**Supplementary File 14 –** **Systematic Review Citation Search Strategy and Quality Assessment**

Assessment of citation of trial results in high quality systematic reviews (SRs) was independently performed by two authors (NH & HM). This first involved a search for sources that are well known for producing high quality SRs: Cochrane SRs on the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews1 and Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) SRs 2. If trials were not included in Cochrane or AHRQ reviews, additional SRs for published studies were identified using the Scopus database 3 citation analysis search function or via Google Scholar 4 for unpublished studies. SRs identified through Scopus or Google Scholar that included trial results in review results were assessed for quality using a modified AMSTAR scoring system:

Operationalization of modified AMSTAR5,6 scoring system

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Was an “a priori” design provided?**   Yes – the authors stated that methods were established prior to conducting the review or provided a link to a registered protocol record  No – the authors stated that there’s no protocol available or no information is provided | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
| 1. **Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?**   Yes – at least two individuals independently performed study selection and data extraction; the method for reaching consensus in the setting of disagreement was reported  No – only one person performed either study selection or data extraction  Can’t answer – no information about independent study selection and/or data extraction was provided | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
| □ Can't answer (0) |
| 1. **Was a comprehensive literature search performed?**   Yes – at least two electronic sources were searched; keywords or MESH terms were provided  No – only one database was searched; no keywords or MESH terms were provided  Can’t answer – partial or no information reported | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
| □ Can't answer (0) |
| 1. **Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?**   Yes - a list of included and excluded studies was provided  No – a list of included and excluded studies was not provided | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
|  |
| 1. **Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented with a study-specific quality score provided?**   Yes – risk of bias or another quality metric was used and reported  No – no risk of bias or quality metric was used  Can’t answer – the authors state that a quality metric was done, but do not provide additional information | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
| □ Can't answer (0) |

High quality review = score of ≥ 3/5

Trials were deemed to have fulfilled the importance criterion if they were cited in the results of a Cochrane SR, an AHRQ SR, or an SR achieving a modified AMSTAR score of greater or equal to 3 out of 5.

Assessment of citation of trial results in SRs was repeated in October 2021 by NH & HM for those trials without an informative citation when first assessed.

Bibliography

1. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. (<https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/reviews>)

2. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (<https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov>).

3. Scopus. (<https://www.scopus.com>)

4. Google Scholar. (<https://scholar.google.ca>).

5. Shea BJ, Hamel C, Wells GA, et al. AMSTAR is a reliable and valid measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2009;62(10):1013-1020.

6. Flodgren G, Eccles MP, Shepperd S, Scott A, Parmelli E, Beyer FR. An overview of reviews evaluating the effectiveness of financial incentives in changing healthcare professional behaviours and patient outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011(7):CD009255.