**Supplementary File 15 – Clinical Practice Guideline and Point-of-Care Medical Database Search Strategies and Quality Assessment**

Assessment of citation of trial results in Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) was independently performed by two authors (NH & HM). CPGs were identified via Scopus 1 citation analysis for published studies or via Google Scholar 2 for unpublished trials. Quality of CPGs was assessed using a modified AGREE II scoring system:

Operationalization of modified AGREE II 3 scoring system

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Were systematic methods used to search for evidence and criteria for selection of evidence clearly described?**   Yes – the authors described electronic databases/sources where search was performed, time periods searched, key terms used; inclusion/exclusion criteria for evidence selection were outlined  No – no description was available/no systematic search for evidence conducted/no criteria for selection of evidence described | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
|  |
| 1. **Were the strengths and limitations of the body of evidence clearly described?**   Yes – description of the tools used to assess quality of evidence provided (e.g. GRADE framework) or explicit discussion of the quality of the entire group of included trials provided  No – no evaluation of quality | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
|  |
| 1. **Were the methods for formulating recommendations clearly described?**   Yes – description of the recommendation development process was included (e.g. voting procedures) and level of consensus reached were described  No – no clear description of the process involved in formulating recommendations provided | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
|  |
| 1. **Were the guidelines externally reviewed prior to publication?**   Yes – guidelines were externally reviewed and reviewers were not involved in the guideline development group  No – no external review performed or reviewers not independent of guideline information  Can’t answer – insufficient information to evaluate external review process | □ Yes (1) |
| □ No (0) |
| □ Can't answer (0) |
| 1. **Were competing interests of guideline developers recorded and addressed?**   Yes – a description of competing interests was provided and their potential impact on guideline development discussed; guideline developers were independent from funding body / funding body did not influence final recommendations  No – no competing interests described, or impact on guideline development not assessed, or unclear if funding body has influenced guideline development | □ Yes (1)  □ No (0) |
|  |

High quality review = score of ≥ 3/5

Trials were deemed to have fulfilled criteria for importance if they were cited in the results of a high-quality CPG. The remaining uncited trials were assessed for inclusion in a point-of-care medical database article by two authors (NH & HM). Using disease and intervention keywords, we searched UpToDate4 to identify any articles citing the remaining trials.

Assessment of citation of trial results in Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) was repeated in October 2021 by NH & HM for those trials without an informative citation when first assessed.
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