				2. Was		4. Was		6. Were	/. was
		Was meta-		there	3. Was a	the status	5. Was a	the	the
		analysis		duplicate	comprehe	of	list of	characteri	scientific
		performe		study	nsive	publicatio	studies	stics of	quality of
		d for the	1. Was an	selection	literature	n (i.e.	(included	the	the
		relevant	'a priori'	and data	search	grey	and	included	included
		outcomes	design	extraction	performe	literature)	excluded)	studies	studies
Artikel	navn	?	provided?	?	d?	used as	provided?	provided?	assessed
Eliyahı	2016	no	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Gravel	2013	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

8. Was 9. Were

the the 10. Was scientific methods the

quality of used to likelihood 11. Was the combine of the included the publicatio conflict of studies findings n bias interest

used of studies assessed? included? Notes

Yes Not applica No Yes Ingen metaanalyser udført

Yes Yes No No

	Was meta-analysis		2. Was there	3. Was a
	performed for the		duplicate study	comprehensive
	relevant	1. Was an 'a priori'	selection and data	literature search
Artikel navn	outcomes?	design provided?	extraction?	performed?
Quatman-Yates 2016	No	No	Yes	Yes
Lal 2018	yes	Can't answer	Yes	Yes

4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	appropriately in formulating
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

methods used to 10. Was the

combine the likelihood of 11. Was the findings of studies publication bias conflict of interest

appropriate? assessed? included?

Yes No No

Yes Yes Yes

## Was meta-analysis performed for $\ \, {\bf 1}.\ \, {\bf Was\ an}\ '{\bf a}\ {\bf priori'}\ design$

Citation	the relevant outcomes?	provided?
Kinne 2018	No	No
Murray 2017	No	No
Quatman-Yates 2016	No	No
Schneider 2017	No	Yes

	3. Was a	
2. Was there duplicate	comprehensive	4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey
study selection and data	literature search	literature) used as an inclusion
extraction?	performed?	criterion?
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes		

5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?
No	Yes	Yes

9. Were th	e
------------	---

8. Was the scientific quality of	methods used to	10. Was the	11. Was the
the included studies used	combine the	likelihood of	conflict of
appropriately in	findings of studies	publication bias	interest
formulating conclusions?	appropriate?	assessed?	included?
Yes	No	No	No
Yes Yes	No No	No No	No No
	_	-	_

Was meta-analysis		2. Was there	3. Was a
performed for the		duplicate study	comprehensive
relevant	1. Was an 'a priori'	selection and data	literature search
outcomes?	design provided?	extraction?	performed?
			Yes
•	performed for the relevant outcomes?	relevant 1. Was an 'a priori' outcomes? design provided?	performed for the duplicate study relevant 1. Was an 'a priori' selection and data

Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
criterion?	provided?	studies provided?	and documented?	conclusions?
inclusion	and excluded)	the included	studies assessed	formulating
used as an	studies (included	characteristics of	the included	appropriately in
grey literature)	5. Was a list of	6. Were the	scientific quality of	studies used
of publication (i.e.			7. Was the	the included
4. Was the status				scientific quality of
				8. Was the

methods used to 10. Was the

combine the likelihood of 11. Was the findings of studies publication bias conflict of interest

appropriate? assessed? included?

Yes No No

Yes

	Was meta-analysis performed for the		2. Was there duplicate study	3. Was a comprehensive
	relevant	1. Was an 'a priori'	selection and data	literature search
Artikel navn	outcomes?	design provided?	extraction?	performed?
416 1 2040				.,
Al Sayegh 2010	No	No	No	Yes
Bergersen 2017	No	No	Yes	Yes
Snell 2009	No	No	Yes	Yes
Sullivan 2018	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	appropriately in formulating
No	No	No	Yes	Yes
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

methods used to 10. Was the combine the likelihood of

combine the likelihood of 11. Was the findings of studies publication bias conflict of interest

appropriate? assessed? included? Notes

Not applicable	No	No
No	No	No
Can't answer	No	No
Not applicable	Yes	No

	Was meta-analysis		2. Was there	3. Was a
	performed for the		duplicate study	comprehensive
	relevant	1. Was an 'a priori'	selection and data	literature search
Artikel navn	outcomes?	design provided?	extraction?	performed?
Gertler 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	appropriately in formulating
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

methods used to 10. Was the

combine the likelihood of 11. Was the findings of studies publication bias conflict of interest

appropriate? assessed? included?

Yes No No