**SDC 2. Modified Methodological Quality checklist developed by Downs & Black, 1998**

*Reviewer’s initials \_\_\_\_First Author \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Journal: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Year published\_\_\_\_\_\_*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reporting | Yes | No | U/D | *Partially* |
| 1. | Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described?  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2A. | Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2B. | Is BP a primary outcome? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. | Are the characteristics of the study population included in the study clearly described? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. | Are the interventions under study clearly described?  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5. | Are the distributions of principal confounders in each group of study participants to be compared clearly described? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. | Are the main findings of the study clearly described?  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. | Does the study provide estimates of the random variability (e.g., standard error, standard deviation, confidence intervals, interquartile range) in the data for the main outcomes? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8A. | Have all important adverse events/negative outcomes that may be a consequence of the intervention been reported? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8B. | Were the screening criteria for study eligibility specified? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. | Have the characteristics of study participants lost to follow up been described? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. | Have actual probability values been reported (e.g., 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| ***Total reporting score*:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /*13*** |
| **External validity** | Yes | No | U/D | *Partially* |
| 11. | Were the study participants asked to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12. | Were study participants who agreed to participate representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13. | Were the staff, places, and facilities where the study participants received the intervention representative of the intervention the majority of subjects receive? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| ***Total external validity score*:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /*3*** |
| **Internal validity – bias**  | Yes | No | U/D | *Partially* |
| 14. | Was an attempt made to blind study participants to the intervention they received? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 15. | Was an attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes of the intervention? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. | If any of the results of the study were based on “data dredging,” was this made clear? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 17.  | In trials and cohort studies, do the analyses adjust for different lengths of follow-up of study participants, or in case-control studies, is the time period between the intervention and outcome the same for cases and controls? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 18. | Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 19. | Was compliance with the intervention reliable?  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 20. | Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)? | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ***Total bias score*:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /*8*** |
| **Internal validity – confounding**  | Yes | No | U/D | *Partially* |
| 21. | Were the study participants in the different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited from the same population? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 22. | Were study participants in the different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited over the same period of time? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 23. | Were study participants randomized to intervention groups?  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 24. | Was the randomized intervention assignment concealed from both study participants and intervention staff until recruitment was complete and irrecoverable? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 25. | Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn? | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 26. | Were losses of study participants to follow-up taken into account?  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| ***Total confounding score*:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /*7*** |
| **Power** | Yes, ≥2 outcome | Yes, 1 outcome | No |
| 27. | Did the study mention having conducted a power analysis to determine the sample size needed to detect a significant difference in effect size for one or more outcome measures? | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| ***Total power score*:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /*2*** |
| ***\*Total quality score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_* /*33*** |