

Table: Correspondence of the domains between AMSTAR and ROBIS

AMSTAR	ROBIS
	<u>Domain 1: Study eligibility criteria</u>
1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?	1.1 Did the review adhere to pre-defined objectives and eligibility criteria?
<i>not considered</i>	1.2 Were the eligibility criteria appropriate for the review question?
<i>not considered</i>	1.3 Were eligibility criteria unambiguous?
<i>not considered</i>	1.4 Were all restrictions in eligibility criteria based on study characteristics appropriate (e.g. date, sample size, study quality, outcomes measured)?
<i>not considered</i>	1.5 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on sources of information appropriate?
	<u>Domain 2: Identification and selection of studies</u>
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	2.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in selection of studies? 3.1 Were efforts made to minimise error in data collection? 3.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in risk of bias assessment?
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	2.1 Did the search include an appropriate range of databases/ electronic sources for published and unpublished reports? 2.2 Were methods additional to database searching used to identify relevant reports? 2.3 Were the terms and structure of the search strategy likely to retrieve as many eligible studies as possible?
4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	2.4 Were restrictions based on date, publication format, or language appropriate?
	<u>Domain 3: Data collection and study appraisal</u>
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? A list of included and excluded studies should be provided.	<i>not considered</i>
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	3.2 Were sufficient study characteristics available for both review authors and readers to be able to interpret the results?
<i>not considered</i>	3.3 Were all relevant study results collected for use in the synthesis?
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	3.4 Was risk of bias (or methodological quality) formally assessed using appropriate criteria?
	<u>Domain 4: Synthesis and findings</u>

<i>not considered</i>	4.1 Did the synthesis include all studies that it should?
<i>not considered</i>	4.2 Were all pre-defined analyses reported or departures explained?
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	4.6 Were biases in primary studies minimal or addressed in the synthesis?
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	4.3 Was the synthesis appropriate given the nature and similarity in the research questions, study designs and outcomes across included studies? 4.4 Was between-study variation (heterogeneity) minimal or addressed in the synthesis?
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	4.5 Were the findings robust, e.g. as demonstrated through funnel plot or sensitivity analyses? (<i>partially</i>)
11. Was the conflict of interest included (both in the systematic review and included studies)	<i>not considered</i>