Ø	Methodology Checklist 1: Sys analyses	tematic Reviews ar	nd Meta-	
SIG	-	, Wells GA, Boers M, Andersson I tool to assess the methodolog dology 2007, <b>7</b> :10 doi:10.1186/14	N, Hamel C,. et ical quality of	
Study	identification (Include author, title, year of pub	lication, journal title, pages)		
Guide	line topic:	Key Question No:	y Question No:	
Is the Interve	e completing this checklist, consider: e paper relevant to key question? Analyse ention Comparison Outcome). IF NO reject. IF			
Check	dist completed by:			
	on 1: Internal validity	Doos this study do it	4 <b>2</b>	
1.1	The research question is clearly defined and t inclusion/ exclusion criteria must be listed in the paper.			
1.2	A comprehensive literature search is carried of	out. Yes □ No □ Not applicable	]	
		If no reject		
1.3	At least two people should have selected studies.	Yes □ No □ Can'	] t say ⊡	
1.4	At least two people should have extracted dat		∃ t say ⊡	
1.5	The status of publication was not used as an inclusion criterion.	Yes D No D	-	
1.6	The excluded studies are listed.	Yes 🗆 No 🗆	]	
1.7	The relevant characteristics of the included studies are provided.	Yes 🗆 No 🗆	]	

1.8	The scientific quality of the included studies was assessed and reported.	Yes 🗆	No 🗆
1.9	Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately?	Yes 🗆	No 🗆
1.10	Appropriate methods are used to combine the individual study findings.	Yes  □ Can't say □	No □ Not applicable □
1.11	The likelihood of publication bias was assessed appropriately.	Yes □ Not applicable □	No 🗆
1.12	Conflicts of interest are declared.	Yes 🗆	No 🗆
SECT	ION 2: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE STUD	ν <b>Υ</b>	
<b>SECT</b> 2.1	TON 2: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE STUD What is your overall assessment of the methodological quality of this review?	Y High quality (++ Acceptable (+) □ Low quality (-)□ Unacceptable –	
	What is your overall assessment of the	High quality (++ Acceptable (+) [ Low quality (-)□	