

Supplementary references

S2 Ref – Meta-epidemiologic studies.¹⁻⁹

“Our bias risk assessment was based on the results of meta-epidemiological studies”¹⁻⁹

S3 Ref – Trial sequential analyses

“Trial Sequential Analysis to assess the risks of random errors”,¹⁰⁻¹⁹

1. Lundh A, Lexchin J, Mintzes B, et al. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2017;2:Mr000033. doi: 10.1002/14651858.MR000033.pub3 [published Online First: 2017/02/17]
2. Hrobjartsson A, Thomsen AS, Emanuelsson F, et al. Observer bias in randomized clinical trials with measurement scale outcomes: a systematic review of trials with both blinded and nonblinded assessors. *CMAJ* 2013;185(4):E201-11. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.120744. Epub 2013 Jan 28.
3. Hrobjartsson A, Emanuelsson F, Skou Thomsen AS, et al. Bias due to lack of patient blinding in clinical trials. A systematic review of trials randomizing patients to blind and nonblind sub-studies. *Int J Epidemiol* 2014;43(4):1272-83. doi: 10.093/ije/dyu115. Epub 2014 May 30.
4. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. *BMJ* 2008;336(7644):601-5. doi: . doi: 10.1136/bmj.39465.451748.AD. Epub 2008 Mar 3.
5. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, et al. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. *JAMA* 1995;273(5):408-12. doi: doi: 10.1001/jama.273.5.408.
6. Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. *Health Technol Assess* 2012;16(35):1-82. doi: . doi: 10.3310/hta16350.
7. Moher D, Pham B, Jones A, et al. Does quality of reports of randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? *Lancet* 1998;352(9128):609-13. doi: doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(98)01085-X.
8. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, Gluud C. Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. *Ann Intern Med* 2001;135(11):982-9. doi: doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-135-11-200112040-00010.
9. Gluud LL. Bias in clinical intervention research. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006;163(6):493-501. doi: doi: 10.1093/aje/kwj069
10. Trial Sequential Analysis [program]. <http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/>.
11. Wetterslev J TK, Brok J, Gluud C. Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61:64-75.
12. Brok J TK, Gluud C, Wetterslev J. Trial sequential analysis reveals insufficient information size and potentially false positive results in many meta-analyses. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61:763-69.
13. Brok J TK, Wetterslev J, Gluud C. Apparently conclusive meta-analyses may be inconclusive - Trial sequential analysis adjustment of random error risk due to repetitive testing of accumulating data in apparently conclusive neonatal meta-analyses. *Int J Epidemiol* 2009;38:287-98.

14. Thorlund K, Devereaux PJ, Wetterslev J, et al. Can trial sequential monitoring boundaries reduce spurious inferences from meta-analyses? *Int J Epidemiol* 2009;38(1):276-86. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyn179 [published Online First: 2008/10/01]
15. Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, et al. Estimating required information size by quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2009;9:86. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-9-86 [published Online First: 2010/01/01]
16. Thorlund K, Anema A, Mills E. Interpreting meta-analysis according to the adequacy of sample size. An example using isoniazid chemoprophylaxis for tuberculosis in purified protein derivative negative HIV-infected individuals. *Clin Epidemiol* 2010;2:57-66. [published Online First: 2010/09/25]
17. Thorlund K WJ, Brok J, Imberger G, Gluud C. User manual for trial sequential analysis (TSA) http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/files/tsa_manual.pdf2011 [
18. Imberger G, Gluud C, Boylan J, et al. Systematic Reviews of Anesthesiologic Interventions Reported as Statistically Significant: Problems with Power, Precision, and Type 1 Error Protection. *Anesth Analg* 2015;121(6):1611-22. doi: 10.1213/ane.0000000000000892 [published Online First: 2015/11/19]
19. Imberger G, Thorlund K, Gluud C, et al. False-positive findings in Cochrane meta-analyses with and without application of trial sequential analysis: an empirical review. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(8):e011890. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011890 [published Online First: 2016/08/16]