| **Author, year** | **Allocation sequence adequate** | **Allocation concealment adequate** | **Blinding** | **Incomplete outcome data** | **Other potential threats** | **Pharmaceutical support** | **Company involvement in design, conduct or reporting** | **Overall study quality\*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cezard, 2009194  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No | NA | Fair |
| Escher, 2004190  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Good |
| Griffiths, 1993221  | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | UTD | Fair |
| Levine, 2003191  | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | UTD | NA | Poor |
| Markowitz, 2000192  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | NA | Good |

Abbreviations: NA = not applicable; UTD = unable to determine
\*Study Quality Criteria: Criteria for a judgment of “GOOD” (i.e. low risk of bias): These studies have the least bias and results are considered valid- A study that adheres mostly to the commonly held concepts of high quality including the following: a) A formal randomized controlled study; b)Clear description of the population, setting, interventions, and comparison groups; c) Appropriate measurements of outcomes; d) Appropriate statistical and analytic methods and reporting; e) No reporting errors; f) Low dropout rate; and g) Clear reporting of dropouts. Criteria for a judgment of “FAIR”: a) These studies are susceptible to some bias, but it is not sufficient to invalidate the results; b) do not meet all the criteria required for a rating of good qualities because they have some deficiencies, but no flaw is likely to cause major bias; and c) The study may be missing information, making it difficult to assess limitations and potential problems. Criteria for a judgment of “POOR” (i.e. high risk of bias): a) These studies have significant flaws that imply biases of various types that may invalidate the results; b) Have serious errors in design, analysis, or reporting; large amounts of missing information; or discrepancies in reporting.