



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Impact of Clustering Oral Symptoms in the Pathogenesis of Radiation Caries: A Systematic Review*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/156374/>

Version: Supplemental Material

Article:

Gouvêa Vasconcellos, AF, Palmier, NR, Ribeiro, ACP et al. (10 more authors) (2020)
Impact of Clustering Oral Symptoms in the Pathogenesis of Radiation Caries: A
Systematic Review. *Caries Research*. ISSN 0008-6568

<https://doi.org/10.1159/000504878>

© 2020 S. Karger AG, Basel. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Caries Research*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Supplementary Table 4. Risk of bias assessed by Meta Analysis of Statistics Assessment and Review Instrument (MAStARI)¹ critical appraisal tools. Risk of bias was categorized as **High** when the study reaches up to 49% score “yes”, **Moderate** when the study reached 50% to 69% score “yes”, and **Low** when the study reached more than 70% score “yes”.

MAStARI critical appraisal tools for Descriptive/Case series

Question	Answer*								
	Murphy et al., 2010	Haisfield-Wolfe et al., 2012	Xiao et al., 2013	Rosenthal et al., 2014	Kirca and Kutluturkan 2016	Barnhart et al., 2018	McDowell et al., 2018	Chiang et al., 2018	Ridner et al., 2018
1. Was the study based on a random or pseudo-random sample?	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
2. Were the criteria used for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U
3. Were confounding factors identified and strategies to deal with them stated?	N	U	Y	U	N	N	U	Y	N
4. Were outcomes assessed using objective criteria?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5. If comparisons are being made, was there sufficient description of the groups?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Was follow up carried out over a sufficient time period?	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7. Were outcomes of people who withdrew described and included in the analysis?	N	U	N	N	N	Y	Y	U	N
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
% yes/risk	55.5% M	66.6% M	88.8% L	66.6% M	66.6% M	55.5% M	77.7% L	77.7% L	55.5% M

*Y=Yes, N=No, U=Unclear, M=Moderate, H=High, L=Low.

¹Meta Analysis of Statistics Assessment and Review Instrument (MAStARI). Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers Manual. Australia: The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2014.

Supplementary Table 4 (continued). Risk of bias assessed by the Meta Analysis of Statistics Assessment and Review Instrument (MAStARI)¹ critical appraisal tools. Risk of bias was categorized as **High** when the study reaches up to 49% score “yes”, **Moderate** when the study reached 50% to 69% score “yes”, and **Low** when the study reached more than 70% score “yes”.

Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Analytical Cross Sectional Studies

Question	Answer*	
	Eraj et al., 2017	Xiao et al., 2017
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	Y	Y
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Y	Y
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	Y	Y
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	Y	Y
5. Were confounding factors identified?	U	U
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	N	N
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	Y	Y
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Y	Y
% yes/risk	75% L	75% L

*Y=Yes, N=No, U=Unclear, M=Moderate, H=High, L=Low.

¹Meta Analysis of Statistics Assessment and Review Instrument (MAStARI). Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers Manual. Australia: The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2014