

AMSTAR2-NNR: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies and/or observational studies. Question 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 13 are critical domains. Overall rating: **High confidence** = all critical domains YES, 0-2 non-critical domains NO; **Moderate confidence** = all critical domains YES, > 2 non-critical domains NO; **Low confidence**: 1 critical domain NO, 0-2 non-critical domains NO; **Critically low**: 1 critical domain NO, > 2 non-critical domains NO; or 2 or more critical domains NO, independent of non-critical domains. NB: Partial YES is rated as YES. Modified from: Shea et. al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ (2017).

1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?

For Yes:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comparator group | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome | |

2. 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?

For Partial Yes:

The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:

- review question(s)
- a search strategy
- inclusion/exclusion criteria
- a risk of bias assessment

For Yes:

As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:

- a meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, *and*
- a plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity
- justification for any deviations from the protocol

- Yes
- Partial Yes
- No

3. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?

For Partial Yes (all the following):

- searched at least 2 databases (relevant to research question)
- provided key word and/or search strategy
- justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)

For Yes, should also have (all the following):

- searched the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies
- conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review

- Yes
- Partial Yes
- No

4. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?

For Yes, either ONE of the following:

- at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include
- OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.

- Yes
- No

AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies and/or observational studies

5. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?

For Yes, either ONE of the following:

- at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies Yes
- OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer. No

6. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?

For Partial Yes:

- provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review

For Yes, must also have:

- Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study Yes
- Partial Yes No

7. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?

For Partial Yes (ALL the following):

- described populations
- described interventions/exposures
- described comparators
- described outcomes
- described research designs

For Yes, should also have ALL the following:

- described population in detail Yes
- described intervention/exposure in detail (including doses where relevant) Partial Yes
- described comparator in detail (including doses where relevant) No
- described timeframe for follow-up

8. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?

RCTs

For Partial Yes, must have assessed RoB from

- unconcealed allocation, *and*
- lack of blinding of patients and assessors when assessing outcomes (unnecessary for objective outcomes such as all-cause mortality)

For Yes, must also have assessed RoB from:

- allocation sequence that was not truly random, *and*
- selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome Yes
- Partial Yes No
- Includes only NRSI NRSI

NRSI or observational studies

For Partial Yes, must have assessed RoB:

- from confounding, *and*
- from selection bias

For Yes, must also have assessed RoB:

- methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes, *and*
- selection of the reported result from among multiple measurements or analyses of a specified outcome Yes
- Partial Yes No

9. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?

For Yes

- Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review. Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors also qualifies Yes
- No No

AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies, and/or observational studies

10. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?

RCTs

For Yes:

- The authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results and adjusted for heterogeneity if present. Yes
- AND investigated the causes of any heterogeneity No
- No meta-analysis conducted

For NRSI or observational studies

For Yes:

- The authors used an appropriate weighted technique to combine study results, adjusting for heterogeneity if present Yes
- AND they statistically combined effect estimates that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect estimates were not available No
- AND they reported separate summary estimates for for different study types separately when included in the review No meta-analysis conducted

11. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies by subgroup analysis, or when they interpreted/discussed the results of the review?

For Yes:

- included only low risk of bias RCTs Yes
- OR, if studies with moderate or high RoB were included the review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results No

12. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?

For Yes:

- There was no significant heterogeneity in the results Yes
- OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact of this on the results of the review No

13. 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?

For Yes:

- performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias Yes
- No No
- No meta-analysis conducted

14. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

For Yes:

- The authors reported no competing interests OR Yes
- The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest No