

Case Report Studies										
	Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?	Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?	Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?	Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal
Chen et al, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	87,50%	Good
Combs et al, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Yes	NA	No	Yes	50%	Moderate
Williams et al, 2017	Yes	NA	NA	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	50%	Moderate
Park et al, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	87,50%	Good
Chen-Yi Chu et al, 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	75%	Good

Cross sectional studies										
	Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	Were confounding factors identified?	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal
Nahan et al, 2012	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	50%	Moderate

Cohort studies													
	Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?	Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Were confounding factors identified?	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?	Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?	Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal
Varughese et al, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	81,80%	Good

Quasi-Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial											
	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)?	Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	Was there a control group?	Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal
Miyaki et al, 2011	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	77,80%	Good

Qualitative studies												
	Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?	Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal
Rebmann et al, 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	90%	Good
Charania et al, 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	Good
Ear, 2012	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	90%	Good

Before-after studies															
	Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described?	Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?	Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?	Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?	Was the test/service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population?	Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?	Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions?	Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?	Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes?	Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time series design)?	If the intervention was conducted at a group level (e.g., a whole hospital, a community, etc.) did the statistical analysis take into account the use of individual-level data to determine effects at the group level?	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal	
Pershad et al, 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	75%	Good	
Narrative Reviews															
	Justification for the article's importance for the readership. Not justified/ Alluded but not explicitly justified/ Explicitly justified	Statements of concrete aim or formulation of questions. None formulated/ Formulated generally/ Concrete aims formulated	Description of the literature search. Not presented/ Described briefly/ described in details	Referencing. Not supported by references/ Referencing inconsistent/ Supported by references	Scientific reasoning. Not based on appropriate arguments/ Selective evidence/ Appropriate evidence	Appropriate presentation of data. Data presented inadequately/ Data presented in an inappropriate manner/ Data presented adequately	Criteria satisfied	Overall appraisal							
Krumkamp et al, 2009	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	100%	Good						
Shah et al, 2020	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	100%	Good						