## **Supplementary material to:**

## EFFICACY OF ANTIOXIDANT IN IDIOPATHIC PULMONARY FIBROSIS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Amit D. Kandhare, Anwesha Mukherjee, Pinaki Ghosh, Subhash L. Bodhankar\*

Department of Pharmacology, Poona College of Pharmacy, Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed University, Erandwane, Paud Road, Pune-411 038, India

\* Corresponding author: Dr. Subhash L. Bodhankar, Professor, and Head, Department of Pharmacology, Poona College of Pharmacy, Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed University, Erandwane, Paud Road, Pune-411038, Maharashtra, India. Phone: +91-20-25437237, Fax: +91-20-25439383; E-mail: drslbodh@gmail.com

http://dx.doi.org/10.17179/excli2016-619

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

S. No	o. Study ID	Country														Do	vns and	Black scoring sys	stem														
				Reporting										an External validity		Mean	Mean Internal validity - bias							Mean	Mean Internal validity -confounding (selection bias)						Mean		
			1	2	3	4	5*	6	7	8	9	10	1	11	12	13		14	15	16	17	18	19	20		21	22	23	24	25	26		A
			Is the hypothesis/objective of the study clearly described?	Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the introduction or methods section?	Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study clearly described?		Are the distributions of principal confounders in each group of subjects to be compared clearly described?	findings of the study clearly	Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes?	important adverse		Have actual probability values been reported (eg. 0.035 rather than <0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001?	s tu tl r c p fi	the study representative of the entire copulation from which	to participate representative of the entire	Were the staff, places and facilities where the patients were treated representative of the treatment the majority of the patients receive?		Was an attempt made to blind study subjects to the intervention they received?	Was an attempt made to blind those measuring the main outcomes of the intervention?	1 0 0	cohort studies, da the analyses	tests used to assess the	Was compliance with the interventions reliable?	Were the main outcomes measures used accurate (valid and reliable)?		patients in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited from the same	Were study subjects in different intervention groups (trials and cohort studies) or were the cases and controls (case-control studies) recruited over the same period of time?		Was the randomised intervention assignment concealed from both patients and healthcare staff until recruitment was complete and irrevocable?	adequate adjustment for confounding	Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account?	Total	al
1	Bando_2010	Japan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	9	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	2 17	
2	Behr_2009	Multi-countries	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	11	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6 27	
3	Behr_2016	Multi-countries	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	11	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6 27	
4		Japan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	9	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	0	5 20	
5	Huang_2015	China	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6 26	
6	Kamio_2014	Japan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6 26	
/	Martinez_2014	United State	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6 26	4
8	Okuda_2016	Japan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 16	
10	Raghu_2012 Sakamoto_2013	Japan	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	11	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	6 27	
11	Sakamoto_2015		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	9	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	4 19	
12	Tomioka_2005		1	1	0	0	Ó	1	1	0	0	1	5	1	1	1	3	0	0	Ô	Ô	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	2 13	
12	Torriiona_2003	σαραιτ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	9	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	4 19	