Table 2: Results of Quality Assessment

	Emery(1991) ^a	Emery (1994) ^a	Emery (1998)	Etnier(2001)	Korora (2002)	Pereira (2011)	Aquino (2016)
Reporting							
1. Hypothesis/aim/ objective clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Main outcomes clearly described in introduction/methods?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Characteristics of patients included clearly described?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
4. Interventions of interest clearly described?	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
5. Distributions of confounders in each group to be compared clearly described?	No	No	Yes^b	Yes^b	Yes^b	Yes^b	Yes^b
6. Main findings clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
7. Estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. All adverse events potentially from the intervention reported?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
9. Characteristics of patients lost to follow-up described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
10. Actual probability values for the main outcomes reported?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Subscore ^b (/11)	5	5	8	9	7	8	10
External validity							
11. Subjects asked to participate representative of the entire population?	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No
12. Subjects who accepted to participate representative of the entire population?	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
13. Staff, places, facilities where patients were treated representative of the treatment most patients receive?	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
Subscore (/3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internal validity - bias							
14. Attempt made to blind study subjects?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
15. Attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes?	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes
16. Any results based on "data dredging" made clear?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17. Analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up or follow-up length the same for cases and controls?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
18. Statistical tests for main outcomes appropriate?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
19. Compliance with intervention reliable?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
20. Main outcome measures used valid and reliable?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Subscore (/7)	5	4	6	4	4	4	5

Internal validity – confounding (selection bias)

21. Subjects from both groups recruited from the same population?	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes
22. Subjects from both groups recruited over the same time period?	N/A	N/A	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes
23. Study subjects randomised to intervention group?	No	No	Yes	No (intervention phase) Yes (maintenance phase)	No	No	Yes
24. Randomisation concealed from patients and staff until recruitment complete and irrevocable?	No	No	No	Unclear	N/A	N/A	Unclear
25. Adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses for main findings?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
26. Losses of patient to follow-up taken into account?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes
Subscore (/6)	1	1	3	3 (intervention phase) 4 (maintenance phase)	1	1	5
Power							
27. Study adequately powered?	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
Subscore (/1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (/28)	10	9	16	16	11	12	20
Scoring: Yes = 1 for all items (unless otherwise indicated), No = 0, Unclear = 0, 1 a Studies share common participants. b Yes = 2 points.	N/A (not applica	ble) = 0.					