

Supplementary Appendix**Table S1: MeSH terms for the Ovid (MEDLINE) search strategy.**

Search term	Results
1 (exp Registries/ or Datasets as Topic/ or exp Management Information Systems/ or hospital records/ or exp medical records/ or nursing records/) and exp Quality Assurance, Health Care/	16541
2 (("Clinical" or "Clinical quality") adj ("Registry" or "Registries" or "register" or "registers")).mp.	938
3 (("Clinical" or "Clinical quality") adj ("data base" or database*)).mp.	2635
4 (("Clinical" or "Clinical quality") adj5 ("medical record*" or "patient record*" or "health record*")).mp.	4188
5 exp "costs and cost analysis"/ or exp economics, hospital/ or exp economics, medical/ or economics, nursing/ or economics, pharmaceutical/	240706
6 exp Resource Allocation/	16404
7 exp Health Services Research/ec, mt, sn, td, ut [Economics, Methods, Statistics & Numerical Data, Trends, Utilization]	23288
8 exp Evaluation Studies as Topic/cl, ec, mt, st, td [Classification, Economics, Methods, Standards, Trends]	38495
9 Program Evaluation/	56767
10 Economic evalu*.mp.	10449
11 Cost-benef*.mp.	79465
12 Cost-eff*.mp.	121231
13 cost-util*.mp.	4165
14 Medica* expend*.mp.	3733
15 Medica* cost*.mp.	10127
16 Health* expend*.mp.	20335

Search term	Results
17 Health* cost*.mp.	12307
18 ("direct service costs" or "drug costs" or "hospital costs" or "health expenditures").mp.	47234
19 (cost or costs or expend* or finance* or economic*).mp.	981580
20 or/1-4	23961
21 or/5-19	1084097
22 20 and 21	3450
23 (randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial).pt.	551183
24 case-control studies/ or retrospective studies/ or cohort studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or follow-up studies/ or prospective studies/ or cross-sectional studies/	2152209
25 meta analysis/ or "review"/ or systematic reviews/	2434008
26 exp animals/ not humans.sh.	4470062
27 23 or 24 or 25	4929042
28 22 and 27	894
29 28 not 26	888
30 limit 29 to (english language and yr="2000 -Current")	709

Table S2: Quality appraisal of the three studies using CHEERS guidelines.

Item		Score (1 = Yes; 0.5 = partial; 0 = No)			
		Hollenbeak (2011)	Thanh (2018)	Woolley (2006)	Overall score (%)
Title and abstract					
1	Title	1	1	1	100%
2	Abstract	1	1	1	100%
Introduction					
3	Background and objectives	1	1	1	100%
Methods					
4	Target population, subgroups	1	1	1	100%
5	Setting and location	1	1	1	100%
6	Study perspective	1	1	1	100%
7	Comparators	1	1	1	100%
8	Time horizon	1	1	1	100%
9	Discount rate	0	0	1	33%
10	Health outcomes	1	1	1	100%
11	Measurement of effectiveness	1	1	1	100%
12	Measurement and valuation of preference-based outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
13	Estimating resources and costs	1	1	1	100%
14	Currency, price date, conversion	1	1	1	100%
15	Choice of model	0	0.5	0.5	33%
16	Assumptions	1	1	1	100%
17	Analytical methods	1	1	0.5	83%
Results					
18	Study parameters	1	1	1	100%

19	Incremental costs and outcomes	1	1	1	100%
20	Characterising uncertainty	1	1	1	100%
21	Characterising heterogeneity	0	1	0	33%
Discussion					
22	Study findings, limitations, generalizability	1	1	0.5	83%
Other					
23	Source of funding	0	1	1	67%
24	Conflicts of interest	1	1	0	33%
Quality score (n = 3)		83%	93%	85%	-
Average quality score (n = 3)		87%			

N/A = not applicable

Table S3: Quality appraisal of the ACSQHC report using AACODS guidelines.

Item		Score (Yes = 1; Unclear = 0.5; No = 0)
Authority		
1.1	Does the report identify who is responsible for the intellectual content?	1
1.2	Are they reputable?	1
Accuracy		
2.1	Does the item have a clearly stated aim or brief?	1
2.2	Does it have a stated methodology?	1
2.3	Has it been peer-reviewed?	1
2.4	Has it been edited by a reputable authority?	1
Coverage		
3.1	Are any limits clearly stated?	1
Objectivity		
4.1	Is the author's standpoint clear?	1
4.2	Does the work seem to be balanced in presentation?	1
Date		
5.1	Does the item have a clearly stated date related to content?	1
Significance		
6.1	Is the item meaningful?	1
6.2	Does it add context?	1
6.3	Does it strengthen or refute a current position?	1
6.4	Would the research area be lesser without it?	1

Table S4: Quality appraisal of the three studies using the CHEC-extended checklist.

Question	Score (1 = Yes; 0.5 = partial; 0 = No)			
	Hollenbeak (2011)	Thanh (2018)	Woolley (2006)	Overall score (%)
Is the study population clearly described?	1	1	1	100%
Are competing alternatives clearly described?	0	0	1	33%
Is a well-defined research question posed in answerable form?	1	1	1	100%
Is the economic study design appropriate to the stated objective?	1	1	1	100%
Are the structural assumptions and the validation methods of the model properly reported?	1	1	0.5	83%
Is the chosen time horizon appropriate in order to include relevant costs and consequences?	1	1	1	100%
Is the actual perspective chosen appropriate?	1	1	1	100%
Are all important and relevant costs for each alternative identified?	1	1	1	100%
Are all costs measured appropriately in physical units?	1	1	1	100%
Are costs valued appropriately?	1	1	1	100%
Are all important and relevant outcomes for each alternative identified?	1	1	1	100%
Are all outcomes measured appropriately?	1	1	0.5	83%
Are outcomes valued appropriately?	1	1	1	100%
Is an appropriate incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?	1	1	1	100%
Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	0	0	1	33%

Are all important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?	1	1	1	100%
Do the conclusions follow from the data reported?	1	1	0.5	83%
Does the study discuss the generalizability of the results to other settings and patient/client groups?	1	1	0.5	83%
Does the article/report indicate that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?	1	1	0	67%
Are ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?	0	0	0	0
% Yes	17	17	16	-
Overall Quality	85%	85%	80%	83%