

Risk of Bias tables

Risk of bias table for systematic reviews

Study reference	Appropriate and clearly focused question? ¹	Comprehensive and systematic literature search? ²	Description of included and excluded studies? ³	Description of relevant characteristics of included studies? ⁴	Assessment of scientific quality of included studies? ⁵	Enough similarities between studies to make combining them reasonable? ⁶	Potential risk of publication bias taken into account? ⁷	Potential conflicts of interest reported? ⁸
Pearce, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

1. Research question (PICO) and inclusion criteria should be appropriate (in relation to the research question to be answered in the clinical guideline) and predefined
2. Search period and strategy should be described; at least Medline searched
3. Potentially relevant studies that are excluded at final selection (after reading the full text) should be referenced with reasons
4. Characteristics of individual studies relevant to the research question (PICO) should be reported
5. Quality of individual studies should be assessed using a quality scoring tool or checklist (preferably QUADAS-2; COSMIN checklist for measuring instruments) and taken into account in the evidence synthesis
6. Clinical and statistical heterogeneity should be assessed; clinical: enough similarities in patient characteristics, diagnostic tests (strategy) to allow pooling? For pooled data: at least 5 studies available for pooling; assessment of statistical heterogeneity and, more importantly (see Note), assessment of the reasons for heterogeneity (if present)? Note: sensitivity and specificity depend on the situation in which the test is being used and the thresholds that have been set, and sensitivity and specificity are correlated; therefore, the use of heterogeneity statistics (p-values; I^2) is problematic, and rather than testing whether heterogeneity is present, heterogeneity should be assessed by eye-balling (degree of overlap of confidence intervals in Forest plot), and the reasons for heterogeneity should be examined.
7. There is no clear evidence for publication bias in diagnostic studies, and an ongoing discussion on which statistical method should be used. Tests to identify publication bias are likely to give false-positive results, among available tests, Deeks' test is most valid. Irrespective of the use of statistical methods, you may score "Yes" if the authors discuss the potential risk of publication bias.
8. Sources of support (including commercial co-authorship) should be reported in both the systematic review and the included studies. Note: To get a "yes," source of funding or support must be indicated for the systematic review AND for each of the included studies.

Risk of bias table for intervention studies

Study reference (first author, year)	Was the allocation sequence adequately generated?	Was the allocation adequately concealed?	Blinding:	Was loss to follow-up (missing outcome data) infrequent?	Are reports of the study free of selective outcome reporting?	Was the study apparently free of other problems that could put it at a risk of bias?	Overall risk of bias
Abic, 2024	Definitely yes Reason: Authors used an online research randomizer.	Definitely yes Reason: Authors used numbered opaque envelopes.	Definitely no Reason: No blinding.	Definitely no Reason: There were no loss to follow-up.	Definitely yes Reason: Protocol checked, all outcomes are reported.	Probably yes Reason: No funding or competing conflicts of interest reported. Sample size calculation performed.	Some concerns Reason: No blinding.
Al Kiyumi, 2023	Unclear Reason: Cluster randomization of the	Probably no Reason: No information provided.	Definitely no Reason: Open-label trial.	Definitely no Reason: There were no loss to follow-up.	Definitely yes Reason: Protocol checked, all outcomes are reported.	Probably no Reason: Adherence to intervention is unknown.	High risk of bias Reason: Unclear randomization

	two schools, no further information provided.					Sample size calculation performed.	process, open-label study.
Yurt, 2020	Definitely yes Reason: Authors used random number charts.	Probably no Reason: No information provided.	Definitely no Reason: No blinding.	Probably no Reason: 4 out of 20 and 5 out of 20 were loss to follow-up.	Probably yes Reason: All outcomes reported in the Methods section are reported.	Probably no Reason: Small sample size: number of calculation not reach. Funding of professors of the department.	High risk of bias Reason: No blinding, funding.