



Supplementary Material

Table i. Detailed Newcastle Ottawa Scale

Authors, year	Selection			Comparability		Outcome			Risk score				
	1a) Intervention group truly representative	1b) Intervention group somewhat	2a) Control group from same community	3a) Secure record used	3b) Structured interview used	1a) Controlled for important factor	1b) Controlled for additional factor	1a) Blind assessment	1b) Record linkage	2a) Sufficient follow-up period	3a) Complete follow-up	3b) Loss to follow-up unlikely to affect bias	High risk (0-3) Moderate risk (4-5) Low risk (6-8)
Askoy 2004	-	√	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (4)
Arkader 2008	-	√	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (4)
Brech 2006	√	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	√	-	-	√	Low (7)
Citlak 2012	-	√	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (4)
Cooperman 1984	-	√	-	√	-	√	√	-	√	-	-	-	Moderate (4)
Edvarson 1981	-	√	-	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (3)
Evans 1988	-	√	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (4)
Fulford 1993	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	Moderate (4)
Herring 2004	√	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	Low (7)
Jani 1980	√	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	-	Low (7)
Marklund 1976	√	-	-	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (4)
Osman 2009	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	-	Moderate (5)
Poussa 1993	√	-	√	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	Low (6)
Wang 1995	-	-	√	√	-	√	√	√	-	√	√	-	Low (8)
Wiig 2008	√	-	-	√	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	√	Low (7)

Table ii. Detailed TIDieR checklist

TIDieR checklist														
Study Reference	0 not reported 1 partly reported 2 adequately reported	Brief Name: Provides the name or a phrase that describes the intervention	Goal: Describes any rationale, theory or goal of elements essential to the intervention	Materials. Describes any physical or information materials used in the intervention. Provides information on where the materials can be accessed (e.g. online appendix, URL)	Procedures. Describes each of the procedures, activities, and/or processes used in the intervention	Who. For each category of intervention provider, describes their expertise, background and any specific training.	How. Describes the modes of delivery of the intervention and model (e.g. individual or group)	Where. Describes the type(s) or location(s) where the intervention occurred, including any necessary infrastructure or relevant features	When & How much Describes the number of times the intervention was delivered and over what period of time (e.g. dose, intensity, duration)	Tailoring. If the intervention can be personalised or adapted (what, why, when and how)	Modifications If the intervention was modified during the course of the study, describes the changes (what, why, when and how).	Planning. If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, and how/by whom, and if any strategies were used to maintain or improve fidelity	Actual treatment fidelity. If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describes the extent the intervention was delivered as planned	OVERALL TIDIER SCORE (Max 24)
Askoy 2004	Score 0, 1, 2 (see above)	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	11
	Notes		No rationale for treatment choice	Gives name of brace but no information as to how long worn during day, etc. Only duration of months worn. Lacks info regarding any non-braced protocol other than 'orthopaedic review'	Combined with PT but does not give detailed information on regimes used				Combined with PT but does not give detailed information on regimes used		Combined with PT but does not give detailed information on regimes used			
Arkader 2008	Score:	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
	Notes		No PT or abduction cast description		No PT or abduction cast description				No PT or abduction cast description					
	Score:	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	13

Brech 2006	Notes:						Describe s that patients attended a clinic twice a week for 12/52 but no more detail on mode							
Citlak 2012	Score:	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
	Notes		No splint info			Surgeons used surgical intervention (Axer)	Retrospective cohort study, Patient treated at a certain hospital but no other info		No dose for splint					
Cooperman 1984	Score:	2	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	9
	Notes		Discussed crutches equal to no treatment, but no info on splint aims.	States crutches but no info on splints other than name					No dose for splint					
Edvarson 1981	Score:	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	13
	Notes						States treatment delivered in hospital but not							

							by who or mode							
Evans 1988	Score:	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	11
	Notes				Retrospe ctive report of NAO group but limited descripti on on process or supporti ng activities	No descripti on of who provided NAO group	No descripti on for how NAO group were delivered /manage d							
Fulford 1993	Score:	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	14
	Notes		No rationale for calliper			No descripti on of calliper provision	No descripti on of calliper provision							
Herring 2004	Score:	2	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	12
	Notes					Lacks info on provision of splints	Lacks info on provision of splints							
Jani 1980	Score:	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
	Notes					Describe s surgeons , but no other info			Limited info regarding dosage/ti me spent in traction, PT input					
	Score:	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7

Marklund 1976	Notes				Limited description of conservative group - states what was done but no procedures explained									
Poussa 1993	Score:	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Notes				Describes surgery		States where surgery was, but no other info							
Osman 2009	Score:	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
	Notes			Only surgical info described	Only surgical info described		Only surgical info described							
Wang 1995	Score:	2	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	10
	Notes				No info on physio involvement in intervention				Limited info on dosage/time spent in traction, PT input, etc.					
Wiig 2008	Score:	2	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	10
	Notes		Described aim of intervention but not detailed for		Lacks info on PT				Lacks info on PT	Described when patient's change				

		individual interventio ns given the scale of the study							d interve ntion type e.g. patient had that deterio rated and require d surgical input			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--