Supplementary file 3:
Quality assessment of the included reviews

	Garside (2018)	Hadjibalassi (2018)	Hu (2015)	Jagan (2019)	Locihova (2017)	Miller (2019)	Poongkuran (2015)	Tamrat (2013)	Weiss (2016)
Item 1. Is the review question clearly and explicitly stated?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 2. Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 3. Was the search strategy appropriate?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 4. Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 5. Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 6. Was critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?	U	Y	Y	Y	U	U	U	Y	Y
Item 7. Were there methods to minimise errors in data extraction?	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 8. Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 9. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	U	U	N	U	N	U	Y	Y	U
Item 10. Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 11. Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Total "Yes" %	73	91	91	91	55	82	91	100	91

Y: Yes; N: No; U: Unclear.

<40 % low quality

40- 70 medium quality

> 70 High quality