Roth et al.	2011	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote "randomised," but no further information on how (Pg 554)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: “Identically appearing empty gelatin capsule.” Prepared and randomised by the institution's clinical trials pharmacy (Pg 554).
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Summary abstract stated double blind (Pg 552)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Of 63 participants consented, 47 excluded (Pg 553)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Appeared to report all outcomes
Other bias	Unclear risk	W Vaughn McCall: Speaker's bureaus for Merck and Sepracor, Scientific Advisor for Merck, Sealy and Sepracor, but funding not mentioned. Alicia J Roth and Anthony Liguori: none
Krystal et al.	2011	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Very well described (Pg 1434)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	not mentioned
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	Double-blind (Pg 1434)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	ITT analysis; participant numbers were stable throughout the study
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	
Other bias	High risk	Study funded by pharmaceutical company; no evidence of independence of blinding or analysis
Krystal et al.	2010	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation done by an external person/group, but no details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	26/240 participants did not complete the study (Pg 1555, "study population"). No imputation for ITT analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Some self-report data that were not available at baseline were imputed.
Other bias	High risk	Study funded by a pharmaceutical company and authors salaries were paid by the same company.
Riemann et al.	2002	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given

Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	9/55 participants did not complete the study (first line of results section). ITT based on LOCF
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	
Other bias	Low risk	Independent company analysed the results; study funded by pharmaceutical company
Chalon et al.	2005	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Well described (Pg 359)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	double-dummy techniques
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"One subject discontinued for personal reasons after completing the first period"
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Unclear risk	Missing foundings
Doerr et al.	2010	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"All treatments were provided as matching white capsules by the pharmacy of the Johannes Gutenberg-University of Mainz."
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	Reported double blind, placebo-controlled, randomized, crossove
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Reported double blind, placebo-controlled, randomized, crossove
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	3/14 partecipant excluded, one "because of technical problems" not clear
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	
Other bias	Medium risk	supported by a grant from Lundbeck GmBH, G e r m a ny
Drake et al.	2017	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	All experimental medications were visually identical. Testing to assess for arousability and subsequent fall risk (as impacted by gait and balance) was conducted in all treatment periods by trained research technicians
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	Randomisation
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	double-blind, placebo-controlled, fourway crossover trial

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Medium risk	supported by Pernix Therapeutics
Goerke et al.	2014	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Well described (Pg 978)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Well described (Pg 978)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	subjects, outcome assessors, and data analysts were kept blinded to the allocation.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	SEM instead of SD
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	Not published results but mean differences
Other bias	Low risk	
Hajak et al.	1996	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Reynolds et al.	1991	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	blinding details were not given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	No data on missing partecipants
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Schulz et al.	1996	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Medium risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	Missing records
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Silvestri et al.	2001	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Medium risk	Subject could determine which drug becasue pills were given in their commercial form
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Blinding details were not given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	Missing records
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	Missing records
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Yamadera et al.	1998	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	High risk	Single blind (partecipants)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	Missing records
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Saletu et al.	1991	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	baseline considered as placebo
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Vasar et al.	1994	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Medium risk	partecipants are all from medical personnel
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Sharpley et al.	1996	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	no data on rem sleep
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	no data on rem sleep
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Barbanoj et al.	2005	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	
Other bias	Low risk	
Wilson et al.	2015	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Unclear risk	Lundbeck funding
Aslan et al.	2002	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	reported change from baseline
Other bias	Medium risk	Organon fund

Wilson et al.	2002	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	recruited from our volunteer panel
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Medium risk	financial support from Eli Lilly

Hajak et al.	2001	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	7 partecipants didn't complete the study
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV

Hohagen et al.	1994	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	High risk	Single blind (partecipants)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Single blind (partecipants)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	4 patients did not complete the whole study protocol
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III

Nowell et al.	1999	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	High risk	No details given

