



	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ament [20]</b>	<b>Benenson [21]</b>	<b>Cates [22]</b>	<b>Enriquez [23]</b>	<b>Forsner [24]</b>	<b>Gerber [35]</b>	<b>Higuchi [25]</b>	<b>Kelly [26]</b>
8	Have all important adverse events that may be a consequence of the intervention been reported?	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
9	Have the characteristics of patients lost to follow-up been described?	<i>Patients' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	utd	utd	utd	utd	yes	utd	utd
10	Have actual probability values been reported (e.g. 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001?	yes	yes	utd	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

---

**External validity**

11	Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	<i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'. In case of general guideline and a multicentre study: yes. In case of a centre specific guideline and one guideline: yes.</i>	yes	no	utd	yes	yes	yes	no	no
----	---	---	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----

	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ament [20]</b>	<b>Benenson [21]</b>	<b>Cates [22]</b>	<b>Enriquez [23]</b>	<b>Forsner [24]</b>	<b>Gerber [35]</b>	<b>Higuchi [25]</b>	<b>Kelly [26]</b>
12	Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? <i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	yes	utd	utd	no	yes	yes	no	utd
13	Were the staff, places, and facilities where the patients were treated, representative of the treatment the majority of patients receive?	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

---

**Internal validity - bias**

14	Was an attempt made to blind study subjects to the intervention they have received? <i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
15	Was an attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes of the intervention?	utd	utd	utd	utd	utd	no	utd	utd
16	If any of the results of the study were based on "data dredging", was this made clear?	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no
17	In trials and cohort studies, do the analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up of patients, or in case-control studies, is the time period between the intervention and outcome the same for cases and controls?	na	na	na	yes	yes	na	na	na

	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ament [20]</b>	<b>Benenson [21]</b>	<b>Cates [22]</b>	<b>Enriquez [23]</b>	<b>Forsner [24]</b>	<b>Gerber [35]</b>	<b>Higuchi [25]</b>	<b>Kelly [26]</b>
18	Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
19	Was compliance with the intervention/s reliable?	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
20	Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

---

**Internal validity - confounding (selection bias and power)**

21	Were the patients in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited from the same population?	<i>Patients' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	na	na	na	yes	yes	na	na	na
22	Were study subjects in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited over the same period of time?	<i>Study subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	na	na	na	yes	yes	na	na	na
23	Were study subjects randomised to intervention groups?	<i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no

	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ament [20]</b>	<b>Benenson [21]</b>	<b>Cates [22]</b>	<b>Enriquez [23]</b>	<b>Forsner [24]</b>	<b>Gerber [35]</b>	<b>Higuchi [25]</b>	<b>Kelly [26]</b>
24	Was the randomised intervention assignment concealed from both patients and health care staff until recruitment was complete and irrevocable?	na	na	na	utd	utd	na	na	na
25	Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn?	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
26	Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account?	utd	utd	utd	yes	utd	utd	utd	utd
	<i>Patients was replaced by professionals</i>								
27	Did the study have sufficient power to detect a clinically important effect where the probability value for a difference being due to chance is less than 5%?	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no

utd: Items were qualified as 'unable to determine' when information was not reported  
na: not applicable

#### Supplementary File 4: Risk of bias using the Downs and Black

	Author:	Knops [27]	Lozsadi [28]	McLaws [29]	Stephan [30]	Wakefield [31]	Williams [32]
<b>Reporting</b>	<b>comment</b>						
1	Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section?	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
3	Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study clearly described ?	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no
	<i>Patients' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>						
4	Are the interventions of interest clearly described?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	<i>Intervention was replaced by guideline</i>						
5	Are the distributions of principal confounders in each group of subjects to be compared clearly described?	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
6	Are the main findings of the study clearly described?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
7	Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?	na	na	na	na	na	na

	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Knops [27]</b>	<b>Lozsadi [28]</b>	<b>McLaws [29]</b>	<b>Stephan [30]</b>	<b>Wakefield [31]</b>	<b>Williams [32]</b>
8	Have all important adverse events that may be a consequence of the intervention been reported?	na	na	na	na	na	na
9	Have the characteristics of patients lost to follow-up been described?	<i>Patients' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	utd	utd	utd	utd	utd
10	Have actual probability values been reported (e.g. 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001?	utd	utd	yes	yes	yes	yes

---

**External validity**

11	Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	<i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'. In case of general guideline and a multicentre study: yes. In case of a centre specific guideline and one guideline: yes.</i>	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes
----	---	---	-----	----	-----	----	----	-----

	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Knops [27]</b>	<b>Lozsadi [28]</b>	<b>McLaws [29]</b>	<b>Stephan [30]</b>	<b>Wakefield [31]</b>	<b>Williams [32]</b>
12	Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? <i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	yes	utd	yes	utd	utd	yes
13	Were the staff, places, and facilities where the patients were treated, representative of the treatment the majority of patients receive?	yes	no	yes	no	no	no

---

**Internal validity - bias**

14	Was an attempt made to blind study subjects to the intervention they have received? <i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	na	na	na	na	na	na
15	Was an attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes of the intervention?	utd	utd	utd	utd	utd	utd
16	If any of the results of the study were based on "data dredging", was this made clear?	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
17	In trials and cohort studies, do the analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up of patients, or in case-control studies, is the time period between the intervention and outcome the same for cases and controls?	na	na	na	na	na	na



	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Knops [27]</b>	<b>Lozsadi [28]</b>	<b>McLaws [29]</b>	<b>Stephan [30]</b>	<b>Wakefield [31]</b>	<b>Williams [32]</b>
18	Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?	no	utd	yes	yes	yes	yes
19	Was compliance with the intervention/s reliable?	na	na	na	na	na	na
20	Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

---

**Internal validity - confounding (selection bias and power)**

21	Were the patients in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited from the same population?	<i>Patients' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	na	na	na	na	na	na
22	Were study subjects in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited over the same period of time?	<i>Study subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	na	na	na	na	na	na
23	Were study subjects randomised to intervention groups?	<i>Subjects' was replaced by 'professionals'</i>	no	no	no	no	no	no

	<b>Author:</b>	<b>Knops [27]</b>	<b>Lozsadi [28]</b>	<b>McLaws [29]</b>	<b>Stephan [30]</b>	<b>Wakefield [31]</b>	<b>Williams [32]</b>
24	Was the randomised intervention assignment concealed from both patients and health care staff until recruitment was complete and irrevocable?	na	na	na	na	na	na
25	Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn?	no	no	yes	yes	no	no
26	Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account? <i>Patients was replaced by professionals</i>	utd	utd	utd	utd	utd	utd
27	Did the study have sufficient power to detect a clinically important effect where the probability value for a difference being due to chance is less than 5%?	no	no	no	yes	no	no

utd: Items were qualified as 'unable to determine' when information was not  
na: not applicable