

Antibiotic use for acutely ill children in the ambulatory care setting in high income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. (Burvenich R, et al. (2022))

Reference	Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	Was the study design appropriate for the stated aims?	Was the sample size justified?	Was the target/reference population clearly defined?
Al-Tawfiq, 2017	Yes	No	No	Yes
Andrade, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Angoukunt, 2011	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Arnold, 2006	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Balasundaram, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Barrera, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Bernardo, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Bizen, 2015	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Boatright, 2015	Yes	Some concerns	No	Do not know
Burrowes, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Christakis, 2005	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Coco, 2010	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Dallas, 2016	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Dallas, 2017	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Davey, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
de Bont, 2015	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Dumitrascu-Birisi, 2016	No	Yes	NA	Yes
Dumpsis, 2017	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Ebell, 2015	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Ethocht, 2013	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Flood, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Florin, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Freer, 2017	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Frost, 2018	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Hagedboom, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Havers, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Hebert, 2012	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Howarth, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Ivanovska, 2018	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Jain, 2014	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Kharazmi, 2012	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Khine, 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kimura, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Kjaergaard, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Kraus, 2017	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Leigh, 2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Lerjy, 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lindberg, 2017	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Magin, 2016	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Maguire, 2018	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Malo, 2015	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Mehta, 2017	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Messina, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Montejo Fernández, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Montejo, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Nadeem Ahmed, 2010	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
O'Brien, 2015	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Okubo, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Olson, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Ouldali, 2017	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Palma, 2015	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Papenburg, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Patel, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Piller, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Pouwels, 2018	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Pulla, 2020	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Ramgopal, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Ray, 2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Razai, 2017	Yes	Yes	NA	No
Redmond, 2018	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Rothman, 2018	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Schmutz, 2017	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Speets, 2011	Yes	No	No	Yes
Stefanoff, 2013	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Teratani, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Triih, 2020	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Usonis, 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
van Aerde, 2021	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
van de Maat, 2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
van Esso, 2020	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
van Houten, 2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
van Vugt, 2017	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Williams, 2018	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Yang, 2016	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Zhou, 2019	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes
Zipursky, 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zolaly, 2011	Yes	Yes	NA	No

NA = not applicable

Antibiotic use for acutely ill children in the ambulatory care setting in high income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. (Burvenich R, et al. (2022))

Cochrane RoB 2.0 - Parallel RCT

Reference	Was the allocation sequence random?	Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	Risk of bias arising from the randomization process
Reboredo, 2016	N	N	Y	High
Doan, 2009	Y	Y	PN	Low
Gotta, 2017	Y	Y	N	Low

Y/PN = 'Yes' or 'Probably yes'; N/PN = 'No' or 'Probably no'; NI = 'No information';
NA = Not applicable

Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?	Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?
PN	PY	PN	NA
Y	Y	NI	NA
PN	PY	PN	NA

Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions
NA	NI	PN	Some concerns
NA	NI	NI	Some concerns
NA	Y	NA	Low

Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?	Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	Risk of bias due to missing outcome data
Y	NA	NA	NA	Low
PY	NA	NA	NA	Low
Y	NA	NA	NA	Low

Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?
PN	PN	Y	PN
PN	PN	Y	PN
N	N	N	NA

Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome	Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?
NA	Low	Y
NA	Low	NI
NA	Low	Y

Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible analyses of the data?
PN	PN
PN	PN
PN	PN

Risk of bias in selection of the reported result	Overall risk of bias
Low	Some concerns
Some concerns	Some concerns
Low	Low

Antibiotic use for acutely ill children in the ambulatory care setting in high income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. (Burvenich R, et al. (2022))

Cochrane RoB 2.0 - Cluster RCT				
Reference	Was the allocation sequence random?	Was the allocation sequence concealed until clusters were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	Risk of bias arising from the randomization process
Blair, 2017	NI	NI	PN	Some concerns
de Bont, 2018	Y	Y	PN	Low
Francis, 2009	Y	Y	N	Low
Kronman, 2020	Y	Y	N	Low
Lemliengre, 2018	Y	NI	PN	Some concerns
van Uum, 2020	Y	PY	PN	Low

Y/PY = 'Yes' or 'Probably yes'; N/PN = 'No' or 'Probably no'; NI = 'No information';
NA = Not applicable

Were all the individual participants identified or recruited (if appropriate) before randomization of clusters?	Is it likely that selection of individual participants was affected by knowledge of the intervention assigned to the cluster?	Were there baseline imbalances that suggest differential identification or recruitment of individual participants between intervention groups?
N	PY	PY
N	N	N
N	N	PN
N	N	N
Y	NA	PN
N	PN	PN

Risk of bias arising from the timing of identification or recruitment of participants in a cluster-randomized trial	Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?
High	Y N	PY
Low	PY PN	NA
Low	Y PN	PY
Low	PN NA	PY
Low	NI PN	PY
Low	Y N	Y

Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?	Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?
N	NA	NA	NI
NA	NA	NA	NI
PN	NA	PN	PV
N	NA	NA	Y
PN	NA	NA	Y
N	NA	NA	PV

Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions	Were data for this outcome available for all clusters that recruited participants?	Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants within clusters?
NI	High	Y	PY
NI	Low	PY	PY
NA	Low	Y	PY
NA	Low	Y	Y
NA	Low	PY	Y
NA	Low	PY	PY

Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing data?	Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	Risk of bias due to missing outcome data	Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?
NA	NA	NA	Low	PN
NA	NA	NA	Low	PN
NA	NA	NA	Low	N
NA	NA	NA	Low	N
NA	NA	NA	Low	N
NA	NA	NA	Some concerns	PN

Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	Were outcome assessors aware that a trial was taking place?	Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?
PN	PY	PY	PN
PN	NI	PY	PN
PN	PY	PN	NA
N	PY	PY	N
PN	PY	NI	PN
PN	PY	PY	PN

Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome	Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?
NA	Low	Y
NA	Low	Y
NA	Low	Y
NA	Low	Y
NA	Some concerns	Y
NA	Low	Y

Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible analyses of the data?
PN	PN
N	N
N	N
N	N
PN	PN
PN	PN

Risk of bias in selection of the reported result	Overall risk of bias
Low	High
Low	Low
Low	Low
Low	Low
Low	Some concerns
Low	Some concerns