Appendix 4

Quality assessment checklist

Study quality assessment for RCTs and controlled trials			
1.	Was the number of participants randomised stated?	1.1 Yes	
		1.2 No	
		1.3 Unclear	
		1.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
2.	Was the method of randomisation adequate (e.g. use of random number	2.1 Yes	
	table, computer random number generator, coin tossing, shuffling of cards or	2.2 No	
	envelopes, throwing of dice)?	2.3 Unclear	
		2.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
3.	Was allocation concealment adequate (e.g. central allocation, sequentially	3.1 Yes	
	numbered opaque sealed envelopes)?	3.2 No	
		3.3 Unclear	
		3.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
4.	Were the treatment groups comparable at baseline for important prognostic	4.1 Yes	
	factors?	4.2 No	
		4.3 Unclear	
		4.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
5.	Was a suitable statistical method used to adjust for possible baseline	5.1 Yes	
	imbalance?	5.2 No	
		5.3 Unclear	
		5.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
6.	Was the study reported as being at least double blind?	6.1 Yes	
		6.2 No	
		6.3 Unclear	
		6.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
7.	Were patients blinded?	7.1 Yes	
		7.2 No	
		7.3 Unclear	
		7.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
8.	Were outcome assessors blinded?	8.1 Yes	
		8.2 No	
		8.3 Unclear	
		8.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
9.	Were caregivers blinded?	9.1 Yes	
		9.2 No	
		9.3 Unclear	
		9.4 Not applicable (N/A)	
10.	Was ITT analysis used (in the analysis, participants were kept in the	10.1 Yes	
	intervention groups to which they were randomised, regardless of the	10.2 No	
	intervention they received)?	10.3 Unclear	
		10.4 Not applicable (N/A)	

11.	Were there any unexpected imbalances in dropouts between groups?	11.1 Yes		
		11.2 No		
		11.3 Unclear		
		11.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
12.	If there were any unexpected imbalances in dropouts were they explained or	12.1 Yes		
	adjusted for?	12.2 No		
		12.3 Unclear		
		12.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
13.	Was the study powered for at least one outcome?	13.1 Yes		
		13.2 No		
		13.3 Unclear		
		13.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
Study quality assessment for case series				
-	Were selection/eligibility criteria adequately reported?	14.1 Yes		
14.	were selection engionity enterta adequatery reported:	14.2 No		
		14.3 Unclear		
		14.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
1.5	Weg the colored a cardetion according of the top in a cardinal are stice?			
15.	Was the selected population representative of that seen in normal practice?	15.1 Yes 15.2 No		
		15.3 Unclear		
1.0	XV	15.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
16.	Was an appropriate measure of variability reported?	16.1 Yes		
		16.2 No		
		16.3 Unclear		
	XX 1 C II 1 10	16.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
17.	Was loss to follow-up reported or explained?	17.1 Yes		
		17.2 No		
		17.3 Unclear		
		17.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
18.	Were at least 90% of those included at baseline followed up?	18.1 Yes		
		18.2 No		
		18.3 Unclear		
		18.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
19.	Were patients recruited prospectively	19.1 Yes		
		19.2 No		
		19.3 Unclear		
		19.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
20.	Were patient recruited consecutively?	20.1 Yes		
		20.2 No		
		20.3 Unclear		
		20.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
21.	Did the study report relevant prognostic factors?	21.1 Yes		
		21.2 No		
		21.3 Unclear		
		21.4 Not applicable (N/A)		
22.	Any other additional limitations?	22.1 Yes		
		22.2 No		
		22.3 Unclear		
		22.4 Not applicable (N/A)		