Case Report Studies											_			
				Were diagnostic										
	1	Was the patient's	Was thecurrent	tests or	Was the	Was the post-	Were adverse		1	ĺ				
	Were patient's	history clearly	clinical condition of	assessment	intervention(s) or	intervention	events (harms) or	Does the case						
	demographic	described and	the patient on	methods and the	treatment	clinical condition	unanticipated	report provide						
	characteristics	presented as a	presentation clearly	results clearly	procedure(s)	clearly	events identified	takeaway						
	clearly described?	timeline?	described?	described?	clearly described?	described?	and described?	lessons?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal				
Chen et al, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	87,50%					
Combs et al, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA NA	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	50%	Moderate	-			
Williams et al, 2017	Yes	NA NA	NA	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	50%	Moderate	-			
Park et al, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	87,50%		-			
Chen-Yi Chu et al, 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	75%		-			
Chen-11 Chu et al, 2010	res	res	res	res	res	NO	INO	res	/370	0000	1			
Cross sectional studies		1												
	I	l		Were objective,		l	Were the	l	1	ĺ				
	Were the criteria		Was the exposure	standard criteria		Were strategies		Was	1	ĺ				
	for inclusion in	subjects and the	measured in a	used for	confounding	to deal with	measured in a	appropriate	1	ĺ				
	the sample	setting described	valid and reliable	measurement of	factors	confounding	valid and reliable	statistical	I	1				
	clearly defined?	in detail?	way?	the condition?	identified?	factors stated?	wav?	analysis used?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal				
Nahan et al. 2012	Yes	Yes	NA NA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No		Moderate	1			
	1	,		,	1		1	1	3070		1			
Cohort studies		1												
						Were the								
	1	Were the				groups/participa	1	Was the follow	1	ĺ				
		exposures				nts free of the		up time	Was follow up					
		measured similarly				outcome at the		reported and	complete, and if not,					
	Were the two	to assign people to			Were strategies	start of the study	Were the	sufficient to be	were the reasons to					
	groups similar and	both exposed and	Was the evnosure		to deal with	(or at the	outcomes	long enough for	loss to follow up	Were strategies to address	Was appropriate			
	recruited from the	unexposed	measured in a valid	Were confounding	confounding	moment of	measured in a valid	outcomes to	described and	incomplete follow up	statistical analysis			Overall
												Colescia contestical		
V	same population?	groups?	and reliable way?	factors identified?	factors stated?	exposure)?	and reliable way?	occur?	explored?	utilized?	used?	Criteria satisfied	04.000/	appraisal
Varughese et al, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA		81,80%	Good
Duasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	ntrolled Trial			1										
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	ntrolled Trial	1	Were the		1	Was follow up	1		1	1	-	1		
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Coi	ntrolled Trial		Were the			Was follow up]		
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor			participants			complete and if								
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	Is it clear in the		participants included in any		Warethere	complete and if not, were	Ware the							
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Coi	Is it clear in the study what is the		participants included in any comparisons		Were there	complete and if not, were differences	Were the							
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is	Ware the	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar		multiple	complete and if not, were differences between groups	outcomes of							
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e.	Were the	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care,		multiple measurements of	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their	outcomes of participants							
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no	participants	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the		multiple measurements of the outcome both	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	outcomes of participants included in any							
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about	participants included in any	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or		multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons	Were outcomes	Was appropriate					
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable	participants included in any comparisons	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of	Was there a	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the	measured in a	statistical analysis					
	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about	participants included in any	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	Was there a control group?	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure?	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons			Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal			
	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable	participants included in any comparisons	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of		multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the	measured in a	statistical analysis	Criteria satisfied 77,80%				
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	participants included in any comparisons similar?	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group?	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure?	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way?	statistical analysis used?					
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	participants included in any comparisons similar?	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group? Yes	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure?	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way?	statistical analysis used?					
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group? Yes Is there	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure?	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way?	statistical analysis used? Yes					
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group? Yes Is there congruity	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way?	statistical analysis used? Yes					
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the the 'fefter' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way? Yes	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to	77,80%				
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group? Yes Is there congruity	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way?	statistical analysis used? Yes					
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the the 'fefter' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	measured in a reliable way? Yes	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to	77,80%				
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the research	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants,	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or,	77,80% Do the conclusions drawn in the research				
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated philosophical	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity between the research	yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research methodology	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes Is the influence of the researcher on	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants, and their	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there	77,80% Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the				
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'fetc' (l.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity between the research methodology and	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research methodology and the	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants, and their voices,	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical	Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or				
Miyaki et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research methodology and the intervention	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa,	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants, and their voices, adequately	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an	77,80% Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the	Good			
Miyaki et al, 2011 Qualitative studies	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	77,80% Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Good Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal		
Miyaki et al, 2011 Qualitative studies Rebmann et al, 2013	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'feter' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology? Yes	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives? Yes	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data? Yes	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data? Yes	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results? Yes	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed? No	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented? Yes	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body? Yes	Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Good Criteria satisfied	Good		
Quasi-Cluster Randomized Cor Miyaki et al, 2011 Qualitative studies Rebmann et al, 2013 Charania et al, 2011	Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)? Yes Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	participants included in any comparisons similar? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest? NA Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	control group? Yes Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exp osure? No Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed? Yes	outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way? Yes Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?	measured in a reliable way? Yes Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	statistical analysis used? Yes Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	77,80% Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Good Criteria satisfied			

justified/ Alluded

but not explicitly

ustified

Krumkamp et al, 2009

Shah et al, 2020

ustified/ Explicitly

Formulated

generally/

formulated

Concrete aims

literature search.

Described brifely/

described in details

Not presented/

Before-after studies														
			Were the								Were outcome			
			participants in the								measures of			
			study				Were the outcome				interest taken	If the intervention was		
			representative of			Was the	measures			Did the statistical methods	multiple times	conducted at a group level		
			those who would			test/service/inter	prespecified,	Were the people	•	examine changes in	before the	(e.g., a whole hospital, a		
		Were	be eligible for the			vention clearly	clearly defined,	assessing the	Was the loss to follow	outcome measures from	intervention and	community, etc.) did the		
		eligibility/selection	test/service/interve	Were all eligible	Was the sample	described and	valid, reliable, and	outcomes	up after baseline 20%	before to after the	multiple times after	statistical analysis take into		
	Was the study	criteria for the	ntion in the general		size sufficiently	delivered	assessed	blinded to the	or less? Were those	intervention? Were	the intervention	account the use of		
	question or	study population	or clinical	met the	large to provide	consistently	consistently across	1'	lost to follow-up	statistical tests done that	(i.e., did they use	individual-level data to		
	objective clearly		population of	prespecified entry					accounted for in the	provided p values for the				Overall
	stated?	clearly described?			findings?		participants?	ventions?	analysis?	pre-to-post changes?	series design)?	group level?		appraisal
Pershad et al, 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	75%	Good
		-												
Narrative Reviews			•						_					
						Appropriate								
						presentation of								
		Statements of			Scientific	data. Data								
	Justification for the				reasoning. Not	presented								
	article's	formulation of		-	based on	inadequately/								
	importance for the	1 '		supported by	appropriate	Data presented								
I	readership. Not	formulated/	Description of the	references/	arguments/	in an		1						

100% Good

100% Good

Selective

evidence/

Appropriate

Referencing

Supported by

inappropriate

manner/ Data

presented

adequately