

**Item S1.** Structured Quality Assessment Questions (adapted from Chalmers, et al.<sup>1</sup>)

**Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria**

**1. How well were the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the subjects described in the study?**

- a. Excellent: The inclusion and exclusion criteria were specifically and clearly stated OR it was specified that all consecutive subjects were enrolled.
- b. Good: The inclusion and exclusion criteria were stated reasonably completely and clearly, but could have been improved in one or two items.
- c. Fair: The inclusion and exclusion criteria appeared to be lacking in a few items.
- d. Poor: No description of specific inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- e. Can't tell

*\*Table 2 Note: Articles that received "excellent" or "good" ratings received a "yes" for "inclusion/exclusion criteria well-described."*

**Response Rate**

**2. What was the response rate? (provide response rate \_\_\_\_\_)**

- a. Excellent: 80% or higher
- b. Good: 60-79% or higher
- c. Fair: 45-59%
- d. Poor: Less than 45%
- e. Can't tell
- f. Not applicable

**Minimal Potential for Selection Bias**

**3. How similar were the sociodemographic and/or clinical characteristics of the subjects who enrolled and the eligible subjects who did not enroll?**

- a. Excellent: No significant differences in any characteristics likely to affect the outcome of interest
- b. Good: Minor differences in one or more characteristics unlikely to affect the outcome of interest OR study mentions that groups were not different but fails to provide characteristics of both groups.
- c. Fair: Moderate differences in one or more characteristics that may affect the outcome of interest.
- d. Poor: Major differences in one or more characteristics likely affect the outcome of interest.
- e. Can't tell

*\*Table 2 Note: Articles that received "excellent" or "good" ratings received a "yes" for "minimal potential for selection bias."*

#### **Valid Outcome Assessment**

##### **4. Was the ascertainment of the outcome (or exposure of interest) appropriate?**

- a. Excellent: Clearly defined and no clear indication of information bias
- b. Good: Clearly defined and minimal potential for information bias
- c. Fair: Not well-defined and/or moderate potential for information bias
- d. Poor: Poorly defined and/or major potential for information bias
- e. Can't tell

*\*Table 2 Note: Articles that received "excellent" or "good" ratings received a "yes" for "valid outcome assessment."*

#### **Appropriate Study Analysis**

##### **5. Were adjustments made for potential confounders or differences between comparison groups in the study? If potential confounding was present, were appropriate adjustments made?**

- a. Excellent: Multivariate statistical analysis is performed and adequately accounts for potential confounding.
- b. Good: Multivariate statistical analysis is performed that probably accounts for potential confounding.
- c. Fair: Multivariate statistical analysis is performed that probably does not adequately account for potential confounding.
- d. Poor: No statistical adjustment(s) made for potential confounding.
- e. Can't tell
- f. N/A: Important confounding unlikely.

*\*Table 2 Note: Articles that received "excellent," "good," or "N/A" ratings received a "yes" for "appropriate study analysis."*

#### **Reference**

1. Chalmers TC, Smith H, Jr., Blackburn B, et al. A method for assessing the quality of a randomized control trial. *Control Clin Trials*. May 1981;2(1):31-49.