1. Q1. What is the objective of the systematic review?
Record verbatim the objective of the systematic review described in one of the following sections of the article using this order of priority: Abstract; Methods/Background; Other. If not reported, insert NR in the text box.

2. Q2. What is the main conclusion(s) of the systematic review?
Record verbatim the conclusion(s) of the systematic review described in one of the following sections of the article using this order of priority: Abstract; Discussion; Other. If not reported, insert NR in the text box.

3. Q3. In your judgment, did the authors ask at least one clearly-focused research question?
Check "yes" if at least the population and test intervention are specified in the review.

4. Q4a. Did the author(s) report having eligibility criteria for including/excluding primary studies in the systematic review?
Answer "yes" for all Cochrane reviews. If "yes" is selected, answer Q4b. IF "NO" OR "CAN'T TELL" ARE SELECTED, SKIP TO Q5a.

5. Q4b. Did the author(s) say that the eligibility criteria were pre-specified?
Answer "yes" for all Cochrane reviews. If a protocol or design paper with eligibility criteria is cited, check "yes".

Please Note: This page allows you to generate extraction form questions for Design Details, each with an optional set of suggested responses. Responses can be designated as drop down lists, radio buttons or check boxes, or text fields.

Display Options
Would you like to include the Design Details section in your extraction form? [Yes]"
Q5a. Did the authors report that they planned to include participants of the following ages?

This question asks about the eligibility criteria rather than the results. Please only choose what is EXPLICITLY stated.

- All participants <12 years
- All participants ≥12 years
- Participants both younger and older than 12 years
- Can't tell

Q5b. Did the authors report that they planned to include participants with any of the following CONDITIONS?

This question asks about the eligibility criteria rather than the results. Check "Yes", "No," or "Can't tell" for each category. Please only choose what is EXPLICITLY stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Can't tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5b1. Astigmatism</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b2. Hyperopia</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b3. Myopia</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b4. Presbyopia</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Did the authors report that they planned to examine any of the following interventions?

Select "Yes", "No," or "Can't tell" for each category. Please only choose what is EXPLICITLY stated. If yes, specify the exact type of intervention (e.g., LASIK) and specify if multiple types of the intervention were compared (e.g., soft versus rigid contact lenses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of interventions</th>
<th>If yes, specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6a. Acupuncture</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6b. Contact lenses</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6c Eyeglasses</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6d. Patching</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6e. Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6f. Surgery</td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):

Q7. Did the authors report that they planned to examine any of the following outcomes?

Look in the METHODS rather than the results section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Can't tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7a. Visual acuity: Uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7b. Visual acuity: Best corrected visual acuity (BCVA)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7c. Visual acuity: Usual (habitual) corrected visual acuity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7d. Visual acuity: Mean postoperative spherical equivalent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7e. Visual acuity: Patient acceptance of correction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7f. Refractive error (e.g., achieving target refraction, proportion of eyes within ±0.50 D of target refraction)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7g. Need for correction (e.g., proportion of</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
patients continue to wear glasses or contact lenses)

Q7h. Contrast sensitivity

Q7i. Patient satisfaction (appearance, comfort)

Q7j. Quality of life / vision-related quality of life

Q7k. Functioning (e.g., reading, driving, mobility, activities of daily living)

Q7l. Adverse events (e.g., corneal ectasia, discomfort, infection, induced astigmatism, subepithelial haze, IOP, dry eye, pain, etc.)

Q7m. Cost effectiveness of intervention

Other (please specify): 

10. Q8. Did the authors report that they planned to include the following types of study design to answer the main research question(s) as defined in the objective?

Please see question 1 for defined objective

Yes  No  Unclear

Q8a. Randomized controlled trial (RCT)

Q8b. Quasi-randomized controlled trial

Q8c. Observational study (including cohort study, case-control study, cross-sectional study, information from patient registries, case-series, and patient testimonials)

Other (please specify): 

11. Q9a. Did the authors report that they searched any of the following bibliographic databases?

Yes  No  Unclear

Q9a1. PubMed or MEDLINE

Q9a2. The Cochrane Library or the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)

Q9a3. EMBASE
Q9a4. LILACS

Q9a5. Any other bibliographic database(s)

12 Q9b. What was the total number of bibliographic databases searched?

Please enter the number of databases explicitly stated in the methods or enter "not reported". BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATABASE is defined as a database which provides descriptive records of items such as book(chapter)s, articles and conference proceedings. Do NOT count clinical trial registers, Science Citation Index, or reference lists as bibliographic databases.

13 Q9c. What was the latest date of searching any bibliographic databases?

Please select one option from each drop down menu. If the month, date, or year is not reported, select "not reported" for that item.

14 9d-9i. Did the authors report using any of the following methods to identify relevant studies?

9d. Searched for non-English-language studies for at least one of the above bibliographic database(s)

9e. Searched for all relevant years (i.e., all years after which the interventions became available) for at least one of the above bibliographic database

9f. Searched reference lists, or searched for reports that cited included studies

9g. Contacted experts in the field and/or contacted study authors

9h. Searched for unpublished or difficult-to-access studies (e.g., grey literature, FDA data, internal company reports, conference abstracts)

9i. Searched for ongoing studies (e.g., clinicaltrials.gov, WHO search portal)

Other (please specify):

15 9. Overall, in your judgment, do you think the search for evidence was reasonably comprehensive?

