JBI critical appraisal checklist for randomized controlled trials

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Jones et al. (2) |
| Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups? | Y |
| Was allocation to treatment groups concealed? | U |
| Were treatment groups similar at the baseline? | N |
| Were participants blind to treatment assignment? | NA |
| Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment? | U |
| Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment? | Y |
| Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest? | Y |
| Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? | Y |
| Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized? | Y |
| Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups? | Y |
| Were outcomes measured in a reliable way? | U |
| Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | Y |
| Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? | Y |
| Bias risk (%) | 66,67% (moderate) |

Y = yes; N = no; U = unclear; NA = not applicable

JBI critical appraisal checklist for cohort studies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Heffernan et al. (13) | Price et al. (12) | Wallis & Carley (3) |
| Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population? | Y | Y | Y |
| Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? | Y | Y | Y |
| Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? | U | Y | U |
| Were confounding factors identified? | N | Y | Y |
| Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | N | Y | U |
| Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | Y | Y | Y |
| Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? | U | U | U |
| Was the follow-up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur? | Y | Y | Y |
| Was follow-up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow-up described and explored? | Y | NA | N |
| Were strategies to address incomplete follow-up utilized? | NA | NA | N |
| Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | U | Y | U |
| Bias risk (%) | 50%  (moderate) | 88,89%  (low) | 45,45%  (high) |

Y = yes; N = no; U = unclear; NA = not applicable

JBI critical appraisal checklist for analytical cross-sectional studies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cicero et al. (1) | Nadeau & Cicero (7) |
| Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? | Y | Y |
| Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? | Y | Y |
| Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? | Y | Y |
| Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? | Y | Y |
| Were confounding factors identified? | Y | Y |
| Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? | U | N |
| Were outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? | Y | Y |
| Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | Y | U |
| Bias risk (%) | 87,50%  (low) | 75%  (low) |

Y = yes; N = no; U = unclear; NA = not applicable