

The criteria used in this checklist are adapted from Hayden *et al.*<sup>51</sup>

### Cianferoni 2004<sup>3</sup>

1. The study sample represents the population of interest with regard to key characteristics, sufficient to limit potential bias to the results	Unclear Not reported if all available patients were included in previous study and how the patients for this study were selected
2. Loss to follow-up is unrelated to key characteristics (i.e., the study data adequately represent the sample), sufficient to limit potential bias	Yes Results for all patients included in this study were reported
3. The prognostic factor of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit potential bias	N/A
4. The outcome of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit bias	Yes Definition of recurrence given
5. Important potential confounders are appropriately accounted for, limiting potential bias with respect to the prognostic factor of interest	N/A
6. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the design of the study, limiting potential for the presentation of invalid results	Yes Risk of recurrence presented as percentage

### Decker 2008<sup>4</sup>

1. The study sample represents the population of interest with regard to key characteristics, sufficient to limit potential bias to the results	Yes All patients who met pre-specified criteria in a certain period were included. Key characteristics are reported and representative
2. Loss to follow-up is unrelated to key characteristics (i.e., the study data adequately represent the sample), sufficient to limit potential bias	Yes Results for all patients included in this study were reported
3. The prognostic factor of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit potential bias	N/A
4. The outcome of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit bias	Unclear No definition of recurrence given in this abstract
5. Important potential confounders are appropriately accounted for, limiting potential bias with respect to the prognostic factor of interest	N/A
6. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the design of the study, limiting potential for the presentation of invalid results	Yes Risk of recurrence presented as percentage and relative risk

**Mehl 2005<sup>5</sup>**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. The study sample represents the population of interest with regard to key characteristics, sufficient to limit potential bias to the results    | Yes<br>All patients who met pre-specified criteria in a certain period were included. Key characteristics are reported and representative |
| 2. Loss to follow-up is unrelated to key characteristics (i.e. the study data adequately represent the sample), sufficient to limit potential bias | Yes<br>Results for all patients included in this study were reported  |
| 3. The prognostic factor of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit potential bias                              | N/A   |
| 4. The outcome of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit bias  | Unclear<br>No definition of recurrence given  |
| 5. Important potential confounders are appropriately accounted for, limiting potential bias with respect to the prognostic factor of interest      | N/A   |
| 6. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the design of the study, limiting potential for the presentation of invalid results                 | Yes<br>Risk of recurrence presented as percentage   |

**Múgica Garcia 2010<sup>6</sup>**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. The study sample represents the population of interest with regard to key characteristics, sufficient to limit potential bias to the results     | No<br>Cohort of previous study contacted (58.7% response rate). No details on age, sex, weight and ethnicity |
| 2. Loss to follow-up is unrelated to key characteristics (i.e., the study data adequately represent the sample), sufficient to limit potential bias | Yes<br>Results for all patients included in this study were reported   |
| 3. The prognostic factor of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit potential bias                               | N/A  |
| 4. The outcome of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit bias   | Yes<br>Definition of recurrence given  |
| 5. Important potential confounders are appropriately accounted for, limiting potential bias with respect to the prognostic factor of interest       | N/A  |
| 6. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the design of the study, limiting potential for the presentation of invalid results                  | Yes<br>Risk of recurrence presented as percentage  |
-

## Mullins 2003<sup>7</sup>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. The study sample represents the population of interest with regard to key characteristics, sufficient to limit potential bias to the results    | Yes<br>All patients referred for evaluation of possible anaphylaxis were included. Key characteristics are reported and representative |
| 2. Loss to follow-up is unrelated to key characteristics (i.e. the study data adequately represent the sample), sufficient to limit potential bias | Yes<br>Results for all patients included in this study were reported   |
| 3. The prognostic factor of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit potential bias                              | N/A  |
| 4. The outcome of interest is adequately measured in study participants, sufficient to limit bias  | Unclear<br>No definition of recurrence given   |
| 5. Important potential confounders are appropriately accounted for, limiting potential bias with respect to the prognostic factor of interest      | N/A  |
| 6. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the design of the study, limiting potential for the presentation of invalid results                 | Yes<br>Risk of recurrence presented as percentage and as risk per patient-years  |

N/A, not applicable.