

**Supplementary B: Results from Reporting Quality Assessment**

Study	Q1. Reported aim/hypothesis clearly	Q2. Interventions described	Q3. Definition of FAIS	Q4. Describes study design	Q5. Reports sampling frame	Q6. Reports inclusion criteria	Q7. Reports participation rate	Q8. Reports participant characteristics	Q9 Participant dropouts described	Q10. Intervention adverse events reported	Q11. Intervention co-variants reported	Q13. Statistical methods described	Q14. Main findings described	Q15. Random variability reported	Q16. Statistical parameters reported	Q17. Sample size calculation reported	Q18. Comparability of reference group	Q19. Adequate participation rate	Q20. Recruitment period described	Q21. Participant losses taken into account	Q25. Reliability of FAIS assessment	Q27. Standardised assessment of FAIS	Q29. Binding of observers	Q31. Reliability of 3D Biomechanics	Q33. Standardised assessment of 3D Biomechanics	Q34. Assessment period conducted at the same time	Q35. Collected data on severity/symptoms	Q36. Adjusted for co-variants/confounders	Q38. Sufficient follow-up timeframes	Q39. Lengths of follow up taken into account	Q41. Data reported in subgroups	Q42. Generalizability to the eligible population (participation rate)	Q43. Generalizability to the population (random sampling)	Overall score	Average score (0-2)	Quality H=High, M=Moderate, L=Low
Bagwell et al, 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33/54	1.22	M
Diamond et al, 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29/54	1.07	M
Hammond et al, 2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27/54	1.00	L	
Hetsroni et al, 2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27/54	1.00	L	
Hunt et al, 2013	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26/54	0.96	L	
Kennedy et al, 2009	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28/54	1.04	M	
Kumar et, 2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28/54	1.04	M	
Lamontagne et al, 2009	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34/54	1.26	M	
Ng et al, 2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37/54	1.37	M	
Samaan et al, 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28/54	1.04	M	
Samaan et al, 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31/54	1.15	M	
Brisson et al, 2013	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27/66	0.82	L	
Lamontagne et al, 2011	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30/60	1	L	
Rylander et al, 2013	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37/66	1.12	M	
Studies scoring "Yes" (%)	100	100	78.5	21.4	7.1	85.7	21.4	100	66.7	0	0	92.9	85.7	85.7	35.7	0	0	21.4	0	14.3	28.6	50	0	100	100	0	85.7	100	33.3	33.3	0	0	0			

Black shading "Yes"; grey shading, "Partial"; white (no shading), "No" or "Unable to Determine"; "-", "Not Applicable", item removed from scoring and not included in the percentage calculations.

