**Table S1** Posterior mean residual deviance  $D_{res}$ , effective number of parameters  $p_D$  and deviance information criterion (DIC) for the hierarchical models fitted to the ROBES data.

| Model      | Design characteristic/s                                  | Interacti<br>on/s<br>between<br>design<br>character<br>istics | Covariat es in model for τ <sup>2</sup> | Dres | <b>p</b> D | DIC  |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------|------------|------|
| A1         | Sequence generation                                      | N/A                                                           | -                                       | 2982 | 1909       | 4891 |
|            | Sequence generation                                      | N/A                                                           | Outcome type                            | 3000 | 1889       | 4889 |
| A2         | Allocation concealment                                   | N/A                                                           | -                                       | 2972 | 1914       | 4886 |
|            | Allocation concealment                                   | N/A                                                           | Outcome type                            | 3003 | 1899       | 4902 |
| A3         | Blinding                                                 | N/A                                                           | -                                       | 2968 | 1915       | 4883 |
|            | Blinding                                                 | N/A                                                           | Outcome type                            | 3003 | 1891       | 4894 |
| B1         | Sequence generation and allocation concealment           | Yes                                                           | -                                       | 3001 | 1900       | 4901 |
|            | Sequence generation and allocation concealment           | No                                                            | -                                       | 2988 | 1906       | 4894 |
| В2         | Sequence generation and blinding                         | Yes                                                           | -                                       | 2978 | 1908       | 4886 |
| <b>D</b> 2 | Sequence generation and blinding                         | No                                                            | -                                       | 2988 | 1904       | 4892 |
| В3         | Allocation concealment and blinding                      | Yes                                                           | -                                       | 2996 | 1902       | 4898 |
| כם         | Allocation concealment and blinding                      | No                                                            | -                                       | 2981 | 1908       | 4889 |
|            | Sequence generation, allocation concealment and blinding | All<br>possible                                               | -                                       | 2985 | 1905       | 4890 |
| B4         | Sequence generation, allocation concealment and blinding | Interactio n between sequence generatio n and blinding alone  | -                                       | 2998 | 1899       | 4897 |
|            | Sequence generation, allocation concealment and blinding | No                                                            | -                                       | 2978 | 1913       | 4891 |
|            | Sequence generation, allocation concealment and blinding | No                                                            | Outcome type                            | 2991 | 1895       | 4886 |

## **Supplementary materials**

# S1 Estimating total heterogeneity variance from the label-invariant model

We used label-invariant hierarchical models to analyse trial data from 117 meta-analyses in *ROBES* simultaneously. The models have been proposed in an earlier paper [9], but we describe the models briefly here to show how to derive the formulae for heterogeneity variance  $\tau_{total,m}^2$  among all trials in a meta-analysis m.

#### S1.1 Univariable model for the influence of accounting for a single trial design characteristic

In a given meta-analysis m, trials are categorised as low risk of bias (L-trials) or high/unclear risk of bias (H-trials) for a specific design characteristic.

The L-trials provide an estimate of the underlying intervention effect  $\theta_{im}^L$ , assumed to have a normal random-effects distribution with mean  $d_m$  and variance  $\tau_m^2$ , specific to meta-analysis m. The H-trials are assumed to estimate an underlying intervention effect  $\theta_{im}^H$ , assumed to be normally distributed with mean  $d_m + b_m$  and variance  $\lambda \tau_m^2$ :

$$\theta_{im}^{L} \sim N(d_{m}, \tau_{m}^{2})$$

$$\theta_{im}^{H} \sim N(d_{m} + b_{m}, \lambda \tau_{m}^{2}).$$

The average bias  $b_m$  in intervention effect in meta-analysis m is assumed to be exchangeable across meta-analyses, with overall mean  $b_0$  and between-meta-analysis variance in mean bias  $\varphi^2$ :

$$b_m \sim N(b_0, \varphi^2)$$
$$b_0 \sim N(B_0, V_0)$$

We set an indicator  $X_{im}$  to be 1 for H trials and 0 for L trials such that

$$X_{im} = \begin{cases} 1 & \pi_m \\ & \text{with probability} \\ 0 & 1 - \pi_m. \end{cases}$$

Each trial is assumed to provide an underlying estimate of intervention effect:

$$\theta_{im} = (1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^L + X_{im}\theta_{im}^H.$$

The first term of the sum will return  $\theta_{im}^L$  if trial i is at low risk of bias. The second term will return  $\theta_{im}^H$  if the trial i is at high/unclear risk of bias.

