**Supplementary Table 6 AMSTAR2 quality rating of included meta-analyses.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study  First author, year | A1 | A2 | A3 | A4 | A5 | A6 | A7 | A8 | A9 | A10 | A11 | A12 | A13 | A14 | A15 | A16 | Overall quality |
| Belletti 2017 | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | Y | PY | Y | N | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | CL |
| Belletti 2015a | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | Y | PY | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | N | CL |
| Belletti 2015b | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | L |
| Cheng 2019 | Y | PY | N | Y | Y | Y | N | PY | Y | N | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | L |
| Chidambaram 2019 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | N | CL |
| De Backer 2012 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | CL |
| Huang 2020 | Y | PY | N | PY | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y | CL |
| Huang 2019 | Y | PY | N | N | Y | Y | N | PY | PY | N | N | N | N | N | N | Y | CL |
| Jia 2023 | Y | PY | Y | Y | Y | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | CL |
| Jiang 2019 | Y | PY | N | N | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | CL |
| Li 2020 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | L |
| Lu 2021 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | N | N | N | PY | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | CL |
| McIntyre 2018 | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | H |
| Nagendran 2016 | N | N | N | PY | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | Y | CL |
| Nagendran 2019 | Y | PY | N | PY | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | L |
| Nedel 2019 | Y | PY | N | PY | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | M |
| Neto 2012 | Y | N | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | PY | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | CL |
| Oba 2014 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | N | N | N | PY | N | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | CL |
| Polito 2012 | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | N | PY | PY | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | N | CL |
| Pruna 2024 | Y | PY | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | CL |
| Ruslan 2021 | Y | PY | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | PY | Y | N | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | CL |
| Tan 2016 | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N | PY | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | N | CL |
| Vasu 2012 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | Y | PY | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y | CL |
| Yao 2020 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | N | PY | PY | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | L |
| Yin 2018 | Y | N | N | N | N | Y | N | PY | N | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | CL |
| Zhao 2012 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | N | CL |
| Zhong 2020 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | Y | N | N | Y | Y | CL |
| Zhou 2015 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | Y | N | PY | PY | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | CL |
| Zhou 2013 | Y | N | N | PY | N | N | N | N | PY | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | CL |
| Zhou 2014 | Y | N | N | PY | Y | N | N | N | PY | N | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | CL |
| Zhu 2019 | Y | PY | N | PY | N | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | M |

Y-yes; PY-partial yes; N-no; H-high quality; M-moderate quality; L-low quality; CL-critically low quality; AMSTAR-2-A MeaSurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews 2.

A1 – Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?

A2 – Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?

A3 – Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?

A4 – Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?

A5 – Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?

A6 – Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?

A7 – Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?

A8 – Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?

A9 – Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?

A10 – Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?

A11 – If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?

A12 – If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?

A13 – Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?

A14 – Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?

A15 – If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?

A16 – Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

**Critical Items: 2, 4, 9, 11, 13 and 15. Non-critical Items: 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16.**

**High quality:** No applicable critical flaws and no or one non-critical weakness.

**Moderate quality:** No applicable critical flaws.

**Low quality:** One applicable critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses.

**Critically low quality:** More than one applicable critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses.

Although item 7 was deemed as critical item in AMSTAR 2, we considered it as a non-critical item due to its late introduced to AMSTAR 2 in 2017.
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