

Table 1 – Reasons for missing evidence and explanations, adapted from Yordanov et al.

<i>Reason for missing evidence</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
<i>Inadequate or alternative or missing planning</i>	Whether the outcome was not planned according to the protocol nor reported in the trial reports.
<i>Selective reporting</i>	Whether the outcome was planned according to the protocol, but not reported in the trial reports.
<i>Incomplete reporting</i>	Whether the outcome was planned or not according to the protocol and reported in the trial reports, but not in a way that allowed its inclusion in the meta-analysis.
<i>Unable to distinguish between selective reporting and inadequate planning</i>	Whether no protocol or registry entry was available and the outcome was not reported in the reports.
<i>Other situations</i>	<p>The dichotomous outcome was listed in the trial reports, but there was no event.</p> <p>The outcome concerned adverse events, but there was no event.</p> <p>If it was judged that the outcome had been reported in a way that would allow it to be included in the meta-analysis, but the SR authors did not include it.</p>
<i>Justified to be not included</i>	In case the study could not be included in the meta-analysis for reasons related to the nature of the data (e.g. results reported as median and interquartile range as they were not normally distributed, or reported as mean change and standard deviation or 95% confidence interval) or to specific choices of the SR authors (e.g. the SR only included in the meta-analysis studies that had assessed an outcome with one or more selected outcome measures and the study in question assessed the same outcome with a different outcome measure).
<i>Not assessed - Language</i>	If the study was published in a language other than English.
<i>Not assessed - Not found and impossible to judge.</i>	In case the full text of the study was not retrieved.