

### Quality Assessment of Prioritized Systematic Reviews

Author Year	Research questions and inclusion criteria included 'PICO'?	Explicit statement that review methods were established prior to conduct of review?	Explained selection of study designs for inclusion?	Comprehensive literature search performed?	Duplicate study selection and data extraction?	List of excluded studies and justification for exclusion provided?	Included studies described in adequate detail?
Ata-Ali 2020 <sup>18</sup>	Yes	Partial yes; no registration	Yes	Partial yes; no expert contact and no search in trial registries.	Yes for both.	Yes	Yes
Beza 2020 <sup>18</sup>	Yes	Partial yes; no registration	Yes	Partial yes; no extra searching outside of databases.	Yes to study selection; data extraction process not reported.	Yes	Yes
D'Autio 2017 <sup>23</sup>	No; PICO framework not used	No; no discussion of protocol or registration	Yes	Partial yes; no extra searching outside of databases.	Yes to study selection; data extraction process not reported.	No; no list of excluded studies	Yes; Appendix 2
D'Isidoro 2019 <sup>25</sup>	Yes	No; no discussion of protocol or registration	Yes; including CCT is reasonable for research question	Partial yes; no extra searching outside of databases.	Yes to data extraction; quality assessment process not reported.	No; no list of excluded studies	Yes; available in table
Garde 2019 <sup>20</sup>	Yes	No; no discussion of protocol or registration	Yes	Partial yes; no extra searching outside of databases.	Yes to study selection; data extraction process not reported.	No; no list of excluded studies	Yes
Lima 2019 <sup>21</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial yes; no expert contact and no search in trial registries	Yes to study selection; data extraction process not reported.	Yes	No; no description of included interventions or comparators.
Liu 2019 <sup>22</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes for both.	Yes	Yes
Simpson 2015 <sup>24</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes to both.	Yes	Yes

**Quality Assessment of Prioritized Systematic Reviews (Continued)**

Author Year	Risk of bias of the included studies assessed appropriately?	Reported on sources of funding of studies included in the review?	If meta-analysis performed, appropriate methods for combining results used?	If meta-analysis performed, potential impact of individual studies' ROB on results of meta-analysis assessed?	Accounted for risk of bias in individual studies when interpreting/discussing results?	Satisfactory explanation for and discussion of heterogeneity?	Likelihood of publication bias assessed?	Review author conflict of interest stated?	Overall quality (high, moderate, low, critically low)
Ata-Ali 2020 <sup>18</sup>	Yes	No; primary studies' funding not reported	Yes	Yes; studies at high risk of bias excluded from meta-analysis.	Yes; studies at high risk of bias excluded from discussion of results.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Beza 2020 <sup>19</sup>	Yes	No; primary studies' funding not reported	Yes	No; all studies included regardless of ROB.	No; discussed results of all studies regardless of ROB.	Yes	Yes; but small # of studies made visual inspection of funnel plot difficult.	Yes	Moderate
D'Autio 2017 <sup>23</sup>	Yes	No; included SRs funding not reported	NA	NA	No; no consistent use of ROB when describing results from studies.	No; heterogeneity between SRs not discussed	No; publication bias not assessed	No; funding info provided but not COI	Critically low
D'Isidoro 2019 <sup>25</sup>	Yes; Cochrane ROB tool used	No; no reporting of study funding.	NA	NA	No; discussed all studies regardless of ROB	Yes; studies described individually, no MA conducted because of heterogeneity	No; publication bias not assessed.	Yes	Moderate
Garde 2019 <sup>20</sup>	Yes	No; primary studies' funding not reported	Yes	No; all studies included regardless of ROB	No; discussed results of all studies regardless of ROB.	Yes	No; publication bias not assessed.	Yes	Moderate

Lima 2019 <sup>21</sup>	No; no assessment of selection or confounding bias.	No; primary studies' funding not reported	NA	NA	Yes; discussed results of all studies because all were deemed high quality	NA	No; publication bias not assessed.	Yes	Low
Liu 2019 <sup>22</sup>	Yes	Yes	NA; not enough studies for MA.	NA; not enough studies for MA	Yes; results not reported if study's flaws were too large.	NA	NA; not enough studies for publication bias assessment	Yes	High
Simpson 2015 <sup>24</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	High