

Appendix 1 to Montgomery SJ, Rollick NJ, Kubik JF, et al. Surgical outcomes of chronic isolated scapholunate interosseous ligament injuries: a systematic review of 805 wrists. *Can J Surg* 2019.

DOI: 10.1503/cjs.006918

© 2019 Joule Inc., or its licensors

Online appendices are unedited and posted as supplied by the authors.

Appendix 1. Supplementary material

Search Strategy

Database: Embase <1990 to 2016>

Search Strategy:

-
- 1 therapeutics.mp. or exp therapy/ (7481124)
 - 2 scapholunate.mp. (1342)
 - 3 treatment.mp. (5927788)
 - 4 1 or 3 (10385416)
 - 5 2 and 4 (613)

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1990 to 2016>

Search Strategy:

-
- 1 therapeutics.mp. or exp therapy/ (4143278)
 - 2 scapholunate.mp. (997)
 - 3 treatment.mp. (3765168)
 - 4 1 or 3 (6545142)
 - 5 2 and 4 (493)

Appendix 1 to Montgomery SJ, Rollick NJ, Kubik JF, et al. Surgical outcomes of chronic isolated scapholunate interosseous ligament injuries: a systematic review of 805 wrists. *Can J Surg* 2019.

DOI: 10.1503/cjs.006918

© 2019 Joule Inc., or its licensors

Online appendices are unedited and posted as supplied by the authors.

Database: PubMed <1990 to 2016>

Search Strategy:

scapholunate[All Fields] AND ("therapy"[Subheading] OR "therapy"[All Fields] OR "treatment"[All Fields] OR "therapeutics"[MeSH Terms] OR "therapeutics"[All Fields]) AND ("1990/01/01"[PDAT] : "2016/12/31"[PDAT])

Appendix 1 to Montgomery SJ, Rollick NJ, Kubik JF, et al. Surgical outcomes of chronic isolated scapholunate interosseous ligament injuries: a systematic review of 805 wrists. *Can J Surg* 2019.

DOI: 10.1503/cjs.006918

© 2019 Joule Inc., or its licensors

Online appendices are unedited and posted as supplied by the authors.

Structured Effectiveness Quality Evaluation Scale (SEQES)

Score each question 0–2 (Higher score indicated higher quality)

Study question

1. Was the relevant background work cited to establish a foundation for the research question?

Study design

2. Was a comparison group used?
3. Was patient status at more than one time point considered?
4. Was data collection performed prospectively?
5. Were patients randomized to groups?
6. Were patients blinded to the extent possible?
7. Were treatment providers blinded to the extent possible?
8. Was an independent evaluator used to administer outcome measures?

Subjects

9. Did sampling procedures minimize sample/selection bias?
10. Were inclusion/exclusion criteria defined?
11. Was an appropriate enrollment contained?
12. Was an appropriate retention/follow-up obtained?

Intervention

13. Was the intervention applied according to established principles?
14. Were biases due to the treatment provider minimized (i.e. attention, training, etc)?
15. Was the intervention compared to appropriate comparator?

Outcomes

16. Was an appropriate primary outcome defined?
17. Were appropriate secondary outcomes considered?
18. Was an appropriate follow-up period incorporated?

Analysis

19. Was an appropriate statistical test(s) performed to indicate differences related to the intervention?
20. Was it established that the study had significant power to identify treatment effects?
21. Was the size and significance of the effects reported?
22. Were missing data accounted for and considered in the analyses?
23. Were the diwenical and practical significance considered in interpreting results?

Recommendations

24. Were the conclusions/clinical recommendations supported by the study objectives, analysis and results?

Total quality score =

Appendix 1 to Montgomery SJ, Rollick NJ, Kubik JF, et al. Surgical outcomes of chronic isolated scapholunate interosseous ligament injuries: a systematic review of 805 wrists. *Can J Surg* 2019.

DOI: 10.1503/cjs.006918

© 2019 Joule Inc., or its licensors

Online appendices are unedited and posted as supplied by the authors.

Sackett's Levels of Evidence

Level of Evidence	General criteria for LOE
I	Single high-quality randomized, controlled trial (RCT) or systematic review of homogenous RCTs
II	Single cohort study, low-quality RCT (i.e. less than 80% follow-up), or systematic review of cohort studies
III	Case-control studies
IV	Case series, low-quality cohort and case-control studies
V	Expert opinion without critical appraisal