

Table E-60. Study quality for trials comparing hormone with hormone

Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Overall
Polvani 1991	Unc	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Poor
Henriksson 1994	Unc	No	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor

Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Overall
Studd 1995	Unc	Unc	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Ayton 1996	Yes	No	No	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Hilditch 1996	No	Yes	Unc	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Egarter 1996	No	No	No	Unc	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Hirvonen 1997	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Hirvonen 1997	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unc	Poor
Rozenberg 1997	Yes	No	No	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Al-Azzawi 1997	Unc	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Lubbert 1997	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Barentsen 1997	Unc	No	No	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Bachmann 1997	Yes	No	No	No	No	Unc	Yes	Yes	No	Poor
Good 1999	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Mattsson 2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Saure 2000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unc	Yes	Fair
Graser 2000	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Rioux 2000	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Dugal 2000	Unc	No	No	Unc	No	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Parsey 2000	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Meuwissen 2001	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Lopes 2001	Unc	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Ozsoy 2002	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Loh 2002	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Buckler (d) 2003	Yes	Yes	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Lobo 2003	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Pornel 2005	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Poor
Gambacciani 2005	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Utian 2005	Yes	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good
Davis 2005	Unc	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Raynaud 2005	Unc	No	No	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Braunstein 2005	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor

Study	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Overall
Simon 2005	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Weisberg 2005	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Buster 2005	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Akhila 2006	Unc	Unc	Unc	Unc	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Serrano 2006	Yes	No	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Cieraad 2006	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Davis 2006	Yes	Yes	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fair
Long 2006	Unc	No	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Poor
Shifren 2006	Unc	Yes	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Limpaphayom (m) 2006	Yes	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Odabasi 2007	Unc	No	No	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Pitkin (d) 2007	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Penteado 2008	Unc	Yes	Unc	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unc	Poor
Panay 2010	Yes	Yes	Unc	Unc	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor

(a): data came from a conference abstract; (c): data came from posted results on the clinical trial registry; CEE: conjugated equine estrogen; (d): duplicate patient population with other included article; (m): trial contains data from multiple publications; MPA: medroxyprogesterone acetate; (SIP); data came from a package insert; Unc: uncertain

Q1: Was initial assembly of comparable groups: adequate randomization including equal distribution of potential confounders?

Q2: Were the researchers and subjects blinded to the study group assignment?

Q3: Was there adequate concealment of the study group assignments?

Q4: Was there maintenance of comparable groups (includes attrition, crossovers, adherence and contamination)?

Q5: Was there important differential loss to follow-up or overall high loss to follow-up?

Q6: Were measurements equal, reliable and valid (includes masking of outcome assessment)?

Q7: Were definitions of interventions clear?

Q8: Were all important outcomes considered and defined?

Q9: At analysis, was there adjustment for potential confounders (cohort studies) and intention-to-treat analysis (RCTs)?

Q10: Overall Quality Assessment