Available online at www.jbr-pub.org.cn

Open Access at PubMed Central

Journal of Biomedical Research, 2024 0(000): 1–3

JBR

Supplementary Data

Efficacy evaluation of standardized *Rheum rhaponticum* root extract (ERr 731®) on symptoms of menopause: A systematic review and meta-analysis study

Vishal P. Dubey✉, Varun P. Sureja, Dharmeshkumar B. Kheni

Department of Scientific and Medical Affairs, Sundyota Numandis Probioceuticals Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad, Gujarat 380015, India.

Supplementary Table 1 **Judgement and support for the judgment of each included study in the PEDro scale**

Entries	Judgment (Yes/No)	Support for judgment	
		Quote	Comment of author
Heger M *et al.*, 2006			
Eligibility criteria specified	Yes	"Inclusion criteria were (1) climacteric complaints…"	Eligibility criteria were specified.
Random allocation	Yes	"Women were randomized to either …"	Subjects were randomly allocated.
Concealed allocation	Yes	"Both participants and investigators and the data monitoring committee were blinded with regard to the individual treatment allocation."	Concealment was maintained.
Groups similar at baseline	Yes	"None of these characteristics, including serum hormone levels, differed significantly between the treatment groups."	Groups were similar at baseline.
Subject blinding	Yes	"Both participants and investigators and the data monitoring committee were blinded with regard to the individual treatment allocation."	Subjects were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Therapist blinding	Yes	"Both participants and investigators and the data monitoring committee were blinded with regard to the individual treatment allocation."	Therapists were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Assessor blinding	Yes	"Both participants and investigators and the data monitoring committee were blinded with regard to the individual treatment allocation."	Subjective scales were used, hence assessor was blinded, and procedures were informed.
Less than 15% dropouts	No	As shown in ***Table 2*** of study article	More than 15% dropouts observed in any one of the interventional groups.
Intention-to-treat analysis	Yes	"109 women, 54 in the ERr 731 group and 55 in the placebo group, were included in the intention-to-treat population."	Intention-to-treat analysis method was used.

✉Corresponding author: Vishal P. Dubey, Department of Scientific and Medical Affairs, Sundyota Numandis Probioceuticals Pvt. Ltd., Prahladnagar, Ahmedabad, Gujarat 380015, India. E-mails: vishal.d@sundyotanumandis.com and rx.vishaldubey@gmail.com.

Received: 15 September 2023; Revised: 16 January 2024; Accepted: 22 January 2024; Published online: 18 April 2024

CLC number: R711, Document code: A

The authors reported no conflict of interests.

https://doi.org/10.7555/JBR.37.20230219

Supplementary Table 1 **Judgement and support for the judgment for each included study in the PEDro scale** (continued)

Entries	Judgment (Yes/no)	Support for judgment	
		Quote	Comment of author
Between-group statistical comparison	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Between-group statistical analysis was performed, and results are reported.
Point measures and variability	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Data of point measure and measure of variability for at least one key outcome were reported.
Kaszkin-Bettag M *et al.*, 2009			
Eligibility criteria specified	Yes	"Inclusion and exclusion criteria"	Eligibility criteria were specified.
Random allocation	Yes	"All enrolled trial subjects were randomized to treatment …"	Subjects were randomly allocated.
Concealed allocation	No	Not applicable	No details regarding randomization concealment provided.
Groups similar at baseline	Yes	"None of the baseline characteristics differed markedly between the treatment groups …"	Groups were similar at baseline.
Subject blinding	Yes	"This was a 12-week, multicenter, prospective, randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled, phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Subjects were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Therapist blinding	Yes	"This was a 12-week, multicenter, prospective, randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled, phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Therapists were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Assessor blinding	Yes	"This was a 12-week, multicenter, prospective, randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled, phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Subjective scales were used, hence assessor was blinded, and procedures were informed.
Less than 15% dropouts	Yes	As shown in ***Fig. 1*** of study article	Data from more than 85% of the subjects initially allocated to groups were obtained for at least one key outcome.
Intention-to-treat analysis	Yes	"All women in the ERr 731 and the placebo group were included in the intention-to-treat analysis …"	Intention-to-treat analysis method was used.
Between-group statistical comparison	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Between-group statistical analysis was performed, and results are reported.
Point measures and variability	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Data of point measure and measure of variability for at least one key outcome were reported.
Hasper I *et al.*, 2009			
Eligibility criteria specified	Yes	"Inclusion criteria for the RCT were …"	Eligibility criteria were specified.
Random allocation	Yes	"A total of 110 women enrolled in the trial were randomized to one of the two treatment groups …"	Subjects were randomly allocated.
Concealed allocation	No	Not applicable	No details regarding randomization concealment provided.
Groups similar at baseline	Yes	"At baseline (day 0 of the RCT), no remarkable differences in age, height, weight, and BMI, …"	Groups were similar at baseline.
Subject blinding	Yes	"The initial trial was a 12-week multicenter, prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Subjects were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Therapist blinding	Yes	"The initial trial was a 12-week multicenter, prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Therapists were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Assessor blinding	Yes	"The initial trial was a 12-week multicenter, prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III clinical trial …"	Subjective scales were used, hence assessor was blinded, and procedures were informed.

Supplementary Table 1 **Judgement and support for the judgment for each included study in the PEDro scale** (continued)

Entries	Judgment (Yes/No)	Support for judgment	
		Quote	Comment of author
Less than 15% dropouts	No	Not applicable	No accurate details regarding dropouts are provided.
Intention-to-treat analysis	Yes	"The intention-to-treat data set comprised all enrolled women who appeared for at least the first observational contact."	Intention-to-treat analysis method was used.
Between-group statistical comparison	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Between-group statistical analysis was performed, and results are reported.
Point measures and variability	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Data of point measure and measure of variability for at least one key outcome were reported.
Thiemann E *et al.*, 2017			
Eligibility criteria specified	No	Not applicable	Eligibility criteria not specified.
Random allocation	Yes	"12-week double-blind, randomized placebo-controlled, prospective phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Subjects were randomly allocated.
Concealed allocation	No	Not applicable	No details regarding randomization concealment provided.
Groups similar at baseline	Yes	"At screening, no remarkable clinical differences …"	Groups were similar at baseline.
Subject blinding	Yes	"12-week double-blind, randomized placebo-controlled, prospective phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Subjects were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Therapist blinding	Yes	"12-week double-blind, randomized placebo-controlled, prospective phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Therapists were blinded and the procedures were informed.
Assessor blinding	Yes	"12-week double-blind, randomized placebo-controlled, prospective phase Ⅲ clinical trial …"	Subjective scales were used, hence assessor was blinded, and procedures were informed.
Less than 15% dropouts	No	Not applicable	No accurate details regarding dropouts are provided.
Intention-to-treat analysis	Yes	As shown in ***Table 1*** of study article	Intention-to-treat analysis method was used.
Between-group statistical comparison	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Between-group statistical analysis was performed, and results are reported.
Point measures and variability	Yes	Described in detail in study article	Data of point measure and measure of variability for at least one key outcome were reported.