Appendix Table 7. Risk of bias assessment							-					40	Tot-I	Industry orkin 10 - 0 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -
Author, year, country	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.		8.	9.	10.	11.		Total	Industry sponsorship and Conflicts of interest
	Randomized?	Allocation concealed?	Patient blinded?	Care provider	Outcome assessor	Drop out rate?	IIT?	Selective reporting?	Equal at baseline?	Co- interventions?	Compliance?	Timing of assessment?		
			-	blinded?	blinded?									
First-time traumatic shoulder dislocation														
Early surgery														
Kirkley, A. (I) 1999 (4),	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9	Industry sponsorship: (I) None, (II) Not reported
(II) 2005 (15), Canada Wintzell, G. (I) 1999 (7),														(I, II) Conflict of interest: Not reported (I, II) Industry sponsorship: Not reported
(II) 1999 (16), Sweden	Unclear	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	6	(I, II) Conflict of interest: Not reported
Jakobsen, B. 2007 (3), Denmark	Unclear	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	6	Industry sponsorship: Not reported Conflict of interest: None declared
Robinson, CM. 2008 (6), UK (Scotland)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	11	Industry sponsorship: None
A	165	163	165	165	163	165	163	163	163	163	165	Officiella		Conflict of interest: None declared
Arm position Itoi, E. 2007 (43), Japan													_	Industry sponsorship: Alcare
	Yes	Unclear	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	Conflict of interest: None declared
Finestone, A. 2009 (41), Israel	Unclear	Unclear	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	4	Industry sponsorship: None Conflict of interest: None declared
Liavaag, S. 2011 (44), Norway	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	Industry sponsorship: None
Unided 1/ 2014 (42) have	163	163		110	140	165	103	163	103	163	163	163	3	Conflict of interest: None declared
Heidari, K. 2014 (42), Iran	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	8	Industry sponsorship: None Conflict of interest: None declared
Whelan, D. 2014 (45), Canada	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9	Industry sponsorship: None
Use of restriction band														Conflict of interest: None declared
Itoi, E. 2013 (53), Japan	\\\-	Harter				V	V	V	V	V	V	Harton	-	Industry sponsorship: Alcare
	Yes	Unclear	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	7	Conflict of interest: Potential
Chronic post-traumatic shoulder instability														
Open versus arthroscopic surgery Sperber, A. 2001 (46), Sweden														Industry sponsorship: Not reported
	Unclear	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	6	Conflict of interest: Not reported
Fabbriciani, C. 2004 (2), Italy	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	8	Industry sponsorship: Not reported
Netto, NA. 2012 (5), Brazil	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	7	Conflict of interest: Not reported Industry sponsorship: Not reported
	TeS	TES	IVO	140	No	TeS	res	TES	Unclear	165	163	IVO	- /	Conflict of interest: None declared
Mohtadi, N. 2014 (47), Canada	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	8	Industry sponsorship: None Conflict of interest: None declared
Absorbable versus nonabsorbable implant														
materials (anchors) Warme, WJ. 1999 (50), USA														Industry sponsorship: Smith & Nephew
waime, ws. 1999 (30), 03A	Unclear	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	5	Conflict of interest: None declared
Tan, C. 2006 (49), UK	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	9	Industry sponsorship: Not reported
Milano, G. 2010 (48), Italy														Conflict of interest: Not reported Industry sponsorship: Not reported
	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10	Conflict of interest: Not reported
Arthroscopic versus arthroscopic surgery														L. L
Castagna, A. 2009 (51), Italy	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	8	Industry sponsorship: Not reported Conflict of interest: Not reported
Absorbable versus absorbable implant														·
materials (tacks) (I) Magnusson, L. 2006 (55), Sweden														Industry sponsorship: (I) None, (II) Smith & Nephew
(II) Elmlund, A. 2009 (56), Sweden	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7	Conflict of interest: (I) Not reported, (II) Potential
Absorbable versus nonabsorbable suture materials														
Monteiro, GC. 2008 (57), Brazil	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7	Industry sponsorship: DePuy Mitek
Rehabilitation	OTIDIGE	100			162		100			100				Conflict of interest: None declared
Kim, S-H. 2003 (58), Korea														Industry sponsorship: Not reported
,	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	7	Conflict of interest: Not reported
Anatomic versus nonanatomic surgical														
techniques														
Salomonsson, B. 2009 (52), Sweden	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8	Industry sponsorship: Not reported Conflict of interest: None declared
														Committed on Thickness. Notice decidal ed
Abbreviations														
NA, Not Applicable														
**************************************														
The criteria for evaluating the risk of bias. If ≥ 6 criteria were met, the trial is assessed to														
have low risk of bias.														
Was the method of randomisation adequate	?													
2. Was the treatment allocation concealed?														
Was the patient blinded to the intervention?														
4. Was the care provider blinded to the														
intervention?  5. Was the outcome (primary) assessor									-					
blinded to the intervention? If observer is state	d													
as "blinded", any case "Yes"														
Was the drop-out rate described and acceptable?														
7. Were all randomized (CCT: allocated)														
participants analysed in the group they were allocated?														
anocated? 8. Are reports of the study free of suggestion of														
selective outcome reporting?														
Were the groups similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic														
indicators?														
If demographics are reported for followed patients, this is stated as "Unclear"														
patients, this is stated as "Unclear" 10. Were co-interventions avoided or similar?									-					
11. Was the compliance acceptable in all														
groups? 12. Was the timing of the outcome assessmen	t													
similar in all groups?														