

Supplement 3: AMSTAR

Table of Contents

AMSTAR Checklist for Reviews	1
Process.....	3
Score Table Key.....	4
Table S3: AMSTAR scores.....	4

AMSTAR Checklist for Reviews

<p>1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? The research question and inclusion criteria should be established before the conduct of the review. <i>Note: Need to refer to a protocol, ethics approval, or pre-determined/a priori published research objectives to score a "yes."</i></p>	<table> <thead> <tr> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Can't answer</th> <th>N/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<p>2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? There should be at least two independent data extractors and a consensus procedure for disagreements should be in place. <i>Note: 2 people do study selection, 2 people do data extraction, consensus process or one person checks the other's work.</i></p>	<table> <thead> <tr> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Can't answer</th> <th>N/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<p>3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? At least two electronic sources should be searched. The report must include years and databases used (e.g., Central, EMBASE, and MEDLINE). Key words and/or MESH terms must be stated and where feasible the search strategy should be provided. All searches should be supplemented by consulting current contents, reviews, textbooks, specialized registers, or experts in the particular field of study, and by reviewing the references in the studies found. <i>Note: If at least 2 sources + one supplementary strategy used, select "yes" (Cochrane register/Central counts as 2 sources; a grey literature search counts as supplementary).</i></p>	<table> <thead> <tr> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Can't answer</th> <th>N/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<p>4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? The authors should state that they searched for reports regardless of their publication type. The authors should state whether or not they excluded any reports (from the systematic review), based on their publication status, language etc.</p>	<table> <thead> <tr> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Can't answer</th> <th>N/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	No	Can't answer	N/A						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						

<p><i>Note: If review indicates that there was a search for “grey literature” or “unpublished literature,” indicate “yes.” SINGLE database, dissertations, conference proceedings, and trial registries are all considered grey for this purpose. If searching a source that contains both grey and non-grey, must specify that they were searching for grey/unpublished lit.</i></p>				
<p>5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? A list of included and excluded studies should be provided. <i>Note: Acceptable if the excluded studies are referenced. If there is an electronic link to the list but the link is dead, select “no.”</i></p>	Yes	No	Can’t answer	N/A
<p>6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? In an aggregated form such as a table, data from the original studies should be provided on the participants, interventions and outcomes. The ranges of characteristics in all the studies analyzed e.g., age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data, disease status, duration, severity, or other diseases should be reported. <i>Note: Acceptable if not in table format as long as they are described as above.</i></p>	Yes	No	Can’t answer	N/A
<p>7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? 'A priori' methods of assessment should be provided (e.g., for effectiveness studies if the author(s) chose to include only randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled studies, or allocation concealment as inclusion criteria); for other types of studies alternative items will be relevant. <i>Note: Can include use of a quality scoring tool or checklist, e.g., Jadad scale, risk of bias, sensitivity analysis, etc., or a description of quality items, with some kind of result for EACH study (“low” or “high” is fine, as long as it is clear which studies scored “low” and which scored “high”; a summary score/range for all studies is not acceptable).</i></p>	Yes	No	Can’t answer	N/A
<p>8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? The results of the methodological rigor and scientific quality should be considered in the analysis and the conclusions of the review, and explicitly stated in formulating recommendations. <i>Note: Might say something such as “the results should be interpreted with caution due to poor quality of included studies.” Cannot score “yes” for this question if scored “no” for question 7.</i></p>	Yes	No	Can’t answer	N/A
	Yes	No	Can’t	N/A

<p>9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate? For the pooled results, a test should be done to ensure the studies were combinable, to assess their homogeneity (i.e., Chi-squared test for homogeneity, I²). If heterogeneity exists a random effects model should be used and/or the clinical appropriateness of combining should be taken into consideration (i.e., is it sensible to combine?). <i>Note: Indicate “yes” if they mention or describe heterogeneity, i.e., if they explain that they cannot pool because of heterogeneity/variability between interventions.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">answer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? An assessment of publication bias should include a combination of graphical aids (e.g., funnel plot, other available tests) and/or statistical tests (e.g., Egger regression test, Hedges-Olken). <i>Note: If no test values or funnel plot included, score “no”. Score “yes” if mentions that publication bias could not be assessed because there were fewer than 10 included studies.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes No Can't N/A answer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>11. Was the conflict of interest included? Potential sources of support should be clearly acknowledged in both the systematic review and the included studies. <i>Note: To get a “yes,” must indicate source of funding or support for the systematic review AND for each of the included studies.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes No Can't N/A answer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Shea *et al.* *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2007 7:10 doi:10.1186/1471-2288-7-10

Copyright © 2015 AMSTAR All Rights Reserved |

Process

All included reviews were independently scored by 2 reviewers, and a consensus process followed, involving a third person if needed. Reviews using statistical meta-analysis were scored out of 11. Narrative reviews, for which AMSTAR questions 9 and 10 were not relevant, were given a score out of 9.

