

ONLINE SUPPLEMENTARY S4

Modified Downs and Black²⁵ Quality assessment scores and 2009 OCEBM²⁶ classifications for studies included.

Included studies	Downs and Black Question													Total score	Quality of study	OCEBM Study level
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13			
<i>Fahlman</i> ²⁷	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Edouard et al.</i> ²⁸	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	Good	2b
<i>Matthews et al.</i> ²⁹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Fricter et al.</i> ³⁰	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Cox et al.</i> ³¹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Ihalainen et al.</i> ³²	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	2b
<i>Ansley et al.</i> ³³	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	Good	3b
<i>Moreira et al.</i> ³⁴	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	10	Good	3b
<i>Svensden et al.</i> ³⁵	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	10	Good	2b
<i>Dressendorfer et al.</i> ³⁶	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Spence et al.</i> ¹⁰	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Hanstock et al.</i> ³⁷	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Schwellnus et al.</i> ³⁸	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Leicht et al.</i> ³⁹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Furusawa et al.</i> ⁴⁰	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Fowler et al.</i> ⁴¹	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	10	Good	1b
<i>Thornton et al.</i> ⁴²	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Cunniffe et al.</i> ⁴³	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Schwellnus et al.</i> ⁴⁴	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Schwellnus et al.</i> ⁴⁵	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Tiernan et al.</i> ⁴⁶	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	Good	1b
<i>Yamauchi et al.</i> ⁴⁷	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Neville et al.</i> ⁴⁸	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	10	Good	1b
<i>Nakamura et al.</i> ⁴⁹	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Milanez et al.</i> ⁵⁰	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	2b
<i>Gleeson et al.</i> ⁵¹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Hellard et al.</i> ¹³	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Gleeson et al.</i> ⁵²	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Gleeson et al.</i> ⁵³	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Rama et al.</i> ⁵⁴	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Hellard et al.</i> ⁵⁵	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Brisola et al.</i> ⁵⁶	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Novas et al.</i> ⁵⁷	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Novas et al.</i> ⁵⁸	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>He et al.</i> ⁵⁹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Hauswirth et al.</i> ⁶⁰	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	2b
<i>Zehsaz et al.</i> ⁶¹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Gleeson et al.</i> ⁶³	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>He et al.</i> ⁶⁴	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Gleeson et al.</i> ⁶⁵	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Ikonen et al.</i> ⁶⁶	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	3b
<i>Scullion et al.</i> ⁶⁷	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Gleeson et al.</i> ⁹	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b
<i>Blume et al.</i> ⁶⁸	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	1b
<i>Cox et al.</i> ⁶⁹	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	10	Good	2b
<i>Cox et al.</i> ⁷⁰	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	12	Excellent	3b
<i>Reid et al.</i> ⁶²	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	9	Good	1b
<i>Hanstock et al.</i> ⁷¹	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	11	Excellent	1b

Note: 1, Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?; 2, Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section?; 3, Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study clearly described; 4, Are the main findings of the study clearly described?; 5, Does the study provide

estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?; 6, Have the characteristics of patients lost to follow-up been described?; 7, 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?; 8, Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?; 9, Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?; 10, If any of the results of the study were based on “data dredging”, was this made clear?; 11, Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?; 12, Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?; 13, Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account?.