AMSTAR 2						
1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?						
For Yes	:	Optional (recommended)				
	<u>P</u> opulation	☐ Timeframe for follow-up		Yes		
	<u>Intervention</u>			No		
	Comparator group Outcome					
2.		ntain an explicit statement that the rest of the review and did the report just				
For Part		For Yes:				
	hors state that they had a written l or guide that included ALL the ag:	As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:				
				Yes		
	review question(s) a search strategy	a meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, <i>and</i>		Partial Yes No		
	inclusion/exclusion criteria	a plan for investigating		140		
	a risk of bias assessment	causes of heterogeneity				
		<ul><li>justification for any deviations from the protocol</li></ul>				
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?						
	, the review should satisfy ONE o					
	Explanation for including only R			Yes No		
	OR Explanation for including or OR Explanation for including bo			INO		
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?						
For Part	tial Yes (all the following):	For Yes, should also have (all the following):				
	searched at least 2 databases	searched the reference		Yes		
	(relevant to research question) provided key word and/or	lists/bibliographies of included studies		Partial Yes No		
	search strategy	searched trial/study		INO		
	justified publication	registries				
	restrictions (eg, language)	included/consulted content experts in the field				
		where relevant, searched for grey literature				
		conducted search within 24 months of completion of the				
		review				
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?						
For Yes	, either ONE of the following:		-1	V		
	studies and achieved consensus of	ntly agreed on selection of eligible on which studies to include		Yes No		
OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved						
good agreement (at least 80 per cent), with the remainder selected by						
	one reviewer					
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?						
For Yes	, either ONE of the following:			•		
	at least two reviewers achieved of	consensus on which data to extract	. /	Vec		

	from included studies		$\square$ No
		a from a sample of eligible studies and	
		st 80 per cent), with the remainder	
	extracted by one reviewer		
7.	Did the review authors provide	e a list of excluded studies and justify	the exclusions?
For Part		For Yes, must also have:	
	provided a list of all	☐ Justified the exclusion from	Yes
	potentially relevant studies	the review of each	□ Partial Yes
	that were read in full text form	potentially relevant study	$\square$ No
	but excluded from the review		
8.	Did the review authors describ	e the included studies in adequate det	ail?
For Part	ial Yes (ALL the following):	For Yes, should also have ALL the following:	,
	described populations	described population in	Yes
	described interventions	detail	☐ Partial Yes
	described comparators	described intervention and	$\square$ No
	described outcomes	comparator in detail	
	described research designs	(including doses where relevant)	
		described study's setting	
		timeframe for follow-up	
		· · ·	
9.	Did the review authors use a saindividual studies that were in	atisfactory technique for assessing the cluded in the review?	risk of bias (RoB) in
RCTs			
For Part RoB fro	ial Yes, must have assessed m	For Yes, must also have assessed RoB from:	
	unconcealed allocation, and	allocation sequence that was	Yes
~~	lack of blinding of patients	not truly random, and	☐ Partial Yes
	and assessors when assessing	selection of the reported	$\square$ No
	outcomes (unnecessary for	result from among multiple	☐ Includes only
	objective outcomes such as all	measurements or analyses of	NRSI
NIDGI	cause mortality)	a specified outcome	
NRSI For Port	ial Vag must have assessed	F., V.,	
roi Paii RoB:	ial Yes, must have assessed	For Yes, must also have assessed RoB:	□ Yes
	Cram and Counting and		
	from confounding, and	<ul><li>methods used to ascertain exposures and outcomes,</li></ul>	☐ Partial Yes
Ш	from selection bias	and	□ No
		□ selection of the reported	☐ Includes only RCTs
		result from among multiple	IC 13
		measurements or analyses of	
		a specified outcome	
10.	Did the review authors report	on the sources of funding for the studi	ies included in the review?
For Ye			<u>.</u>
	•	rces of funding for individual studies inc	eluded Yes
		that the reviewers looked for this inform	
	but it was not reported by stud		
		<u>-</u>	
11.	If meta-analysis was perform combination of results?	ed did the review authors use appropr	iate methods for statistica
RCTe			
	•		
RCTs For Yes		the data in a meta-analysis	Yes
	The authors justified combining	the data in a meta-analysis e weighted technique to combine	Yes No

☐ AND investigated the causes of any heterogeneity	conducted					
For NRSI						
For Yes:						
☐ The authors justified combining the data in a meta-analysis	□ Yes					
☐ AND they used an appropriate weighted technique to combine	□ No					
study results, adjusting for heterogeneity if present	☐ No meta-analysis					
☐ AND they statistically combined effect estimates from NRSI	conducted					
that were adjusted for confounding, rather than combining						
raw data, or justified combining raw data when adjusted effect						
estimates were not available						
AND they reported separate summary estimates for RCTs and						
NRSI separately when both were included in the review						
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?						
For Yes:						
☐ included only low risk of bias RCTs	Yes					
□ OR, if the pooled estimate was based on RCTs and/or NRSI at variable	□ No					
RoB, the authors performed analyses to investigate possible impact of	□ No meta-analysis					
RoB on summary estimates of effect	conducted					
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when i	interpreting/discussing					
the results of the review?						
For Yes:						
☐ included only low risk of bias RCTs	Yes					
OR, if RCTs with moderate or high RoB, or NRSI were included the	□ No					
review provided a discussion of the likely impact of RoB on the results						
14 Did the various authors associate a setisfactors comparation for and d	:					
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and d heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	iscussion of, any					
For Yes:						
There was no significant heterogeneity in the results						
OR if heterogeneity was present the authors performed an investigation	□ Yes					
of sources of any heterogeneity in the results and discussed the impact	No No					
of this on the results of the review						
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry	v out an adequate					
investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its lik						
of the review?	-					
For Yes:	_					
performed graphical or statistical tests for publication bias and	Yes					
discussed the likelihood and magnitude of impact of publication bias	□ No					
	□ No meta-analysis					
	conducted					
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of int	erest, 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	□ No					
managed potential conflicts of interest						