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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reporting of background should include | Page  |
| Problem definition | 6-7 |
| Hypothesis statement | 7 |
| Description of study outcome(s) | 8 |
| Type of exposure or intervention used | 8 |
| Type of study designs used | 8 |
| Study population | Supplementary Tables 3-7 |
|  |  |
| Reporting of search strategy should include |
| Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | The investigators conducted the search |
| Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords | Supplementary Table 1 |
| Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors | 10 |
| Databases and registries searched | 8 |
| Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion) | 8, Reference Manager was used for the screening |
| Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) | No handsearching |
| List of citations located and those excluded, including justification | Supplementary Table 2, Figure 1 |
| Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English | No non-english publications were identified |
| Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies | Not included |
| Description of any contact with authors | 10 |
|  |  |
| Reporting of methods should include |
| Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested | 8 |
| Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience) | 8 |
| Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability) | 8 |
| Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate) | Supplementary Table 3-7 |
| Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results | 10 |
| Assessment of heterogeneity  | 10 |
| Description of statistical methods (eg, complete description of fixed or random effects models, justification of whether the chosen models account for predictors of study results, dose-response models, or cumulative meta-analysis) in sufficient detail to be replicated | 9-11 |
| Provision of appropriate tables and graphics | Table 1-7, Supplementary Table 1-33, Figure 1-6, Supplementary Figure 1-263 |
|  |  |
| Reporting of results should include |
| Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate | 12-15, Table 1-6, Figure 2-6, Supplementary Figure 1-242 |
| Table giving descriptive information for each study included | Supplementary Table 3-7 |
| Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis) | 16-18, Supplementary Table 28-32 |
| Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings | 12-18, Table 1-6, Figure 2-6, Supplementary Figure 1-263 |
|  |  |
| Reporting of discussion should include |
| Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias) | 26-27 |
| Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non–English-language citations) | No non-English citations identified |
| Assessment of quality of included studies | 18, 28, Supplementary Table 28-32 |
|  |  |
| Reporting of conclusions should include |
| Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results | 23-27 |
| Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review) | 25-29 |
| Guidelines for future research | 28 |
| Disclosure of funding source | 29 |