9	9	0	<b>)</b>	0	5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)
	6	6	6	6	6	0	<b>)</b>	ი	6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)
	0	ъ	ъ	σ	0	0	<b>.</b>	0	7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)
	7	7	7	7	7	7	ı ·	7	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)
	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	0	<b>)</b>	∞	9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)
	6	6	6	6	6	6	<b>.</b>	0	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)
	7	7	7	7	7	7	1 .	7	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)
	∞	∞	8	∞	∞	0	<b>.</b>	0	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)
			- '						
	7	7	7	7	7	0	•	7	13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)
	6	6	6	0	6	0	<b>.</b>	0	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
	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	0	) (	∞	based on the study results <b>*(M/N)</b> ** al. BMJ Open 2020; 10:e040022. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040022
	ω	ω	ω	ω	ω	ω	) (	0	16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)
	73	96	95	89	94	<mark>u</mark>		43	Total (Max 100)
	3 Medium	6 High	5 High	9 High	4 High	Low		Low	
	¥								Overall assessment

	(2019 - PLOS Med)	d, D (2019 - BJOG) Wastlun d, D	a Wastlun
	7	7	1. Was the study objective presented in a clear, specific and measurable manner? (Y/N)
	0	0	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)
	BMJ Publishing Group Lin	mited (BMJ) disclain	ns all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance
Supplemental material	placed on this	s supplemental mater	ial whica half hest firm at est carrie from a subgroup analysis, were the groups BMJ Open prespecified in the beginning of the study? (Y/N)
	9	9	5. Was uncertainty handled by (1) statistical analysis to address random events, (2) sensitivity analysis to cover a range of assumptions? (Y/N)
	6	6	6. Was incremental analysis performed between alternatives for resources and costs? (Y/N)
	И	۵	7. Was the methodology for data abstraction (including the value of health states and other benefits) stated? (Y/N)
	7	7	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)
	<b>∞</b>	∞	9. Was the measurement of costs appropriate and the methodology for the estimation of quantities and unit costs clearly described? (Y/N)
	6	6	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)
	7	7	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)
	∞	<b>∞</b>	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)
	7	7	13. Were the choice of economic model, main assumptions, and limitations if the study stated and justified? (Y/N)
	6	0	14. Did the author (s) explicitly discuss direction and magnitude of potential biases? (Y/N)
	<b>∞</b>	∞	15. Were the conclusions/recommendations of the study justified and based on the study results *{\mathbb{N}} t al. BMJ Open 2020; 10:e040022. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040022
	ω	ω	16. Was there a statement disclosing the source of funding for the study? (Y/N)
	87	<b>8</b> 1	Total (Max 100)
	High	High	

**Overall assessment**