
Cochrane Risk of Bias tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewing Study</th>
<th>Selection bias</th>
<th>Performance bias</th>
<th>Detection bias</th>
<th>Attrition bias</th>
<th>Reporting bias</th>
<th>Other bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott 2019</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll-Planas 2017</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu 2018</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection bias</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Confounders</th>
<th>Blinding</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Withdrawals and drop-outs</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the study described as randomized, a randomized trial, or an RCT?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the method of randomization adequate (i.e., use of randomly generated assignment)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the treatment allocation concealed (so that assignments could not be predicted)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were study participants and providers blinded to treatment group assignment?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants’ group assignments?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the groups similar at baseline on important characteristics that could affect outcomes (e.g., demographics, risk factors, co-morbid conditions)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the overall drop-out rate from the study at endpoint 20% or lower of the number allocated to treatment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was the differential drop-out rate between treatment groups at endpoint 15 percentage points or lower?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were there high adherence to the intervention protocols for each treatment group?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Were other interventions avoided or similar in the groups (e.g., similar background treatments)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were outcomes assessed using valid and reliable measures, implemented consistently across all study participants?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Did the authors report that the sample size was sufficiently large to be able to detect a difference in the main outcome between groups with at least 80% power?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Were outcomes reported or subgroups analyzed prespecified (i.e., identified before analyses were conducted)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Were all randomized participants analyzed in the group to which they were originally assigned, i.e., did they use an intention-to-treat analysis?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robinson et al., 2013

Quality Rating: Good