

Ambient air pollution and adverse birth outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Le-qian GUO¹, Yu CHEN², Bai-bing MI¹, Shao-nong DANG¹, Dou-dou ZHAO¹, Rong LIU¹,
Hong-li WANG¹, Hong YAN^{†1}

¹Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Xi'an Jiaotong University Health Science Center, Xi'an
710061, China

²Medical Records Department, the First Hospital of Yulin, Yulin 718000, China

[†]E-mail: yanhong1234@aliyun.com

Table S3 Questions in ROBIS (Whiting et al., 2016)

Phases	Questions
Phase 2	
Study eligibility criteria	<p>Q1.1 Did the review adhere to pre-defined objectives and eligibility criteria?</p> <p>Q1.2 Were the eligibility criteria appropriate for the review question?</p> <p>Q1.3 Were eligibility criteria unambiguous?</p> <p>Q1.4 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on study characteristics appropriate (e.g. date, sample size, study quality, outcomes measured)?</p> <p>Q1.5 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on sources of information appropriate (e.g. publication status or format, language, availability of data)?</p>
Identification and selection of studies	<p>Q2.1 Did the search include an appropriate range of databases/electronic sources for published and unpublished reports?</p> <p>Q2.2 Were methods additional to database searching used to identify relevant reports?</p> <p>Q2.3 Were the terms and structure of the search strategy likely to retrieve as many eligible studies as possible?</p> <p>Q2.4 Were restrictions based on date, publication format, or language appropriate?</p> <p>Q2.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in selection of studies?</p>
Data collection and study appraisal	<p>Q3.1 Were efforts made to minimise error in data collection?</p> <p>Q3.2 Were sufficient study characteristics available for both review authors and readers to be able to interpret the results?</p> <p>Q3.3 Were all relevant study results collected for use in the synthesis?</p> <p>Q3.4 Was risk of bias (or methodological quality) formally assessed using appropriate criteria?</p> <p>Q3.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in risk of bias assessment?</p>
Synthesis and findings	<p>Q4.1 Did the synthesis include all studies that it should?</p> <p>Q4.2 Were all pre-defined analyses reported or departures explained?</p>

		Q4.3	Was the synthesis appropriate given the nature and similarity in the research questions, study designs and outcomes across included studies?
		Q4.4	Was between-study variation (heterogeneity) minimal or addressed in the synthesis?
		Q4.5	Were the findings robust, e.g. as demonstrated through funnel plot or sensitivity analyses?
		Q4.6	Were biases in primary studies minimal or addressed in the synthesis?

Phase 3			
Risk of bias in the review	A	Did the interpretation of findings address all of the concerns identified in Domains 1 to 4?	
	B	Was the relevance of identified studies to the review's research question appropriately considered?	
	C	Did the reviewers avoid emphasizing results on the basis of their statistical significance?	

References

Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JPT, et al., 2016. ROBIS: a new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 69:225-234.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.06.005>