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	High risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Paterson et al.	2009	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	only SS results
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	only SS results
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Roth et al.	2011	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	All pills were prepared and randomized by the institutionÕs clinical trials pharmacy.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Reported double blind, but no further details
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	63 individuals who gave informed consent to participate, 47 did not complete the entire study
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Wiegand et al.	2004	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	No randomization reported
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	High risk	No blinding reported
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	No blinding reported
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	11 dropped out before the end of the treatment period;
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Ivgy-May et al.	2015	

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	Data from one of the sites (n = 15) were not included in the efficacy analysis due to concerns about the eligibility of patients;
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	No data on NREM sleep
Other bias	High risk	current or former employees of Merck, This study was funded by Organon
Roth et al.	1982	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	Double blbind for effects on sleep, single blind for the effect of antidepressant
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	No full data
Other bias	High risk	DSM III
Scharf and Sachais	1990	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	High risk	single blind
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III
Hendrickse et al.	1994	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	very small sample
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III

Gillin et al.	1997	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	described pg 186
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	8 early discontinuation
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III
Winokur et al.	2000	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	small sample
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV, organon fund
Wolf et al.	2001	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	No adjustments of type-I error probability were applied to the test results
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III, Lilly Deutschland fund
Argyropoulos et al.	2003	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote "randomised," but no further information on how
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	Quote "double-blind," but no further information on how
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	

Other bias	High risk	DSM IV, Bristol-Myers Squibb Pharmaceuticals UK provided funding and medication for this study
Winokur et al.	2003	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote "randomly," but no further information on how (pg 1225)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	well described drop off
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Kluge et al.	2007	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	prospective, observational study
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	High risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	prospective, observational study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Göder et al.	2011	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote "randomly assigned" but no further information on how (pg 546)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	4 drop out
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Trivedi et al.	1999	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	3 of whom were subsequently excluded because of missing/incomplete baseline data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III
Hao et al.	2019	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV, Abbott Pharma fund
Armitage et al.	1994	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Medium risk	Bristol-Myers Squibb Pharmaceuticals UK provided funding and medication for this study
Quera Salva et al.	2007	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	data were analysed by the Institut des Recherches International Servier.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Low risk	
Dorsey et al	1996	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III

Jindal et al.	2003	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	Some data on psg missing
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV

Zhang et al.	2018	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"patients and volunteers were selected randomly"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"Patients with depression were randomly divided into two groups."
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Low risk	

Monti et al.	1990	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III

Ott et al.	2002	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given

Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	in a randomized, double-blind, cross-over fashion.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	Sleep records were coded and scored “blindly” according to standard criteria
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV, Glaxo Wellcome Company
Schramm et al.	2014	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"The study had a randomized, double–blind, crossover design"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"The study had a randomized, double–blind, crossover design"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	"The study had a randomized, double–blind, crossover design"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	"The study had a randomized, double–blind, crossover design"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV,
Sonntag et al.	1996	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	All patients received four capsules of identical appearance per day
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM III, supported by a grant from Rhone-Poulenc Rorer Pharma Company
Quera-Salva et al.	2011	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No details given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	No raw data, but diffrence from baseline
Other bias	High risk	funded by Servier
Monti et al.	1989	

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Unclear risk	No details given
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	The sleep records were coded and scored blind.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	Missing data
Other bias	High risk	DSM III
Mi et al.	2020	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Medium risk	The drug was not blind to the researcher and the patient, and it was blind to the PSG reviewers and the MRI analyst
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	The drug was not blind to the researcher and the patient, and it was blind to the PSG reviewers and the MRI analyst
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	drop out not clearly motivated
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	High risk	DSM IV
Kupfer et al.	1994	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Blinding details were not given
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	reported data from responders only
Other bias	High risk	DSM III
van Bemmel et al.	1993	
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomisation details were not given
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All out	Medium risk	The administration of the placebo and citalopram was single-blin
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Medium risk	single blind
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Medium risk	No data on REM sleep

Other bias	High risk	DSM III, Lundbeck fund