Exercision of the information of the partners of the property of the partners									
Name				Baelum et al 2016	Wong et al. 2012	Rosa et al 2011	Wan et al 2009	Gonçalves et al 2015	Badersten et al 1984
Internal to the automation code was promotion of the control of	Domain 1	Bias due to confounding	intervention time points to permit characterization of pre-	N	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
March   Marc			there are extraneous events or changes in context around the time of the intervention that could have influenced the outcome;	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Domina de la companya			accounts for time trends and patterns, and controls for all the	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Domain 2 Discuss a colored and processes of			Risk of bias judgement	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk
Influenced decides in leaf to be accompanied with influence corp or per leaf to the companied with influenced corporation variables that influence code so nearly to be accompanied to accompanied with the companied variables and influenced code on the first relationship to accompanied variables and influenced code on the first relationship to accompanied variables and the companied variables	Domain 2	Bias in selection of	analysis) based on participant characteristics observed after the start of intervention?	N	N	N	N	N	N
in forecased overlain fields not be inflationed by the outpourse of a part of following and the course of the cour									
2.5. If York 9.2.2 and 2.6. is NRN to 2.1. Whe adjustment showers previous reads and leady to control for the presence of shorter to the presence of shorter to the presence of shorter to the previous reads and sole-file control for the presence of shorter to the previous reads and sole-file control for the previous reads and sole-file control for the previous reads and sole-file reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads.  Domain 4 Hast of their previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads.  The previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads.  The previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads.  The previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads and sole-file reads for the previous reads.  The previous reads are also sole-file reads for the previous reads and read			influenced selection likely to be influenced by the outcome or a						
Set of the Control of Set of the Institute of Set				PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
Bear in classification of intervinations and positionism between the points occule have been independent of the points occur oc			techniques used that are likely to correct for the presence of						
Domain 3 shows and post-intervention influence data. In the post-intervention influence data was constructed by the observed of the constructed by the observed by the observe			Risk of bias judgement	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Domain 4 Plas due to deviations from intended intervention were questionable of the intervention were appropriately accounted for.  Hisk of bias judgement  Hisk of bias judgement  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N	Domain 3		time points and post-intervention time points could have been	N	N	N	N	N	N
Domain 4 from Intended interventions of the interventions were appropriately accounted for.  Risk of bias judgement  Domain 5 Bias due to missing data with intervention and a work of the intervention and after the intervention.  Domain 6 Bias in measurement of after the intervention of the intervention.  Domain 7 Bias in selection of the results, from _71.1			Risk of bias judgement	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
Domain 5 Bias due to missing data Whether outcome data were missing for whole clusters (units of multiple individuals) as well as for individual participants.  N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	Domain 4	from intended	Whether the effects of any preparatory (pre-interruption) phases of the intervention were appropriately accounted for.	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Plass for bias judgement  Low risk  Risk of bias judgement  Low risk			Risk of bias judgement	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	Moderate risk
Domain 6 Bias in measurement of outcomes methods of outcome assessment were comparable before and after the intervention;  there were changes in systematic errors in measurement of the outcome coincident with implementation of the intervention.  Fisk of bias judgement  Low risk  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N	Domain 5	Bias due to missing data	Whether outcome data were missing for whole clusters (units of multiple individuals) as well as for individual participants.	N	N	N	N	N	N
after the intervention;  there were changes in systematic errors in measurement of the outcome coincident with implementation of the intervention.  Risk of bias judgement  Low risk  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N			Risk of bias judgement	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
outcome coincident with implementation of the intervention.  Risk of bias judgement  Low risk	Domain 6		•	Υ	Υ	Υ	Y	Υ	Υ
Domain 7  Bias in selection of the reported effect estimate likely to be selected, on the basis of the results, from7.1 multiple outcome measurements within the outcome domain?  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N			there were changes in systematic errors in measurement of the outcome coincident with implementation of the intervention.	N	N	N	N	N	N
Domain 7  Blast in selection of the results of the results, from7.1 multiple outcome measurements within the outcome domain?  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N			Risk of bias judgement	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk
relationship?  7.3 different subgroups?  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N	Domain 7		of the results, from7.1 multiple outcome measurements	N	N	N	N	N	N
Risk of bias judgement Low risk			relationship?	N	N	N	N	N	N
				N Low risk	N I ow risk	N Low risk	N Low risk	N Low risk	N Low risk