

Appendix 2. Summary of AMSTAR-2 items and modified AMSTAR-2 items.

Topic #	AMSTAR-2 Original Items	AMSTAR-2 Modifications
1	<p>Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include components of PICO?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population - Intervention - Comparator group - Outcome - Timeframe for follow-up (optional) 	<p>“Population” became “Population and/or location”.</p> <p>“Intervention” became “Exposure”.</p> <p>The “Comparator group” category was taken out.</p> <p>A new section (#1.b) was created, it includes “Definition of the exposure”, “Definition of the outcome” and “Timeframe for follow up”.</p>
2	<p>Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?</p>	<p>To score “yes”, a protocol must have been established before the review. There are no sub-criteria, you can only score yes or no.</p>
3	<p>Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</p>	<p>If the study designs are specified, you score “partial yes”. They must be explained to score “yes”. No specific study design is required.</p>
4	<p>Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</p>	<p>The “searched trial/study registries” category was taken out.</p> <p>Justified publication restrictions (e.g. language) moved from (partial yes) to (yes)</p>
5	<p>Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</p>	<p>No modifications.</p>
6	<p>Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</p>	<p>No modifications.</p>
7	<p>Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusion?</p>	<p>The explanation of the inclusion and exclusion criteria is evaluated.</p> <p>If there is only one out of the two, you score “partial yes”. The two must be explained to score “yes”.</p>
8	<p>Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</p>	<p>“Populations” became “Populations and/or locations”.</p> <p>“Interventions” became “Exposures”.</p> <p>“Comparator groups” became “Comparator groups (if applicable)”.</p> <p>“Populations and/or locations”, “Exposures” and “Outcomes” must be described in details to score “yes”</p>
9	<p>Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</p>	<p>“RoB” became “limitations”. Instead of assessing the RoB, the review authors must have used a satisfactory technique for assessing the limitations in individual studies that were included in the review.</p>

10	Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?	No modifications.
11	If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	No modifications.
12	If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoBin individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis	No modifications.
13	Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	“RoB” became “limitations”. Instead of accounting for RoB in individual studies, the review authors must have accounted for limitations when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review.
14	Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	No modifications.
15	If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	No modifications.
16	Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	No modifications.