|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **Risk Assessment Items** | | | | | | | | | | | **Total scoreb** |
| **Eligibility criteria specified?1\*** | **Random allocation?2** | **Concealed allocation?3** | **Groups similar at baseline?4** | **Subjects blinded?5** | **Therapists blinded?6** | **Assessors blinded?7** | **Key outcome measures from ≥ 85% subjects?8** | **Intention-to-treat analysis?9** | **Between-group analysis?10** | **Measures of variability presented for key outcome meassure?11** |
| Bieryla et al20 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Chao et al33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Daniel et al21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| de Bruin et al32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Duque et al22 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Franco et al23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Hagedorn et al24 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Janssen et al25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Jorgensen et al16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Keogh et al35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Kim et al17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Lai et al25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Lee et al26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Maillot et al27 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Pichierri et al28 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Pichierri et al29 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Rendon et al30 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Schoene et al18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Silveira et al36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Szturm et al 19 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Toulotte et al 31 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Williams et al15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Risk assessment items: Items 1-11 reporting - 1. Eligibility criteria were specified; 2. Subjects were randomly allocated to groups; 3. Allocation was concealed; 4. The groups were similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators; 5. There was blinding of all subjects; 6. There was blinding of all therapists who administered the therapy; 7. There was blinding of all assessors who measured at least one key outcome; 8. Measures of at least one key outcome were obtained from more than 85% of the subjects initially allocated to groups; 9. All subjects for whom outcome measures were available received the treatment or control condition as allocated or, where this was not the case, data for at least one key outcome was analysed by "intention to treat"; 10. The results of between-group statistical comparisons are reported for at least one key outcome; 11. The study provides both point measures and measures of variability for at least one key outcome. Ratings: No/unclear = 0, Yes = 1. ᵃ Scores which had been rated by reviewers in PEDro website (http://www.pedro.org.au) was adopted. \*As per PEDro guidelines this item is not used to calculate the total score. bStudy quality was categorized as ‘poor’ PEDro score of 1 to 3; ‘moderate’ PEDro score of 4-5; and ‘high’ PEDro score of 6 to 10. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
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