To answer this question, you are encouraged to consider additional information (e.g., search terms, number of trials identified).

Yes

No

Can't tell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Selection Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Did the authors report that they planned to assess the risk of bias in individual studies?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in assessing each title and/or abstract's eligibility?</td>
<td>1, 2 or more, Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in assessing each title and/or abstract's eligibility?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in assessing each full text article's eligibility?</td>
<td>1, 2 or more, Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in assessing each full text article's eligibility?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in assessing the risk of bias of each included study?</td>
<td>1, 2 or more, Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in assessing the risk of bias of each included study?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Can't tell, Not applicable, risk of bias was not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in abstracting data from each included study?</td>
<td>1, 2 or more, Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in abstracting data from each included study?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Can't tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How many primary studies were included in the systematic review?</td>
<td>Enter &quot;Can't tell&quot; if the reporting was unclear and you cannot figure out the number of primary studies included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://srdr.ahrq.gov/projects/912/extraction_forms/1288/edit
26. 13a. How many PARTICIPANTS were included in the systematic review?
Enter “Can’t tell” if the reporting was unclear and you cannot figure out how many participants were included.

27. 13b. How many EYES were included in the systematic review?
Enter “Can’t tell” if the reporting was unclear and you cannot figure out how many eyes were included.

28. 14. Did the authors describe/present the characteristics of the included studies?

Examples of study characteristics include patient age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data; disease status, duration, severity; interventions, outcomes, and risk of bias.

29. 15. What comparisons were made in the systematic review? Please specify

Look in the RESULTS rather than the methods section. Extract the results verbatim (e.g., copy and paste).

30. 16a-16b. How did the authors combine the results?

If “Yes” is selected for 16b, answer 16c-16e.

16a. Qualitatively (the authors described characteristics and risk of bias in individual studies that may affect the cumulative evidence)

16b. Quantitatively (meta-analysis)

31. 16c-16e. How did the authors combine the results?

16c. Reported statistical heterogeneity?

16d. Given the clinical and statistical heterogeneity, was it reasonable to combine results in a meta-analysis?

16e. Were the methods used to combine results of studies appropriate? (Select “Yes” if correct variance and meta-analysis formula were used, and treatment effects were meta-analyzed at trial level (instead of combining results from the same arm))

32. 17. Did the authors report doing a sensitivity analysis?

Yes
No
Can’t tell
18. Did the authors report doing a subgroup analysis?

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

19. Did the authors report doing a meta-regression?

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

20. Did the authors discuss the limitations of the systematic review at the study and outcome level?

*E.g., discuss risk of bias in individual studies and heterogeneity across studies*

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

21. Did the authors discuss the limitations of the systematic review at the review level?

*E.g., discuss incomplete retrieval of relevant studies, publication bias etc.*

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

22a. Did the authors report the source(s) of monetary or material support for the systematic review?

If "Yes" is selected, answer question 22b.

- Yes
- No

22b. What was the reported source(s) of monetary or material support for the systematic review?

Source(s) of monetary or material support for the systematic review

- 22b1. Government (e.g., National Institutes of Health)
- 22b2. Pharmaceutical industry
- 22b3. Other industry
- 22b4. Foundation
- 22b5. Academic department or institution
- 22b6. No funding
- 22b7. Not reported
- 22b8. Other, specify

23a. Did the authors report explicitly that none of the authors has any financial interests?

- Yes
- No

23b. Did the authors report any type(s) of financial interests?

If "Yes" is selected, answer questions 23c-23p.

- Yes
- No

23c-23p: If 23b is yes, please specify type of financial interests.

Specify type of interest

- 23c. Board membership
- 23d. Consultancy
23e. Employment
23f. Expert testimony
23g. Gifts
23h. Grants/grants pending
23i. Honoraria
23j. Payment for manuscript preparation
23k. Patents (planned, pending or issued)
23l. Royalties
23m. Payment for development of educational presentations including service on speakers' bureaus
23n. Stock/stock options
23o. Travel/accommodations expenses covered or reimbursed
23p. Other, specify

42. In your judgment, do you think the conclusions related to main research question of the systematic review are supported by the data?
- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

43. Overall, in your judgment, do you think the systematic review is reliable?
- Yes
- No, because...

44. Why do you think the systematic review is not reliable?
- The systematic review is not reliable because
  25b. Did not define eligibility criteria (see question 4)
  25c. Did not conduct a comprehensive search (see question 9)
  25d. Did not assess risk of bias of included studies (see question 10)
  25e. Used inappropriate quantitative methods to combine findings of included studies (see question 16)
  25f. Sources of monetary or material support for the systematic review and/or author(s) placed the review at high risk of bias (see questions 22 & 23)
  25g. Other, specify

45. Extractor's name:

46. Date form completed

https://srdr.ahrq.gov/projects/912/extraction_forms/1288/edit