The total heterogeneity variance among trials in meta-analysis *m* is given by:

$$\begin{split} &\tau_{total,m}^{2} = \text{var}(\theta_{im}) \\ &= \text{var}((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L} + X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H}) \\ &= \text{var}((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L}) + \text{var}(X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H}) + 2 \operatorname{cov}((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L}, X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H}) \\ &= \operatorname{var}((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L}) + \operatorname{var}(X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H}) + 2 \operatorname{cov}((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L}, X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H}) \\ &= E(1 - X_{im})^{2} \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{L}) + E(\theta_{im}^{L})^{2} \operatorname{var}(1 - X_{im}) + \operatorname{var}(1 - X_{im}) \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{L}) \\ &+ E(X_{im})^{2} \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{H}) + E(\theta_{im}^{H})^{2} \operatorname{var}(X_{im}) + \operatorname{var}(X_{im}) \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{H}) \\ &+ 2[E((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L}X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H}) - E((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L}) + \operatorname{var}(1 - X_{im}) \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{H}) \\ &+ E(X_{im})^{2} \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{H}) + E(\theta_{im}^{H})^{2} \operatorname{var}(X_{im}) + \operatorname{var}(X_{im}) \operatorname{var}(\theta_{im}^{H}) \\ &+ 2[E((1 - X_{im})X_{im})E(\theta_{im}^{L}\theta_{im}^{H}) - E((1 - X_{im})\theta_{im}^{L})E(X_{im}\theta_{im}^{H})] \\ &= (1 - \pi_{m})^{2}\tau_{m}^{2} + d_{m}^{2}(1 - \pi_{m})\pi_{m} + (1 - \pi_{m})\pi_{m}\tau_{m}^{2} \\ &+ \pi_{m}^{2}\lambda\tau_{m}^{2} + (d_{m} + b_{m})^{2}\pi_{m}(1 - \pi_{m}) + \pi_{m}(1 - \pi_{m})\lambda\tau_{m}^{2} \\ &- 2(1 - \pi_{m})d_{m}\pi_{m}(d_{m} + b_{m}) \\ &= (1 - \pi_{m})\tau_{m}^{2} + d_{m}^{2}(1 - \pi_{m})\pi_{m} \\ &+ \pi_{m}\lambda\tau_{m}^{2} + (d_{m} + b_{m})^{2}\pi_{m}(1 - \pi_{m}) \\ &- 2(1 - \pi_{m})d_{m}\pi_{m}(d_{m} + b_{m}) \end{split}$$

 $=(1-\pi_m)\tau_m^2+\pi_m\lambda\tau_m^2+\pi_m(1-\pi_m)b_m^2$ 

## S1.2 Multivariable model for the influence of accounting for multiple trial design characteristics

Suppose trials in a meta-analysis m are categorised as low risk of bias (L-trials) or high/unclear risk of bias (H-trials) for each of 2 reported design characteristics. We set the indicator  $X_{ijm}$  to be 1 for trials at high/unclear risk of bias for the j-th reported characteristic (j=1,2), and 0 for trials at low risk of bias for that characteristic such that

$$X_{ijm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \pi_{jm} \\ & \text{with probability} \\ 0 & 1 - \pi_{jm} \end{cases}$$

Each trial is assumed to provide an estimate of underlying intervention effect:

$$\theta_{im} = (1 - X_{1im})(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{im}^L + X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1im}^H + X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{2im}^H + X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H$$

where

$$\begin{split} \theta_{im}^L &\sim N(d_m, \tau_m^2) \\ \theta_{1im}^H &\sim N(d_m + b_{1m}, \lambda_1 \tau_m^2) \\ \theta_{2im}^H &\sim N(d_m + b_{2m}, \lambda_2 \tau_m^2) \\ \theta_{3im}^H &\sim N(d_m + b_{1m} + b_{2m} + b_{3m}, \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \tau_m^2). \end{split}$$

Trials at low risk of bias for both characteristics 1 and 2 provide an estimate of intervention effect  $\theta_{im}^L$ , as in Section S1.1. The intervention effect  $\theta_{lim}^H$  in a trial i at high/unclear risk of bias for characteristic 1 but low risk of bias for characteristic 2 has a normal distribution with mean  $d_m + b_{lm}$  and variance  $\tau_m^2 \lambda_1$ . The intervention effect  $\theta_{2lm}^H$  in a trial i at high/unclear risk of bias for characteristic 2 but low risk of bias for characteristic 1 has a normal distribution with mean  $d_m + b_{2m}$  and variance  $\tau_m^2 \lambda_2$ . The intervention effect  $\theta_{3lm}^H$  in a trial i at high/unclear risk of bias for both characteristics 1 and 2 has a normal distribution with mean  $d_m + b_{lm} + b_{2m} + b_{3m}$  and variance  $\tau_m^2 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3$ .

