

		Giannelli et al. 2018	Borges et al. 2017	Cosgarea et al 2017	Morales et al. 2016	Tekce et al. 2015	Sanz et al. 2015	Giannelli et al. 2015	Shiloah et al 2014	Feres et al 2013	Mestnik et al 2012	Sampaio et al. 2011	Jonsson et al 2010	Yen et al 2008	Serino et al 2001	Westfelt et al. 1998	Timmerman et al. 1996	Sato et al 1993	Becker et al. 1988	Lindhe et al. 1985	
	References																				
	Type of study	split mouth randomized controlled clinical trial	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	split mouth randomized controlled clinical trial	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	parallel RCT	split mouth randomized controlled clinical trial	parallel RCT	split mouth randomized controlled clinical trial	split mouth randomized controlled clinical trial	split mouth randomized controlled clinical trial
Domain 1: Risk of bias due to randomization	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NI	NI	PY	PY	NI	NI	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y	Y	NI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PY	Y	NI	NI	NI	PY	NI	NI	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NI	N	PN	N	N	
	Risk-of-bias judgement	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low Risk	Low Risk	Some concerns	Some concerns
Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention)	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	N	N	N	N	N	PN	N	N	N	N	N	N	PY	Y	Y	PY	Y	NI	NI	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	PN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?							PN						N		N	NI	NI	NI	NI	
	2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?																				
	2.5 If N/PN/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?																				
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	Y	Y	PY	PY	Y	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?																				
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Some	Low Risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Some	Some	
Domain 3: Missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	NI	Y	N	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		N	N					NA	N				PN	N			NI		N	
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NI	NI					PN	PN				PY	N			NI		NI	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Do the proportions of missing outcome data differ between intervention groups?		N	N										N	Y			NI		NI	
	3.5 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		PN	NI										NI	N			PN		NI	
	Risk-of-bias judgement	Low risk	Some	Some	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low risk	Some	Low risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Some	Low risk	High risk
Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups ?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
	4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants ?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NI	NI	N	NI	Y	NI
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?															NI	PY		PY	Y	NI
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?															NI	PY		PY	Y	NI
	Risk-of-bias judgement	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	Low Risk	High risk	High Risk	Low Risk	High risk	High risk	High risk
Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Was the trial analysed in accordance with a pre-specified plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis ?	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
	Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...																				
	5.2 ... multiple outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	N	PN	PN	PN	N	N	
	5.3 ... multiple analyses of the data?	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	N	PN	PN	PN	N	N
	Risk-of-bias judgement	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some
Overall risk of bias	Risk-of-bias judgement	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	High risk	High risk	Some	High risk	High risk	High risk