

Supplementary file 5: Risk of Bias of included studies

Systematic reviews

| Author, Year                         | RISK OF BIAS | Dual Screening and Extraction | Comprehensive literature search | Study quality assessed | 'A priori' design | Grey literature included | List of studies | Study characteristics provided | Scientific quality used appropriately | Appropriate methods to combine findings | Publication bias     | Conflict of interest included | Reason for High Risk of Bias Decision  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Di Marco et al., 2014 <sup>41</sup>  | High         | NR                            | Yes                             | No                     | Yes               | No                       | No              | No                             | NA                                    | Yes                                     | No                   | No                            | No information on screening methods or dual extraction<br>No risk of bias assessment |
| Opdebeeck et al., 2016 <sup>42</sup> | High         | Yes                           | Yes                             | No                     | Yes               | Yes                      | No              | Yes                            | NA                                    | Yes                                     | No                   | No                            | No risk of bias assessment<br>No assessment of Publication bias                      |
| Sajeev et al., 2016 <sup>43</sup>    | Medium       | NR                            | Yes                             | Yes                    | Yes               | No                       | No              | Yes                            | Yes                                   | Yes                                     | No                   | Yes                           | No information on dual screening or dual extraction                                  |
| Toril et al., 2014 <sup>44</sup>     | High         | NR                            | Yes                             | No                     | Yes               | No                       | No              | Yes                            | NA                                    | Yes                                     | Yes                  | No                            | No information on screening methods or dual extraction<br>No risk of bias assessment |
| Yates et al., 2016 <sup>45</sup>     | Medium       | NR                            | Yes                             | Yes                    | Yes               | No                       | No              | Yes                            | Yes                                   | Yes                                     | No (too few studies) | Yes                           | No information on dual screening or dual extraction                                  |

NA = not applicable, NR = not reported