

Author Year of systematic review	Search methods reported	Comprehensive search	Inclusion criteria reported	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)
Abbass 2009 <sup>102</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Binks 2011 <sup>104</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Corcoran 2011 <sup>105</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell; reported that 6 studies did not meet the quality criteria, but did not specify which studies, which criteria, and did not appear to do any type of sensitivity analysis.	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
Craig 2009 <sup>86</sup>	No; no mention of search terms.	No; no supplemental sources.	Yes	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
Dieterich 2010 <sup>106</sup>	Yes	Yes; only searched one database, though this database combines multiple other databases.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Dubicka 2010 <sup>87</sup>	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
Hazell 2011 <sup>89</sup>	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 <sup>90</sup>	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 <sup>123</sup> scheme for classifying study design and strength of recommendation, but no quality assessment	No	Yes; used Shekelle 1999 <sup>123</sup> scheme for classifying study design and strength of recommendation	Yes	Yes	3

Author Year of systematic review	Search methods reported	Comprehensive search	Inclusion criteria reported	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)
Irving 2010 <sup>107</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Kavanagh 2009 <sup>108</sup>	Partially; date of most recent searches not reported.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Lapierre 2011 <sup>109</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell; detailed results of study selection not reported, no reasons for exclusion described.	Yes	No; reported validity assessment, but did not do any type of analysis with it.	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
Leenaars 2011 <sup>110</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell; detailed results of study selection not reported, no reasons for exclusions described.	No	No validity assessment.	No	No	Can't tell; data not reported for all studies.	2
Muralidharan 2009 <sup>111</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health 2005 <sup>100</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Newton 2010 <sup>112</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Pharaoh 2010 <sup>113</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Robinson 2011 <sup>93</sup>	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

Author Year of systematic review	Search methods reported	Comprehensive search	Inclusion criteria reported	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)
Sakinofsky 2007 (Parts 1 & 2) <sup>94, 95</sup>	Partially; start date provided, but no end date.	Yes; several databases were used.	Can't tell; RCTs were the main focus but of neces- sity; it also considered other cat- egories of investiga- tions 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
Shek 2010 <sup>114</sup>	Yes	Yes; only searched one database, though this database combines multiple other databases.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Shekelle 2009 <sup>14</sup> & Bagley 2010 <sup>103</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
Soomro 2008 <sup>96</sup>	Yes	No; no hand- searching, reference list searching, or asking experts noted.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4
State of Victoria Department of Health 2010 <sup>115</sup>	Yes	No; no hand- searching, reference list searching, or asking experts noted.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell.	Yes	6
Takada 2010 <sup>116</sup>	Yes	No; no hand- searching, reference list searching, or asking experts noted.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	3
Williams 2009 <sup>98</sup> & Williams 2009 <sup>99</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; study flow diagram in Pediatrics publication, <sup>99</sup> reasons for exclusion for individual trials provided in Evidence Report. <sup>98</sup>	Yes	Yes; excluded poor quality studies.	Yes	Yes; did not conduct meta- analyses due to heterogeneity	Yes	7