S4 Table. PRISMA checklist.

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			"
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	1-3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	3
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	n/a
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	3-4, 6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	3-4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	3-4
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	3-4

S4 Table continued from previous page

Data collection process 10 Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and combining our cost and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.			S4 Table continued from previous page	
Profession Provides agency	Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms,	3-4, 6
Profession Provides agency			independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and con-	
Data items				
Funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Data items	11		3-4. 6
Risk of bias in individual studies studies Summary measures Summary measures 13 State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Synthesis of results 14 Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I2) for each meta-analysis. Risk of bias across studies Additional analyses 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies). Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were per-specified. RESULTS Study scharacteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PLCOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies Persent data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Synthesis of results 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 22 Give results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 23 Give results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Limitations 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval o	Data roms			0 1, 0
Studies Cincluding specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis. 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Rick of bigg in individual	19		7 8
level , and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.		14		1-0
Summary measures	studies			
means). March Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., 12) for each metananalysis. Risk of bias across studies 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies) 9	~			_
Synthesis of results	Summary measures	13		7
if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., 12) for each meta- analysis. Risk of bias across studies Additional analyses 16 Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. RESULTS Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Results of individual studies 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 22 Present results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup 3 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup 4 Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 5 Form: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG,			,	
Risk of bias across studies	Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies,	n/a
Risk of bias across studies Additional analyses Additional analyses Additional analyses Additional analyses Additional analyses BESULTS Study selection IT Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow of exclusions. Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Synthesis of individual studies It Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results It Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Synthesis of results It Present results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence The main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations The present cause of funding for the results in the context of other each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Provide a general interpretatio			if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I2) for each meta-	
Risk of bias across studies Additional analyses Additional analyses Additional analyses Additional analyses Additional analyses BESULTS Study selection IT Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics It Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow of exclusions. Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Synthesis of individual studies It Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results It Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Synthesis of results It Present results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence The main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations The present cause of funding for the results in the context of other each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Provide a general interpretatio			analysis.	
Additional analyses	Risk of bias across studies	15		9
Additional analyses 16 Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. RESULTS Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Results of individual studies 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000				
RESULTS Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 47 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Additional analyses	16		9
RESULTS Study selection If Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics If For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies If Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Results of individual studies If Present estudies (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results If Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies If Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis If Present results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence If Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations If Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Conclusions If Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding If Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Traditional analyses	10		· ·
Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 70 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Poral outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	DECHITC		analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	
In the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Results of individual studies 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION 23 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and of the submission system of the subm		17	Circ numbers of studies sensoned assessed for slightlitus and included	1
Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). Results of individual studies 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and other support of the submission system Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Study selection	11		4
Study characteristics Risk of bias within studies Risk of bias within studies Risk of bias within studies Results of individual studies Results of individual studies Synthesis of results 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 22 Present results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.				
Risk of bias within studies Results of individual studies (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations Solicus limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 127 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and off the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			9	
Risk of bias within studies Results of individual studies Results of individual studies Results of individual studies Synthesis of results Synthesis of results 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 51 From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Study characteristics	18		4-6
Results of individual studies level assessment (see item 12). model output 10				
Results of individual studies (a) For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. Financial disclosure section of the submission system Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Risk of bias within studies	19		
(a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 5 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 6 From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			level assessment (see item 12).	model output
Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study:	10
Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review of the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			(a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates	
Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and of the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	
Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and of the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals	9-12
Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Ç			
Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e10000097.	Risk of bias across studies	22		9
Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Additional analysis	23	,	O)
Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Traditional analysis			
Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	DISCUSSION		analyses, meta-regression [see nem 10]).	
main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.		24	Summarize the main findings including the strongth of evidence for each	19.15
Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Summary of evidence	24		12-10
Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.				
review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	**	~~		4.45
Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Limitations	25		14-15
Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			, , ,	
FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			,	
Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other	15
Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			evidence, and implications for future research.	
(e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. closure section of the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	FUNDING			
(e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. closure section of the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.	Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support	financial dis-
of the submission system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.				closure section
sion system From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			· - · - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	of the submis-
From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.				
Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.			From: Moher D. Liberati A. Tetzlaff J. Altman DG. The PRISMA	
Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097.				
doi.10.10/1/Journar.pinea10000031				
			doi.10.1011/ Journal.pined1000031	