

## STAT REVIEW ONLY –

I cannot sort out the probability values listed in the tables and I concur, they are problematic as they currently exist.

First, the exponential values need to be reported in a summary value that readers will understand. It makes no sense to me to be reporting these kinds of exponential values.

Second, while the probability values reported in the tables indicate heterogeneity of studied variables, the reader needs to be informed - perhaps in greater detail in the text, how to interpret the tables. There is reason to expect the values may be reported as 0s or 1s, but what does this mean is the real question (other than the fact that the probability expresses the chance that it would take x number of "no effect" studies to counter the strength of the existing evidence). What probability levels would indicate a robust converging of studies reflecting similar effect sizes? This is what I think is missing.

I am not an expert in meta-analysis. However, I do believe that overall I am sophisticated in reading statistical findings, enough so that I should understand what the investigators have done and what the significance of 0s and 1s are. Given the report and the tables, I do not. I do applaud the writing and the increasing appearance of meta-analysis in the literature.

I am sorry I cannot offer more insight here. I think someone with an understanding of meta-analysis software and of this software specifically would be in a better position to advise you. I do know my limits and I just hit one.