Table 1 The results of methodological quality for included SRs/MAs

AMSTAR domains	addressed completely		addressed partially		not addressed	
	n(%)	95%CI	n(%)	95%CI	n(%)	95%CI
1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?	11(17.2)	9.8-28.4	0	-	53(82.8)	71.6-90.2
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	51(79.7)	68.1-87.8	5(7.8)	3.3-17.4	8(12.5)	6.4-23.1
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	24(37.5)	26.6-49.9	34(53.1)	41.0-64.9	6(9.4)	4.3-19.3
4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	13(20.3)	12.2-31.9	6(9.4)	4.3-19.3	45(70.3)	58.1-80.2
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	17(26.6)	17.2-38.6	33(51.6)	39.5-63.5	14(21.9)	13.4-33.6
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	40(62.5)	50.1-73.4	17(26.6)	17.2-38.6	7(10.9)	5.3-21.2
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	46(71.9)	59.7-81.5	9(14.1)	7.5-24.9	9(14.1)	7.5-24.9
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	42(65.6)	53.3-76.2	10(15.6)	8.6-26.7	12(18.8)	11.0-30.2
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	53(82.8)	71.6-90.2	10(15.6)	8.6-26.7	1(1.6)	0.2-10.3
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	35(54.7)	42.5-66.4	1(1.6)	0.2-10.3	28(43.8)	32.2-56.0
11. Was the conflict of interest stated?	0	-	0	-	64(99.2)	88.9-100
Total score — Scope	1.5-9.0					
Total score — $\overline{X}$±SD	6.16±1.67					