

Appendix 3. Methodological Quality Assessment of the included systematic reviews

Author	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Rating
<i>Kverno 2009</i>	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	4
<i>Lai 2009</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8
<i>Yu 2009</i>	No	CA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	NA	No	No	3
<i>Collet 2010</i>	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	5
<i>O'Neill 2011</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7
<i>Olazaran 2010</i>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
<i>Vasse 2010</i>	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	5
<i>Wall 2010</i>	No	CA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	NA	NA	No	No	2
<i>Padilla 2011</i>	No	CA	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	NA	No	2
<i>Potter 2011</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
<i>Robinson 2011</i>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	NA	No	No	No	3
<i>Salami 2011</i>	No	CA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	NA	No	No	3
<i>Fung 2012</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
<i>Kiepe 2012</i>	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	1
<i>Kim 2012</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
<i>Moniz Cook 2012</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	11
<i>Seitz 2012</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
<i>Subramaniam 2012</i>	No	CA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	NA	No	No	3
<i>Thune-Boyle 2012</i>	No	CA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	NA	NA	No	No	2
<i>Woods 2012</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	10
<i>Aguirre 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	5
<i>Alves 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
<i>Bernabei 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	4
<i>Blake 2013</i>	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	1
<i>Carrion 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	4
<i>Eggenberger 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	3

<i>Guzman-Garcia 2013</i>	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	3
<i>McDermott 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	5
<i>Moyle 2013</i>	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	4
<i>Ueda 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
<i>Vasionytė 2013</i>	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	No	4
<i>Zimmerman 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7
<i>Chaudhury 2013</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	4
<i>Forbes 2014</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	11
<i>Forrester 2014</i>	Yes	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9
<i>Gonzalez 2014</i>	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	3
<i>Livingston 2014</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
<i>Whear 2014</i>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

All 11-items were scored as “Yes”, “No”, “Can’t Answer” or “Not Applicable”. AMSTAR comprises the following items:

1. ‘a priori’ design provided;
2. duplicate study selection/data extraction;
3. comprehensive literature search;
4. status of publication as inclusion criteria (i.e., grey or unpublished literature);
5. list of studies included/excluded provided;
6. characteristics of included studies documented;
7. scientific quality assessed and documented;
8. appropriate formulation of conclusions (based on methodological rigor and scientific quality of the studies);
9. appropriate methods of combining studies (homogeneity test, effect model used and sensitivity analysis);
10. assessment of publication bias (graphic and/or statistical test); and
11. conflict of interest statement.