

Supplementary 4. STROBE checklist

Author	Barber et al., ²⁴	Buchanan et al., ¹⁷	Dambrosio et al., ¹⁸	Flora et al., ²²	Jacobson et al., ²⁶	Jacobson et al., ²⁷	Johnson et al., ³²	Liu et al., ³¹	Oliveira et al., ³⁶	Rajeev et al., ²⁸	Shih et al., ²⁹	Slade et al., ²⁵	Stojanovic et al., ³³	Sugiyama et al., ³⁰	Tonino et al., ¹⁹	Van Der Stam et al., ²¹	Van Der Stam et al., ²⁰	Vuong et al., ³⁴	
Title and Abstract																			
1.	a) Title and Abstract	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	
	b) Title and Abstract	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Introduction																			
2.	Background/Rationale	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
3.	Objectives	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Methods																			
4.	Study design	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
5.	Setting	✓	✓	✗	U	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
6.	Participants	✓	✓	U	U	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	U	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	
7.	Variables	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
8.	Data sources/measurement	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
9.	Bias	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	

10. Study size	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	✓	X	X
11. Quantitative variables	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
12. a) Statistical methods	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
b) Statistical methods	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X
c) Statistical methods	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X
d) Statistical methods	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X
e) Statistical methods	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Results

13. a) Participants	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
b) Participants	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
c) Participants	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	X
14. a) Descriptive data	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	U	✓	✓	✓	✓	U
b) Descriptive data	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X
c) Descriptive data	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓

15. Outcome data	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
16. a) Main results	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗
b) Main results	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗
c) Main results	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
17. Other analyses	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Discussion																		
18. Key results	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19. Limitations	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
20. Interpretation	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
21. Generalizability	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	U	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	U
Other information																		
22. Funding	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	U	✓	✓	✓	✓
Adequate reporting (out of 33)	25	25	18	16	24	17	17	22	22	16	21	22	23	26	22	25	27	12
Overall adequate reporting (%)	75	75	54	48	72	52	52	66	66	48	64	66	69	79	66	75	81	36
Grading	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Poor	Fair	Fair	Fair	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Poor

Key: ✓ = Yes, ✗ = No, U= Unclear, NA = not applicable

Grading:

Excellent: 90–100% of items adequately reported.

Good: 70–89% of items adequately reported.

Fair: 50–69% of items adequately reported.

Poor: less than 50% of items adequately reported.
