|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First Author, Year** | **Was the review based on a focused question of interest?** | **Was the literature search strategy clearly described?** | **Was there evidence of a substantial effort to search for all relevant research?** | **Were there**  **explicit inclusion/ exclusion**  **criteria for the selection of studies?** | **Did at least 2 people independently review studies?** | **Was the validity of included studies adequately assessed?** | **Was publication bias assessed?** | **Was heterogeneity assessed and addressed?** | **Was the approach used to synthesize the information adequate and appropriate?** | **Were the authors’ conclusions supported by the evidence they presented?** | **Quality Rating** |
| Jahromi, 20054 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Nederkoorn, 20035 | Yes | No | No (searched only 1 database, and limited to 1994 to 2001) | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes for positivity criteria; no for clinical heterogeneity | Yes | No | Fair |
| Blakely, 19956 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |

Good: Recent, relevant review with comprehensive sources and search strategies, explicit and relevant selection criteria, standard appraisal of included studies, and valid conclusions.

Fair: Recent, relevant review that is not clearly biased but lacks comprehensive sources and search strategies.

Poor: Outdated, irrelevant, or biased review without systematic search for studies, explicit selection criteria, or standard appraisal of studies.