

Appendix 1. Quality evaluation by main researcher and external examiner, according to the CASP assessment tool

Reviewer	Paper	Evaluation questions											Total rating
		1. Did the trial address a clearly focused issue?	2. Was the assignment of patients to treatment randomised?	3. Were patients, health workers and study personnel blinded?	4. Were the groups similar at the start of the trial?	5. Aside from the experimental intervention, were the groups treated equally?	6. Were all of the patients who entered the trial properly accounted for at its conclusion?	7. How large was the treatment effect?	8. How precise was the estimate of the treatment effect?	9. Can the results be applied in your context? (or to the local population)	10. Were all clinically important outcomes considered?	11. Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?	
Ext	Botero Garcia, 2005	3	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	25 Very low
Res		3	1	1	3	3	3	5	3	2	2	3	29 Low
Ext	Castro et al., 2012	3	3	1	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	31 Medium
Res		3	3	1	1	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	31 Medium
Ext	Contreras et al., 2006	3	3	1	4	4	3	5	3	3	3	3	35 High
Res		3	3	1	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	34 High
Ext	Cordioli et al., 2002	3	1	1	2	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	30 Medium
Res		3	1	1	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	31 Medium
Ext	Evans-Hudnall et al., 2014	3	3	1	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	31 Medium
Res		3	3	1	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	31 Medium
Ext	Feldman et al., 2016	3	3	3	4	4	3	5	3	3	3	3	37 High

Reviewer	Paper	Evaluation questions											Total rating
		1. Did the trial address a clearly focused issue?	2. Was the assignment of patients to treatment randomised?	3. Were patients, health workers and study personnel blinded?	4. Were the groups similar at the start of the trial?	5. Aside from the experimental intervention, were the groups treated equally?	6. Were all of the patients who entered the trial properly accounted for at its conclusion?	7. How large was the treatment effect?	8. How precise was the estimate of the treatment effect?	9. Can the results be applied in your context? (or to the local population)	10. Were all clinically important outcomes considered?	11. Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?	
Res		3	3	3	4	4	3	5	3	3	3	3	37 High
Ext	Habigzang et al., 2016	3	1	1	2	2	3	4	3	2	3	3	27 Low
Res		3	1	1	2	2	3	4	3	2	3	3	27 Low
Ext	Mauldon et al., 2006	3	1	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29 Low
Res		3	1	1	3	3	3	5	3	2	3	3	30 Medium
Ext	Miranda et al., 2003	3	3	1	4	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	30 Medium
Res		3	3	1	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	32 High
Ext	Rosello & Bernal, 1999	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	34 High
Res		3	3	2	1	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	32 High
Ext	Vergara Lope Tristan & Gonzalez-Celis Rangel, 2009	3	1	1	1	2	2	4	3	2	3	3	25 Very low
Res		3	1	1	1	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	27 Low
Ext	Villalobos Perez et al., 2005	3	1	1	3	3	3	5	3	2	1	2	27 Low

Reviewer	Paper	Evaluation questions											Total rating
		1. Did the trial address a clearly focused issue?	2. Was the assignment of patients to treatment randomised?	3. Were patients, health workers and study personnel blinded?	4. Were the groups similar at the start of the trial?	5. Aside from the experimental intervention, were the groups treated equally?	6. Were all of the patients who entered the trial properly accounted for at its conclusion?	7. How large was the treatment effect?	8. How precise was the estimate of the treatment effect?	9. Can the results be applied in your context? (or to the local population)	10. Were all clinically important outcomes considered?	11. Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?	
Res		3	1	1	3	3	3	5	3	3	2	2	29 Low

Note: Ext = External reviewer; Res = Main researcher