Author Year of systematic review	Search methods reported	Comprehensive search	Inclusion criteria	Selection bias avoided	Validity criteria reported	Validity assessed appropriately	Methods used to combine studies reported	Findings combined appropriately	Conclusions supported by data	Overall scientific quality (higher score is better)
Asenjo Lobos 2010 ⁸⁰	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; excluded studies where sequence generation was at high risk of bias or where allocation was clearly not concealed.	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Barbui 200881	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Barbui 200982	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Cipriani 2005 (Fluoxetine) ⁸³	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; no variation to analyze.	Yes	Can't tell for suicide; reported no differences between fluoxetine and control AD among 4 studies but analysis of heterogeneity not reported.	Yes	6
Cipriani 2005 (Lithium) ⁸⁴	Yes	Yes		Yes; study flow diagram provided reasons for exclusion.	Yes	No; reported allocation concealment, blinding and ITT analysis; no analysis based on quality, despite some variation in use of blinding.	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
Cipriani 2009 ⁸⁵	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; those rated C (inadequate) excluded from analysis.	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Craig 2009 ⁸⁶	No; no mention of search terms.	No; no supplemental sources.		No; detailed results of study selection not reported, no reasons for exclusions described.	No	Can't tell; within GRADE evaluation of quality of evidence, deducted points for internal validity limitations; but, unclear as to the scope of the internal validity domains assessed.	Yes	Yes	Yes	3

Author Year of systematic review	Search methods reported	Comprehensive search	Inclusion criteria	Selection bias avoided	Validity criteria reported	Validity assessed appropriately	Methods used to combine studies reported	Findings combined appropriately	Conclusions supported by data	Overall scientific quality (higher score is better)
Dubicka 2010 ⁸⁷	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; study flow diagram provided reasons for exclusion.	Yes	Yes; reported results of validity assessment; none were poor, not necessarily a need to control for variation in synthesis.	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Grandjean 2009 ⁸⁸	Yes	No; only one database.	No	Can't tell.	No	Can't tell; validity of all studies not provided, but noted that only publications with the highest standards of quality were selected.	No	Can't tell; methods not reported.	Yes	2
Hammerness 2006 ⁹¹	Yes	No; only one database.	No	Can't tell; numbers and reasons for exclusions not reported.	Yes	Can't tell; validity of studies not referred to in text.	Can't tell; no mention of consideration of quantitative analysis and no grading of strength of evidence.	Yes	Yes	5
Hazell 2011 ⁸⁹	Partially; no mention of search terms	No; no supplemental sources.	Yes	Can't tell; numbers and reasons for exclusions not reported	No	Yes; validity assessment included in GRADE strength of evidence ratings.	Yes; used GRADE approach to rate strength of evidence.	Yes	Yes	5
Innamorati 2011 ⁹⁰	Yes	No; no supplemental sources.	No; no information on PICOTS.	Can't tell; only reported number of included studies.	No; none described; only use of Shekelle 1999 ¹²³ scheme for classifying study design and strength of recommendation, but no quality.	No	Yes; used Shekelle 1999 ¹²³ scheme for classifying study design and strength of recommendation.	Yes	Yes	3
McDonagh 2010 ⁹²	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health 2005 ¹⁰⁰	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7

Author Year of systematic review	Search methods reported	Comprehensive search	Inclusion criteria	Selection bias avoided	Validity criteria reported	Validity assessed appropriately	Methods used to combine studies reported	Findings combined appropriately	Conclusions supported by data	Overall scientific quality (higher score is better)
Robinson 2011 ⁹³	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell; numbers of exclusions reported at each stage, but reasons not reported.	Yes	No; reported results of validity assessment in table and paragraph, but did not appear to account for variation in synthesis.	Yes	No; only 1 comparison with >1 study and did not combine data and did not explain reasons for this.	Yes	4
Sakinofsky 2007 (Parts 1 & 2) ^{94, 95}	Partially; start date provided, but no end date.	Yes; several databases were used.	Can't tell; RCTs were the main focus but of necessity; it also considered other categories of investigations of the outcome of treatment.	No; no information related to number of articles found, included, and excluded.	No; did not describe criteria used to differentiate between good and deficiencies.	Yes; critical assessment of the quality of design, conduct and analysis of the studies was performed and reported according to authors' constructed schema of level of evidence.	Yes	Yes; report of findings follow simplified scheme of evidence constructed by authors.	Yes	4
Soomro 2008 ⁹⁶	Yes	No; no hand- searching, reference list searching, or asking experts noted.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4
Van Lieshout 2010 ⁹⁷	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; study flow diagram provided reasons for exclusion.	Yes	Yes; only included studies with a Jadad score of ≥3.	Yes; used GRADE approach to rate strength of evidence.	Yes; no significant heterogeneity reported.	Yes	7
Williams 2009 ⁹⁸ & Williams 2009 ⁹⁹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; study flow diagram in Pediatrics publication, ⁹⁹ reasons for exclusion for individual trials provided in Evidence Report. ⁹⁸	Yes	Yes; excluded poor quality studies.	Yes	Yes; did not conduct meta- analyses due to heterogeneity.	Yes	7
Ziemba 2010 ¹⁰¹	Yes	Yes; searched references lists which led to identification of FDA meta- analysis.	No	No; not reported.	No	Can't tell; only reported one study, described as the highest level of evidence they found.	No	No; methods not reported.	Yes	2