Checklist for measuring study quality : Sly, 2016

Reporting		Yes	Partially	No
1.	Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?	**1**		0
2.	Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section?	**1**		0
3.	Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study clearly described?	**1**		0
4.	Are the interventions of interest clearly described?	**1**		0
5.	Are the distributions of principal confounders in each group of subjects to be compared clearly described?	2	1	**0**
6.	Are the main findings of the study clearly described?	**1**		0
7.	Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?	1		**0**
8.	Have all important adverse events that may be a consequence of the intervention been reported?	**1**		0
9.	Have the characteristics of patients lost to follow-up been described?	**1**		0
10.	Have actual probability values been reported (e.g. 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001?	**1**		0

External validity		Yes	No	Unable to determine
11.	Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	1	**0**	0
12.	Were those subjects who were prepared to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited?	1	0	**0**
13.	Were the staff, places, and facilities where the patients were treated, representative of the treatment the majority of patients receive?	**1**	0	0

Internal validity – bias		Yes	No	Unable to determine
14.	Was an attempt made to blind study subjects to the intervention they have received?	**1**	0	0
15.	Was an attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes of the intervention?	1	**0**	0
16.	If any of the results of the study were based on "data dredging", was this made clear?	**1**	0	0
17.	In trials and cohort studies, do the analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up of patients, or in case-control studies, is the time period between the intervention and outcome the same for cases and controls?	**1**	0	0
18.	Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate?	**1**	0	0
19.	Was compliance with the intervention/s reliable?	**1**	0	0
20.	Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?	**1**	0	0

Internal validity – confounding (selection bias)		Yes	No	Unable to determine
21.	Were the patients in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited from the same population?	**1**	0	0
22.	Were study subjects in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited over the same period of time?	**1**	0	0
23.	Were study subjects randomized to intervention groups?	1	0	**0** (N/A)
24.	Was the randomized intervention assignment concealed from both patients and health care staff until recruitment was complete and irrevocable?	1	0	**0** (N/A)
25.	Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn?	1	**0**	0
26.	Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account?	**1**	0	0

Power				
27.	2: A priori power analysis reported and based on clinically meaningful effect size (for primary outcome) 1: A priori power analysis reported, but (importance of) effect size unclear 0: No power analysis reported	2	1	**0**

TOTAL SCORE (max. 29): 18/29

Modified from Downs and Black, 1998