

Table 1 The result of methodological quality assessment (n=487)

AMSTAR	addressed completely		addressed partially		not addressed	
	n(%)	95%CI	n(%)	95%CI	n(%)	95%CI
1:Was an 'a priori' design provided?	3(0.6)	(0.2-1.9)	0(0.1)	(0-1.6)	484(99.4)	(98.1-99.8)
2:Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	206(42.3)	(38.0-46.7)	209(42.9)	(38.6-47.4)	72(14.8)	(11.9-18.2)
3:Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	276(56.7)	(52.2-61.0)	183(37.6)	(33.4-42.0)	28(5.7)	(4.0-8.2)
4:Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	112(23.0)	(19.5-26.9)	84(17.2)	(14.1-20.9)	291(59.8)	(55.3-64.0)
5:Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	128(26.3)	(22.6-30.4)	318(65.3)	(61.0-69.4)	41(8.4)	(6.3-11.2)
6:Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	457(93.8)	(91.3-95.7)	9(1.8)	(1.0-03.5)	21(4.3)	(2.8-6.5)
7:Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	437(89.7)	(86.7-92.1)	7(1.4)	(0.7-3.0)	43(8.8)	(6.6-11.7)
8:Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	397(81.5)	(77.8-84.7)	14(2.9)	(1.7-4.8)	76(15.6)	(12.6-19.1)
9:Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	368(75.6)	(71.6-79.2)	75(15.4)	(12.5-18.9)	44(9.0)	(6.8-11.9)
10:Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	111(22.8)	(19.3-26.7)	55(11.3)	(8.8-14.4)	321(65.9)	(61.6-70.0)
11:Was the conflict of interest stated?	15(3.1)	(1.9-5.0)	0(0.1)	(0-1.6)	472(96.9)	(95.0-98.1)
Total score	Scope			1.5-9.5		
	$\bar{X} \pm SD$			5.94 \pm 1.05		