Table 1_Part 1

Risk of Bias Assessment. YES=1, NO=0, Unable to determine=0 (For external Validity, Internnal Validity Bias and Confounding). Assessing the Quality: Excellent (11-13), Good (9-10), Fair (7-8), Poor (≤6). Note: R1=Rater 1, R2=Rater 2.

ARTICLE AUTHOR AND DATE		CURTIS KA ET AL. 1985		DERMAN ET AL. 2017		DERMAN ET AL. 2020		FERRARA ET AL. 2000		HAWKESWOOD ET AL. 2011		HOLLANDER ET AL. 2020		LEXELL ET AL. 2021		MAGNO E SILVA ET AL. 2012		MCCORMACK DA ET AL. 1991		SOBRY AJ ET AL. 2022		WEBBORN ET AL. 2006		WEBBORN, WILLICK & EMERY 2012		WESSELS ET AL. 2012	
DESCRIPTION		R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2
REPORTING																											
1	Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study clearly described?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Are the main findings of the study clearly described?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
6	Have the characteristics of patients lost to follow-up been described?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1_Part 2

Risk of Bias Assessment. YES=1, NO=0, Unable to determine=0 (For external Validity, Internnal Validity Bias and Confounding). Assessing the Quality: Excellent (11-13), Good (9-10), Fair (7-8), Poor (≤6). Note: R1=Rater 1, R2=Rater 2.

	ARTICLE AUTHOR AND DATE	CURTIS KA ET AL. 1985		DERMAN ET AL. 2017		DERMAN ET AL. 2020		FERRARA ET AL. 2000		HAWKESWOOD ET AL. 2011		HOLLANDER ET AL. 2020		LEXELL ET AL. 2021		MAGNO E SILVA ET AL. 2012		MCCORMACK DA ET AL. 1991		SOBRY AJ ET AL. 2022		WEBBORN ET AL. 2006		WEBBORN, WILLICK & EMERY 2012		WESSELS ET AL. 2012	
DESCRIPTION		R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2	R1	R2
EXTERNAL VALIDITY																											
8	Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
INTERNAL VALIDITY – BIAS																											
10	If any of the results of the study were based on "data dredging", was this made clear?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
INTERNAL VALIDITY – CONFOUNDING (SELECTION BIAS)																											
13	Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	8	8	10	10	9	7	8	8	9	9	8	8	8	8	9	9
MEAN OF THE TWO RATERS		9		10		10		10		8		8		10		8		8		9		8		8		9	
ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY		Good		Good		Good		Good		Fair		Fair		Good		Fair		Fair		Good		Fair		Fair		Good	
OVERALL SOCORE		9																									