

Table 13. Percent of studies meeting individual quality criteria

	Percent of Studies Meeting Criterion
<i>Description</i>	
Was the study sample well described?	26%
Was the intervention well described (what, how, who, where)?	23%
<i>Sampling</i>	
Did the authors specify the sampling frame or universe of selection for the study sample?	19%
Was the sample that served as the unit of analysis the entire eligible sample or a probability sample at the point of reference?	32%
Are there other selection bias issues not otherwise addressed?	13%
<i>Measurement</i>	
Did the authors attempt to measure exposure to the intervention?	55%
Was the exposure variable valid?	11%
Was the exposure variable reliable (consistent and reproducible)?	11%
Were the outcome and other independent (or predictor) variables valid?	47%
Were the outcome and other independent (or predictor) variables reliable (consistent and reproducible)?	53%
<i>Analysis</i>	
Did the authors conduct appropriate statistical testing by conducting statistical testing (when appropriate)?	100%
Did the authors conduct appropriate statistical testing by reporting which statistical tests were used?	96%
Did the authors conduct appropriate statistical testing by controlling for repeated measures in samples that were followed over time?	55%
Did the authors conduct appropriate statistical testing by controlling for differential exposure to the intervention?	2%
Did the authors conduct appropriate statistical testing by using a model designed to handle multi-level data when they included group-level and individual covariates in the model?	26%
<i>Results</i>	
Did at least 80 percent of enrolled participants complete the study?	40%
Did the authors assess if the units of analysis were comparable prior to exposure to the intervention?	77%
Did the authors institute study procedures to limit bias appropriately (e.g. randomization, restriction, matching, stratification or statistical adjustment)?	70%