An estimate of total heterogeneity variance among trials in meta-analysis *m* is given by:

$$\begin{split} &\tau^2_{total,m} = \text{var}(\theta_{im}) \\ &= \text{var}((1 - X_{1im})(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{im}^L + X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1im}^H + X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{2im}^H + X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) \\ &= \text{var}((1 - X_{1im})(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{im}^L) + \text{var}(X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1m}^H) + \text{var}(X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{2im}^L) + \text{var}(X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) \\ &+ 2\text{cov}((1 - X_{1im})(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{im}^L, X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1im}^H) + 2\text{cov}((1 - X_{1im})(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{im}^L, X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{2im}^H) \\ &+ 2\text{cov}((1 - X_{1im})(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{im}^L, X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) + 2\text{cov}(X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1im}^H, X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{2im}^H) \\ &+ 2\text{cov}(X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1im}^H, X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) + 2\text{cov}(X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{1im}^H, X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) \\ &+ 2\text{cov}(X_{1im}(1 - X_{2im})\theta_{1im}^H, X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) + 2\text{cov}(X_{2im}(1 - X_{1im})\theta_{2im}^H, X_{1im}X_{2im}\theta_{3im}^H) \\ &+ (1 - \pi_{1m})(1 - \pi_{2m})\tau_m^2 + ((1 - \pi_{1m})(1 - \pi_{2m}) - (1 - \pi_{1m})^2(1 - \pi_{2m})^2)d_m^2 \\ &+ \pi_{1m}(1 - \pi_{2m})\lambda_1\tau_m^2 + (\pi_{1m}(1 - \pi_{2m}) - \pi_{1m}^2(1 - \pi_{2m})^2)(d_m + b_{1m})^2 \\ &+ \pi_{2m}(1 - \pi_{1m})\lambda_2\tau_m^2 + (\pi_{1m}(1 - \pi_{2m}) - \pi_{1m}^2(1 - \pi_{2m})^2)(d_m + b_{2m})^2 \\ &+ \pi_{1m}\pi_{2m}\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_2\tau_m^2 + (\pi_{1m}\pi_{2m} - \pi_{1m}^2\pi_{2m}^2)(d_m + b_{1m} + b_{2m} + b_{3m})^2 \\ &- 2\pi_{1m}(1 - \pi_{1m})(1 - \pi_{2m})^2d_m(d_m + b_{1m}) \\ &- 2\pi_{2m}(1 - \pi_{2m})(1 - \pi_{1m})^2d_m(d_m + b_{1m}) \\ &- 2\pi_{1m}\pi_{2m}(1 - \pi_{1m})(1 - \pi_{2m})d_m(d_m + b_{1m})(d_m + b_{1m}) \\ &- 2\pi_{1m}(1 - \pi_{2m})\pi_{2m}(1 - \pi_{1m})(d_m + b_{1m})(d_m + b_{2m}) \\ &- 2\pi_{2m}^2(1 - \pi_{2m})\pi_{2m}(d_m + b_{1m})(d_m + b_{1m} + b_{2m} + b_{3m}) \\ &- 2\pi_{2m}^2(1 - \pi_{1m})\pi_{1m}(d_m + b_{2m})(d_m + b_{1m} + b_{2m} + b_{3m}) \\ &- 2\pi_{2m}^2(1 - \pi_{1m})\pi_{1m}(d_m + b_{2m})(d_m + b_{1m} + b_{2m} + b_{3m}). \end{split}$$

In a similar way, we derive estimates of total heterogeneity in a meta-analysis from the multivariable label-invariant models for the influence of accounting for three design characteristics.

# S2 Model comparison

Bayesian hierarchical models were fitted to trial data from all 117 meta-analyses. The various models fitted to the data differed according to the indicators of design characteristics and interactions included as covariates in the model, and according to the inclusion of indicators of outcome type in the regression model for heterogeneity variance  $\tau_m^2$  among trials at low risk of bias. Results to compare model fit are given in Table S1.