**Supplementary table 2: SURE checklist for making judgements about how much confidence to place in a systematic review\***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review**: | | | | | | |
| Shepperd S, Wee B, Straus SE. Hospital at home: home-based end of life care. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, | | | | | | |
| **Section A:** *Methods used to identify, include, and critically appraise studies* | | | | | | |
|  | **Yes** | | **Can’t tell/partially** | **No** | | *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)* |
| A.1 Were the criteria used for deciding which studies to include in the review reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.2 Was the search for evidence reasonably comprehensive? |  | | Partially |  | | It is unclear if there was language bias during the literature search. |
| A.3 Is the review reasonably up-to-date? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.4 Was bias in the selection of articles avoided? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.5 Did the authors use appropriate criteria to assess the risk for bias when analysing the studies included? (e.g. Assessing Risk of Bias Criteria for EPOC Reviews) | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| **A.6 Overall Summary Assessment Score A: How would you rate the methods used to identify, include and critically appraise studies?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This review has **important limitations.** It is unclear if there was language restriction during the literature search. | | | | | | |
| **Section B:** *Methods used to analyse the findings* | | | | | | |
|  | **Yes** | | **Partially** | **No** | | *Comments* |
| B.1 Were the characteristics and results of the included studies reliably reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.2 Were the methods used by the review authors to analyse the findings of the included studies reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.3 Did the review describe the extent of heterogeneity? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.4 Were the findings of the relevant studies combined (or not combined) appropriately relative to the primary question the review addressed and the available data? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.5 Did the review examine the extent to which specific factors might explain differences in the results of the included studies? |  | | Partially |  | | There was no in-depth description on heterogeneity for included studies. However, statistical tests for heterogeneity were conducted, i.e., Cochran’s Q, and the I2 statistic |
| **B.6 Overall Summary Assessment Score B: How would you rate the methods used to analyse the findings relative to the primary question addressed in the review?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This review has **important limitations**. There was no in-depth description on heterogeneity for included studies. However, statistical tests for heterogeneity were conducted, i.e., Cochran’s Q, and the I2 statistic. | | | | | | |
| **Section C: Overall assessment of the reliability of the review** | | | | | | |
|  | **Additional methodological concerns** | | **Robustness** | **Interpretation** | | **Conflicts of interest (of the review authors or for included studies)** |
| C.1 Are there any other aspects of the review not mentioned previously which lead you to question the results? | No | | No | No | | No |
| C.2 **Based on the above assessments of the methods how would you rate the reliability of the review?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This review has **important limitations**. It is unclear if there was language restriction during the literature search. There was no in-depth description on heterogeneity for included studies. However, statistical tests for heterogeneity were conducted, i.e., Cochran’s Q, and the I2 statistic. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Review**: | | | | | | |
| Candy B, Jones L, Drake R, Leurent B, King M. Interventions for supporting informal caregivers of patients in the terminal phase of a disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Section A:** *Methods used to identify, include, and critically appraise studies* | | | | | | |
|  | **Yes** | | **Can’t tell/partially** | **No** | | *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)* |
| A.1 Were the criteria used for deciding which studies to include in the review reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.2 Was the search for evidence reasonably comprehensive? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.3 Is the review reasonably up-to-date? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.4 Was bias in the selection of articles avoided? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.5 Did the authors use appropriate criteria to assess the risk for bias when analysing the studies included? (e.g. Assessing Risk of Bias Criteria for EPOC Reviews) | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| **A.6 Overall Summary Assessment Score A: How would you rate the methods used to identify, include and critically appraise studies?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This is a good quality systematic review. | | | | | | |
| **Section B:** *Methods used to analyse the findings* | | | | | | |
|  | **Yes** | | **Partially** | **No** | | *Comments* |
| B.1 Were the characteristics and results of the included studies reliably reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.2 Were the methods used by the review authors to analyse the findings of the included studies reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.3 Did the review describe the extent of heterogeneity? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.4 Were the findings of the relevant studies combined (or not combined) appropriately relative to the primary question the review addressed and the available data? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.5 Did the review examine the extent to which specific factors might explain differences in the results of the included studies? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| **B.6 Overall Summary Assessment Score B: How would you rate the methods used to analyse the findings relative to the primary question addressed in the review?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This is a good quality systematic review. | | | | | | |
| **Section C: Overall assessment of the reliability of the review** | | | | | | |
|  | **Additional methodological concerns** | | **Robustness** | **Interpretation** | | **Conflicts of interest (of the review authors or for included studies)** |
| C.1 Are there any other aspects of the review not mentioned previously which lead you to question the results? | No | | No | No | | No |
| C.2 **Based on the above assessments of the methods how would you rate the reliability of the review?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This is a good quality systematic review. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Review**: | | | | | | |
| Shepperd S, McClaran J, Phillips C, Lannin N, Clemson L, McCluskey A, et al. Discharge planning from hospital to home (Review). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2010 | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Section A:** *Methods used to identify, include, and critically appraise studies* | | | | | | |
|  | **Yes** | | **Can’t tell/partially** | **No** | | *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)* |
| A.1 Were the criteria used for deciding which studies to include in the review reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.2 Was the search for evidence reasonably comprehensive? |  | | Partially |  | | It is unclear if there was language restriction during the literature search. |
| A.3 Is the review reasonably up-to-date? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.4 Was bias in the selection of articles avoided? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| A.5 Did the authors use appropriate criteria to assess the risk for bias when analysing the studies included? (e.g. Assessing Risk of Bias Criteria for EPOC Reviews) | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| **A.6 Overall Summary Assessment Score A: How would you rate the methods used to identify, include and critically appraise studies?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This review has **important limitations.** It is unclear if there was language restriction during the literature search. | | | | | | |
| **Section B:** *Methods used to analyse the findings* | | | | | | |
|  | **Yes** | | **Partially** | **No** | |  |
| B.1 Were the characteristics and results of the included studies reliably reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.2 Were the methods used by the review authors to analyse the findings of the included studies reported? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.3 Did the review describe the extent of heterogeneity? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.4 Were the findings of the relevant studies combined (or not combined) appropriately relative to the primary question the review addressed and the available data? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| B.5 Did the review examine the extent to which specific factors might explain differences in the results of the included studies? | Yes | |  |  | |  |
| **B.6 Overall Summary Assessment Score B: How would you rate the methods used to analyse the findings relative to the primary question addressed in the review?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This is a good quality systematic review. | | | | | | |
| **Section C: Overall assessment of the reliability of the review** | | | | | | |
|  | **Additional methodological concerns** | | **Robustness** | **Interpretation** | | **Conflicts of interest (of the review authors or for included studies)** |
| C.1 Are there any other aspects of the review not mentioned previously which lead you to question the results? | No | | No | No | | No |
| C.2 **Based on the above assessments of the methods how would you rate the reliability of the review?** | | | | | | |
| **Fatal flaws** – Limitations that are important enough such that the results of the review are not reliable and should not be used in the policy brief | | **Important limitations** – Limitations that are important enough such that it would be worthwhile to search for another systematic review and to interpret the results of this review cautiously if a better review cannot be found | | | **Reliable** – Only minor limitations | |
| *Comments (note important limitations or uncertainty)*  This review has **important limitations.** It is unclear if there was language restriction during the literature search. | | | | | | |