

Additional file 6. Shortcuts taken in this review to make it rapid and quality assessment

Shortcuts taken

- One reviewer screened titles and abstracts
- One reviewer extracted data with checking by a second reviewer
- Data extraction limited to key characteristics and results
- Limit placed on language of publication – English, French, Portuguese and Spanish
- Narrow time frame – studies published from 2004
- Narrative synthesis only, although meta-analysis was not possible due to heterogeneity of included studies
- Publication bias not assessed, although no clear methods available for assessing publication bias qualitatively
- External peer review of report to funder not obtained

Assessment of this rapid review against the AMSTAR criteria

No.	AMSTAR questions	Assessment
1	Was an 'a priori' design provided?	Yes
2	Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	Yes
3	Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	Yes
4	Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	Yes
5	Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	Yes
6	Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	Yes
7	Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	Yes
8	Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?	Yes
9	Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	Yes
10	Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	No
11	Was the conflict of interest stated?	Yes
	Total number of 'yes' scores	10