Supplementary materials

Table S1 PRISMA NMA Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting a Systematic Review Involving a Network Meta-analysis

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review *incorporating a network meta-analysis (or related form of meta-analysis).*	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: **Background:** main objectives **Methods:** data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal; and *synthesis methods, such as network meta-analysis.* **Results:** number of studies and participants identified; summary estimates with corresponding confidence/credible intervals; *treatment rankings may also be discussed. Authors may choose to summarize pairwise comparisons against a chosen treatment included in their analyses for brevity.* **Discussion/Conclusions:** limitations; conclusions and implications of findings. **Other:** primary source of funding; systematic review registration number with registry name.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known*, including mention of why a network meta-analysis has been conducted.*	2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed, with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	2
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. *Clearly describe eligible treatments included in the treatment network, and note whether any have been clustered or merged into the same node (with justification).*	2
Information sources	6	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	2
Search strategy	7	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	3

Study selection	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	3
Data collection process	9	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	3-4
Data items	10	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	4
Risk of bias within individual studies	11	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	3
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	3
Synthesis method	13	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis	3
Reporting bias assessment	14	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	3
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	2-3
RESULTS			
Study selection	16	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	4
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	5-6
Risk of bias within studies	18	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment.	5
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots	6-10
Synthesis of results	20	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	9
Risk of bias across studies	21	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies for the evidence base being studied.	9-10
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	6-10

DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	23	Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy-makers).	11-12
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	1, 2
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	14
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	14
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	4-5