

Table 1 The results of methodological quality assessment (n=79)

AMSTAR domains	addressed completely		addressed partially		not addressed	
	n(%)	95%CI	n(%)	95%CI	n(%)	95%CI
1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?	2(2.5)	0.6-9.6	0(0.6)	0-9.2	0(0.6)	0-9.2
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	57(72.2)	61.3-80.9	22(27.8)	19.1-38.7	0(0.6)	0-9.2
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	21(26.6)	0.18-37.4	58(73.4)	62.6-88.0	0(0.6)	0-9.2
4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	19(24.1)	15.9-34.7	22(27.8)	19.1-38.7	38(48.1)	37.3-59.0
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	32(40.5)	30.3-51.6	47(59.5)	48.4-69.7	0(0.6)	0-9.2
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	72(91.1)	82.6-95.7	2(2.5)	0.6-9.6	5(6.3)	2.7-14.3
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	68(86.1)	76.6-92.1	0(0.6)	0-9.2	11(13.9)	7.9-23.4
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	43(54.4)	43.4-65.0	25(31.6)	22.4-42.7	11(13.9)	7.9-23.4
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	79(99.4)	90.8-1	0(0.6)	0-9.2	0(0.6)	0-9.2
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	28(35.4)	25.7-46.5	0(0.6)	0-9.2	51(64.4)	53.5-74.3
11. Was the conflict of interest stated?	2(2.5)	0.6-9.6	0(0.6)	0-9.2	77(97.5)	90.4-99.4
Total score	Scope		1-10			
	$\bar{X} \pm SD$		5.34±1.64			