

Supplementary File S3

Summary of risk of Bias assessment.

	Was the study population representative of the target population?	Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?	Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR, was a census undertaken?	Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?	Were data collected directly from the subjects (as opposed to proxy)?	Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	Was there a description of the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest (incidence of pneumonia)?	Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Was the length of the shortest incidence period for the parameter of interest appropriate?	Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest appropriate?	Summary of the overall risk of study bias from the five most important items (2,4,6,7,10) regarding our study question
Choi et al. (38)	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
Citak et al. (39)	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	high
Fenton et al. (40)	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	high
Fussenich et al. (41)	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	high
Garcia-Leoni et al. (36)	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	high
Hatton et.al. (42)	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+		high
Ito et al. (43)	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+		high
Kamiya et al. (44)	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	high
McKinley et al. (45)	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
McKinley et al. (46)	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	high
Medee	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	high

et al. (37)											
Patel	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (47)											
Raab	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	high
et al. (48)											
Shem	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (18)											
Shem	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (19)											
Shem	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (29)											
Smith	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (49)											
Stillman	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	high
et al. (50)											
Street	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	high
et al. (51)											
Unsal-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
Delialioglu											
et al. (52)											
Wahman	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (53)											
Younan	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	high
et al. (54)											
Yu	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	high
et al. (55)											
Vitaz	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	high
et al. (56)											

Two questions were modified concerning the aim of the study. The question in item 1 was rephrased to "Was the study population representative of the target population?" (26) because our systematic review included the clinical SCI population. The question in item 7 was changed into "Was there a description of the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest (incidence of pneumonia)?".

We focused on the five most important items regarding our study question, namely item 2,4,6,7,10. The worst item out of these five items was decisive for the rating of the whole study.