Risk of Bias Assessment Checklist

Author(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total Score
Anagnostopoulos et al. (2012)[31]	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Halbesleben et al. (2008)[32]	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Hayashino et al. (2012)[30]	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Klein et al. (2010)[5]	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Rabatin et al. (2016)[29]	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6
Ratanawongsa et al. (2008)[33]	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	6
Shanafelt et al. (2010)[42]	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Shirom et al. (2006)[43]	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	5
Travado et al. (2005)[34]	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
Weigl et al. (2015)[45]	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	6
Wen et al. (2016)[46]	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
Weng et al. (2011)[35]	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	5

Risk of Bias Assessment Criteria

1. Study population is well described to facilitate understanding about the generalizability of the results based on the study sample (e.g., age, sex, location of the study, physician specialty, practice location)
2. Data collection methods that address the risk of bias are described
3. Participation/response rate was at least 50% on average
4. The psychometric properties of the quality of care outcome measure have been tested
5. Statistical method was appropriate for the question being answered
6. Statistical significance of associations were tested and reported
7. Study controlled for at least one confounder such as sex or age in the analyses
8. Physician matched with patient
9. Longitudinal data was used