

Annex 4: quality appraisal for economic evaluation studies				
JBIC checklist for economic evaluation studies	Vossius (2014)			Comment
	Yes	No	Unclear	
1. Is there a well-defined question?	X			The research question is well defined
2. Is there comprehensive description of alternatives?		X		The description of the alternatives is not included, only a single intervention is described
3. Are all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative identified?		X		The study only report on costs related to main intervention (single intervention HBB)
4. Has clinical effectiveness been established?	X			Yes, from an observational descriptive open cohort study
5. Are costs and outcomes measured accurately?	X			Yes, from a single intervention with no consideration of alternatives
6. Are costs and outcomes valued credibly?	X			Costs and outcomes for single intervention evaluated are considerably adequate
7. Are costs and outcomes adjusted for differential timing?	X			Yes, no other direct costs were observed as training was conducted during working hours
8. Is there an incremental analysis of costs and consequences?			X	IC seems not be clearly described, so unsure if it was conducted
9. Were sensitivity analyses conducted to investigate uncertainty in estimates of cost or consequences?	X			Yes, the authors conducted a sensitivity analysis
10. Do study results include all issues of concern to users?	X			Partly yes because cost for transport, training fee are not considered. The healthcare purchase point of view was the approach used
11. Are the results generalizable to the setting of interest in the review?	X			The authors attempted to reflect on the limitations of the study and the confounding factors contributing to the decrease in EBM. Location of the is rural, hence the findings can be contextualised in rural context

HBB: helping babies breathe; IC: incremental analysis; EBM: evidence-based medicine