Score Table Key

	Yes
	No / Can't answer
	Not applicable

Table S3: AMSTAR scores

	AMSTAR 1	AMSTAR 2	AMSTAR 3	AMSTAR 4	AMSTAR 5	AMSTAR 6	AMSTAR 7	AMSTAR 8	AMSTAR 9	AMSTAR 10	AMSTAR 11	Score
Akers, et al. (2016)												5 / 9
Alber & Heward (2000)												1 / 9
Baker, et al. (2009)												4 / 9
Barton & Wolery (2008)												3 / 9
Beets, et al. (2010)												3 / 9
Bellini & Akullian (2007)												7 / 11
Bennett, et al. (2017)												4 / 9

Briesch, et al. (2018)												6 / 11
Bruhn, et al. (2015)												3 / 9
Bruhn, et al. (2016)												2 / 9
Caldwell, et al. (2013)												8 / 11
Cameron, et al. (2001)												3 / 11
Cepeda, et al. (2006)												9 / 11
Clinton (2016)												5 / 11
Coakley, et al. (2017)												4 / 9
Commendador (2010)												2 / 9
Corralejo, et al. (2018)												1 / 9
Cowan, et al. (2017)												6 / 11
Cox (2005)												4 / 9
Davis, et al. (2016)												2 / 11
de Vries, et al. (2015)												6 / 11
Deci, et al. (1999)												7 / 11

DeMore & Cohen (2005)												3 / 11
Domire & Wolfe (2014)												5 / 9
Flower, et al. (2014)												3 / 11
Gaastra, et al. (2016)												5 / 11
Gerow, et al. (2018)												4 / 9
Gerow, Davis, et al. (2018)												5 / 9
Goh & Bambara (2012)												3 / 11
Gover, et al. (2018)												2 / 11
Griebler, et al. (2017)												5 / 9
Hawken, et al. (2014)												5 / 9
Hitchcock, et al. (2003)												3 / 9
Hoeve, et al. (2009)												5 / 11
Hong, et al. (2016)												5 / 11
Hong, et al. (2017)												7 / 11
Hynynen, et al. (2016)												7 / 11

Livingstone, et al. (2013)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	10 / 11
Luman, et al. (2005)	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-			-	3 / 9
Lydon, et al. (2013)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	5 / 9
Lydon, et al. (2017)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	5 / 11
Ma, et al. (2016)	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	3 / 11
MacNaul & Neely (2018)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	6 / 11
Mager & Nowak (2012)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	6 / 9
Mason, et al. (2012)	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	4 / 11
Mason, et al. (2013)	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	7 / 11
Mason, et al. (2016)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	6 / 11
Matson, et al. (2005)	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-			-	2 / 9
McDonald & Machalicek (2013)	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-			-	3 / 9
McGill, et al. 2015	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	9 / 11
McKenna, et al. (2016)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	6 / 9
Mindell (2006)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	5 / 9

Morgan (2006)												3 / 9
Mulligan, et al. (2014)												2 / 11
Mynttinen, et al. (2017)												4 / 9
Neely, et al. (2018)												6 / 9
Nugent, et al. (2004)												5 / 11
Owen, et al. (2012)												4 / 9
Patall, et al. (2008)												6 / 11
Petscher, et al. (2009)												3 / 9
Pollastri, et al. (2013)												3 / 9
Pyle & Fabiano (2017)												7 / 11
Radley & Dart (2016)												5 / 9
Reid, et al. (2005)												3 / 11
Reinoso, et al. (2018)												3 / 9
Reynhout & Carter (2011)												6 / 11
Richardson, et al. (2015-1)												10 / 11

Richardson, et al. (2015-2)	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	7 / 9
Royer, et al. (2018)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	6 / 11
Ryan, et al. (2010)	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	3 / 11
Schwalbe, et al. (2012)	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	5 / 11
See, et al. (2012)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	6 / 9
Seubert, et al. (2014)	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-			-	2 / 9
Shilling, et al. (2012)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	6 / 9
Simonsen, et al. (2008)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	1 / 9
Spriggs, et al. (2017)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	5 / 9
Strang, et al. (2013)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	7 / 11
Styles (2011)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	5 / 9
Sutton, et al. (2014)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	5 / 9
Tatla, et al. (2014)	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+			-	6 / 9
Vannest, et al. (2010)	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	5 / 11
Vegas, et al. (2007)	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	5 / 11

Voight & Nation (2016)												5 / 11
Vriend, et al. (2011)												5 / 9
Walker & Snell (2013)												7 / 11
Warmbold-Brann et al. (2017)												8 / 11
Warzak, et al. (2016)												4 / 9
Wolfe, et al. (2016)												6 / 11
Wong, et al. (2015)												2 / 9
Wong, et al. (2016)												6 / 11
Yee, et al. (2017)												5 / 11
Zhou, et al. (2011)												3 / 9
Zimmer-Gembeck & Helfand (2008)												3 / 9
Zimmerman & Ledford (2017)												5 / 9