

## Supplementary Information

**Table S1.** OQAQ: Quality assessment tool for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. A modified version of the OQAQ was used to assess the quality of reviews. This consists of the following nine questions each answerable as “yes”, “no” or “partially/can’t tell”, carrying scores of 2, 0 and 1, respectively.

---

<b>1. Were the search methods used to find evidence on the primary question(s) stated?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , description of databases searched, search strategy, and years reviewed. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Partially</i> , descriptions of methods not complete. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , no description of search methods. <i>No points</i> .

---

<b>2. Was the search for evidence reasonably comprehensive?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , at least one computerised database searched and also a search of unpublished or non-indexed literature. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Can't tell</i> , search strategy partially comprehensive, at least one of the strategies performed. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , search not comprehensive or not described well. <i>No points</i> .

---

<b>3. Were the criteria used for deciding which studies to include in the review reported?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , inclusion and exclusion criteria clearly defined. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Partially</i> , reference to inclusion and exclusion criteria can be found but are not defined clearly enough. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , no criteria defined. <i>No points</i> .

---

<b>4. Was bias in the selection of articles avoided?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , issues influencing selection bias were covered. Both of the following bias-avoiding strategies were used: (1) two or more assessors independently judged study relevance, (2) assessors selected studies using predetermined criteria. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Can't tell</i> , only one of the strategies used. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , selection bias was not avoided or was not discussed. <i>NO points</i> .

---

<b>5. Were the criteria used for assessing the methodological quality of studies reviewed reported?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , criteria defined and used addressed the major factors influencing bias. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Partially</i> , some discussion or reference to criteria. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , validity or methodological quality criteria not used or not described. <i>No points</i> .

---

<b>6. Were study quality assessment criteria used to inform the review analysis?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , criteria were used to inform the analysis, either by exclusion from the analysis if low quality or through sensitivity analysis. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Partially</i> , some discussion but not clearly described application of criteria. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , criteria not used or not described. <i>No points</i> .

---

<b>7. Were the methods used to combine the findings of the relevant studies (to reach a conclusion) reported?</b>
(a) <i>Yes</i> , qualitative and quantitative methods are acceptable. <i>Two points</i> .
(b) <i>Partially</i> , partial description of methods to combine and tabulate; not sufficient to duplicate. <i>One point</i> .
(c) <i>No</i> , methods not stated or described. <i>No points</i> .

---

Table S1. Cont.

---

**8. Were findings of the relevant studies combined appropriately relative to the primary question of the overview?**

---

- (a) *Yes*, combining of studies appears acceptable. *Two points*.
- (b) *Can't tell*, should be marked if in doubt. *One point*.
- (c) *No*, no attempt was made to combine findings, and no statement was made regarding the inappropriateness of combining findings. *0 points*.
- 

**9. Were the conclusions made by the author(s) supported by the data and/or analysis reported in the overview?**

---

- (a) *Yes*, data were reported that support the main conclusions regarding the primary question(s) that the overview addresses. *Two points*.
- (b) *Partially*. *One point*.
- (c) *No*, conclusions not supported or unclear. *0 points*.
-