

Supplementary table 4. Detailed quality assessment table

Threats to validity	Castro	Chaiklieng	Chua	Dawson (2003)	Dawson (2002)	Dufour	Gabell	Hong
Selection bias (Participant representativeness)	?	✓	?	?	?	✓	✓	X
Selection bias (Group equivalence)	?	?	?	✓	?	?	?	NA
Chance (Sample size rationale)	?	?	?	x	x	✓	?	?
Detection bias (Exposure measure)	?	✓	✓	?	?	?	?	✓
Detection bias (Outcome measure)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Detection bias (Loss to follow-up)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	✓	NA
Detection/Reporting bias (Appropriate analysis)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reporting bias (Conflict of interest)	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Quality summary	43 L	71 H	43 L	57 M	43 L	71 H	63 M	67 M

Threats to validity	Keegan	McWilliams	Menz	Moore	Nagata	Nguyen	Sherrington	Tencer
Selection bias (Participant representativeness)	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓	?	✓
Selection bias (Group equivalence)	✓	✓	?	NA	?	?	?	✓
Chance (Sample size rationale)	?	?	?	✓	✓	?	?	?
Detection bias (Exposure)	?	?	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓
Detection bias (Outcome measure)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Detection bias (Loss to follow-up)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Detection/Reporting bias (Appropriate analysis)	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓
Reporting bias (Conflict of interest)	✓	×	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓
Quality summary	71 H	43 L	57 M	83 H	57 M	57 M	57 M	86 H

Threats to validity	Williams	Yung-Hui
Selection bias (Participant representativeness)	✓	×
Selection bias (Group equivalence)	NA	NA
Chance (Sample size rationale)	✓	?
Detection bias (Exposure)	?	✓
Detection bias (Outcome measure)	✓	✓
Detection bias (Loss to follow-up)	NA	NA
Detection/Reporting bias (Appropriate analysis)	✓	✓
Reporting bias (Conflict of interest)	✓	✓
Quality summary	83 H	67 M

✓ = low risk of bias, × = high risk of bias, ? = unclear, NA = not applicable. Quality summary expressed as % of applicable items that are graded as ✓ and classified as H (high quality) if ≥70%, M (moderate quality) if 50-69 and L (low quality) if ≤4