Additional file 5. Quality assessment

Table 1. Risk of bias assessment – The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias. Study: Opiyo et al. (2013)

Bias	Review authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	Low risk	"One investigator (NO) generated the random allocation sequence (using a computer random number generator) and assigned participants to the different trial groups in sequential order." Web appendix 2.
Allocation concealment	Unclear risk	All participants received each pack – recruitment for reasons other than intervention, but no methods of concealment documented in the paper.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk	Blinding not mentioned in the paper but is not likely to have influenced the outcome. All participants received each of the 3 interventions (summary formats) but on different topics.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk	Blinding of outcome assessment not mentioned in the paper but is not likely to have influenced the outcome. All participants received each of the 3 interventions (summary formats) but on different topics.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data	Unclear risk	65/70 (93%) participants completed questionnaires but no details provided of missing data.
Reporting bias.		
Selective reporting	Low risk	The study protocol is not available. However, planned analyses and outcomes of interest mentioned in methods section of paper reported on in results.
Other bias.		
Other sources of bias	Low risk	Low numbers of participants for subgroup analyses

Overall assessment: Low risk of bias

Table 2. Assessment of the included systematic reviews against the AMSTAR criteria – Methods for rapid reviews

No.	AMSTAR QUESTIONS	Featherstone et al. (2015), Hartling et al. (2015)	Harker and Kleijnen (2012)	Abrami et al. (2010)	Ganann et al. (2010)	Cameron et al. (2007), Watt et al. (2008)
1	Was an 'a priori' design provided?	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer	Yes
2	Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	No	No	Can't answer	Can't answer	Can't answer
3	Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	No	No	No	No	Yes
6	Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	No	Yes	No	No	No
7	Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	No	No	No	No	No
8	Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
9	Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
10	Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	No	No	No	No	No
11	Was the conflict of interest stated?	No	No	No	No	No
	Total number of 'yes' scores	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**4**