**Attachment B.** **Methodological quality assessment of the included studies**

**Table 1. Quality assessment of the randomized controlled trial - EPOC checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDY | RANDOM SEQUENCE GENERATION | ALLOCATION CONCEALMENT | BLINDING OF PARTICIPANTS AND PERSONNEL | BLINDING OF OUTCOME ASSESSMENT | INCOMPLETE OUTCOME DATA | SELECTIVE REPORTING | OTHER SOURCES OF BIAS | QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULT |
| Jiamjariyapon et al. 2017 | High risk | High risk | Unclear | Unclear | Low risk | Low risk | Unclear | Low quality |

**Table 2. Quality assessment of the controlled before-after study - EPOC checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDY | TWO INTERVENTION SITES AND TWO CONTROL SITES | COMPARABILITY OF STUDY PERIOD | INTERVENTION AND CONTROL GROUPS COMPARABILITY | RANDOM SEQUENCE GENERATION | ALLOCATION CONCEALMENT | BLINDING OF PARTICIPANTS AND PERSONNEL | BLINDING OF OUTCOME ASSESSMENT | INCOMPLETE OUTCOME DATA | SELECTIVE REPORTING | OTHER SOURCES OF BIAS | QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULT |
| Kane et al. 2016 | Yes | Yes | Yes | High risk | High risk | Unclear | Unclear | Low risk | Unclear | Low risk | Moderate quality |
| Ray-Coquard et al. 2002 | Yes | Yes | Yes | High risk | High risk | Unclear | Unclear | Low risk | Unclear | Low risk | Moderate quality |
| Ray-Coquard et al. 2005 | Yes | Yes | Yes | High risk | High risk | Unclear | Unclear | Low risk | Unclear | Low risk | Moderate quality |

**Table 3. Quality assessment of the before-after studies - NIH checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDY | CLEARNESS OF AIM | CLEARNESS OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA | REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE SAMPLE | PARTICIPANTS ENROLLMENT | SAMPLE SIZE | CLEARNESS OF THE INTERVENTION | OUTCOME MEASURES | OUTCOME ASSESSORS BLINDED | LOST TO FOLLOW-UP | STATISTICAL TEST | ITS | INDIVIDUAL LEVEL DATA | QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULT |
| Gale et al. 2012 | Yes | Yes | CD | CD | CD | NR | Yes | No | CD | Yes | No | No | Low quality |
| Greene et al. 2009 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | NA | Yes | Yes | NA | Moderate quality |
| Hamilton et al. 2005 | Yes | Yes | CD | Yes | NR | Yes | Yes | NR | NR | Yes | No | Yes | Moderate quality |
| Mc Cullough et al. 2014 | Yes | Yes | CD | Yes | NR | Yes | No | NR | NA | Yes | No | No | Low quality |
| Tideman et al. 2014 | Yes | Yes | CD | Yes | NR | Yes | Yes | NR | NA | Yes | CD | Yes | Moderate quality |

**Table 4. Quality assessment of the cross-sectional study - NIH checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDY | CLEARNESS OF AIM | FEATURES OF THE STUDY POPULATION | REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE SAMPLE | CLEARNESS OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA | STATISTICAL QUALITY | EXPOSURE MEASUREMENT TIMING | FOLLOW-UP APPROPRIATENESS | LEVELS OF EXPOSURE | EXPOSURE MEASURES | MULTIPLE MEASUREMENTS OF EXPOSURES | OUTCOME MEASURES | OUTCOME ASSESSORS BLINDED | LOST TO FOLLOW-UP | CONFOUNDING VARIABLES | QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULT |
| Rosko et al. 2005 | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | NA | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | NA | Yes | Low quality |

**Table 5. Quality assessment of the Cohort study - NOS checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDY | REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE EXPOSED COHORT | SELECTION OF THE NON-EXPOSED COHORT | ASCERTAINMENT OF EXPOSURE | OUTCOME NOT PRESENT PREVIOUSLY | COHORTS COMPARABILITY | OUTCOME ASSESSORS BLINDED | FOLLOW-UP APPROPRIATENESS | LOST TO FOLLOW-UP | QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULT |
| Kesson et al. 2012 | Truly representative | Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort | Secure record | Yes | Study controls for confounders | Record linkage | Yes | Complete follow up | Good quality |

**Table 6. Quality assessment of the case-control study - CASP checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDY | CLEARNESS OF AIM | METHODS APPROPRIATENESS | CASES SELECTION APPROPRIATENESS | CONTROLS SELECTION APPROPRIATENESS | ASCERTAINMENT OF EXPOSURE | CONFOUNDING FACTORS EVALUATION | STRENGHT OF RESULTS | PRECISION OF RESULTS | CREDIBILITY OF RESULT | APPLICABILITY OF RESULTS | COHERENCE WITH AVAILABLE EVIDENCE | QUALITY ASSESSMENT RESULT |
| Göbel et al. 2009 | Yes | Yes | CT | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | CT | CT | CT | Low quality |

*Abbreviations:* EPOC, Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care; NIH, National Institutes of Health; NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa Scale; CASP, Critical Appraisal Skills Programme; ITS, interrupted time series; CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported; CT, Can’t tell.