

Checklist Table. Mark ✓ to indicate that the issue has been addressed satisfactorily, and ✖ if there is any cause for concern on the item. The Comments column should be used to answer the question (YES, NO, NA: not applicable) and/or to spell out the reasons for any concerns, the need for sensitivity analyses etc.

		Item satisfactory?	Comments
<b>A. DEFINITION OF THE DECISION PROBLEM</b>			
<b><i>A1. Target population for decision</i></b>			
<i>A1.1</i>	<i>Has the target patient population for decision been clearly defined?</i>		
<b><i>A2. Comparators</i></b>			
<i>A2.1</i>	<i>Decision Comparator Set: Have all the appropriate treatments in the decision been identified?</i>		
<i>A2.2</i>	<i>Synthesis Comparator Set: Are there additional treatments in the Synthesis Comparator Set, which are not in the Decision Comparator Set? If so, is this adequately justified?</i>		
<b><i>A3 Trial inclusion / exclusion</i></b>			
<i>A3.1</i>	<i>Is the search strategy technically adequate and appropriately reported?</i>		
<i>A3.2</i>	<i>Have all trials involving at least two of the treatments in the Synthesis Comparator Set been included?</i>		
<i>A3.3</i>	<i>Have all trials reporting relevant outcomes been included?</i>		

		Item satisfactory?	Comments
A3.4	<i>Have additional trials been included? If so, is this adequately justified?</i>		
<b>A4 Treatment Definition</b>			
A4.1	<i>Are all the treatment options restricted to specific doses and co-treatments, or have different doses and co-treatments been “lumped” together? If the latter, is it adequately justified?</i>		
A4.2	<i>Are there any additional modelling assumptions?</i>		
<b>A5 Trial outcomes and scale of measurement chosen for the synthesis</b>			
A5.1	<i>Where alternative outcomes are available, has the choice of outcome measure used in the synthesis been justified?</i>		
A5.2	<i>Have the assumptions behind the choice of scale been justified?</i>		
<b>A6 Patient population: trials with patients outside the target population</b>			
A6.1	<i>Do some trials include patients outside the target population? If so, is this adequately justified?</i>		
A6.2	<i>What assumptions are made about the impact, or lack of impact this may have on the relative treatment effects? Are they adequately justified?</i>		
A6.3	<i>Has an adjustment been made to account for these differences? If so, comment on the adequacy of the evidence presented in support of this adjustment, and on the need for a sensitivity analysis.</i>		
<b>A7 Patient population: heterogeneity within the target population</b>			
A7.1	<i>Has there been a review of the literature concerning potential modifiers of treatment effect?</i>		
A7.2	<i>Are there apparent or potential differences between trials in their patient populations, albeit</i>		

		Item satisfactory?	Comments
	<i>within the target population? If so, has this been adequately taken into account?</i>		
<b>A8 Risk of Bias</b>			
A8.1	<i>Is there a discussion of the biases to which these trials, or this ensemble of trials, are vulnerable?</i>		
A8.2	<i>If a bias risk was identified, was any adjustment made to the analysis and was this adequately justified?</i>		
<b>A9. Presentation of the data</b>			
A9.1	<i>Is there a clear table or diagram showing which data have been included in the base-case analysis?</i>		
A9.2	<i>Is there a clear table or diagram showing which data have been excluded and why?</i>		
<b>B. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS</b>			
<b>B1 Meta-analytic methods</b>			
B1.1	<i>Is the statistical model clearly described?</i>		
B1.2	<i>Has the software implementation been documented?</i>		
<b>B2. Heterogeneity in the relative treatment effects</b>			
B2.1	<i>Have numerical estimates been provided of the degree of heterogeneity in the relative treatment effects?</i>		
B2.2	<i>Has a justification been given for choice of random or fixed effect models? Should sensitivity analyses be considered?</i>		
B2.3	<i>Has there been adequate response to heterogeneity?</i>		
B2.4	<i>Does the extent of unexplained variation in relative treatment effects threaten the robustness of</i>		

		Item satisfactory?	Comments
	<i>conclusions?</i>		
B2.5	<i>Has the statistical heterogeneity between baseline arms been discussed?</i>		
<b>B3 Baseline model for trial outcomes</b>			
B3.1	<i>Are baseline effects and relative effects estimated in the same model? If so, has this been justified?</i>		
B3.2	<i>Has the choice of studies to inform the baseline model been explained?</i>		
<b>B4 Presentation of results of analyses of trial data</b>			
B4.1	<i>Are the relative treatment effects (relative to a placebo or “standard” comparator) tabulated, alongside measures of between-study heterogeneity if a RE model is used?</i>		
B4.2	<i>Are the absolute effects on each treatment, as they are used in the CEA, reported?</i>		
<b>B5 Synthesis in other parts of the natural history model</b>			
B5.1	<i>Is the choice of data sources to inform the other parameters in the natural history model adequately described and justified?</i>		
B5.2	<i>In the natural history model, can the longer-term differences between treatments be explained by their differences on randomised trial outcomes?</i>		
<b>C. ISSUES SPECIFIC TO NETWORK SYNTHESIS</b>			
<b>C1 Adequacy of information on model specification and software implementation</b>			
<b>C2. Multi-arm trials</b>			
C2.1	<i>If there are multi-arm trials, have the correlations between the relative treatment effects been taken into account?</i>		
<b>C3 Connected and disconnected networks</b>			

		Item satisfactory?	Comments
C3.1	<i>Is the network of evidence based on randomised trials connected?</i>		
<b>C4 Inconsistency</b>			
C4.1	<i>How many inconsistencies could there be in the network?</i>		
C4.2	<i>Are there any a priori reasons for concern that inconsistency might exist, due to systematic clinical differences between the patients in trials comparing treatments A and B, and the patients in trials comparing treatments A and C, etc?</i>		
C4.3	<i>Have adequate checks for inconsistency been made?</i>		
C4.4	<i>If inconsistency was detected, what adjustments were made to the analysis, and how was this justified?</i>		
<b>D EMBEDDING THE SYNTHESIS IN A PROBABILISTIC COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS</b>			
<b>D1. Uncertainty Propagation</b>			
D1.1	<i>Has the uncertainty in parameter estimates been propagated through the CEA model?</i>		
<b>D2 Correlations</b>			
D2.1	<i>Are there correlations between parameters? If so, have the correlations been propagated through the CEA model?</i>		