

<b>Unique ID</b>	1	<b>Study ID</b>	Chen	<b>Assessor</b>
<b>Ref or Label</b>		<b>Aim</b>	adhering to intervention (the 'per-protocol' effect)	<b>The effect of adhering to intervention...</b>
<b>Experimental</b>	Favipiravir	<b>Comparator</b>	Albidol	<b>Source</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Clinical recovery at 7d	<b>Results</b>	70/98 vs 61/111 p*0.02	<b>Weight</b>
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Signalling question</b>			<b>Response</b>
<b>Bias arising from the randomization process</b>	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			<b>Y</b>
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			<b>NI</b>
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			<b>N</b>
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>			<b>Some concerns</b>
<b>Bias due to deviations from intended interventions</b>	2.1 Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			<b>PN</b>
	2.2 Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			<b>PY</b>
	2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?			<b>NA</b>
	2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?			<b>NA</b>
	2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?			<b>PY</b>
	2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?			<b>N</b>
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>			<b>High</b>
<b>Bias due to missing outcome data</b>	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			<b>Y</b>
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			<b>NA</b>
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			<b>NA</b>
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			<b>NA</b>

	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>
<b>Bias in measurement of the outcome</b>	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	<b>N</b>
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	<b>N</b>
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	<b>PN</b>
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	<b>NA</b>
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	<b>NA</b>
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>
<b>Bias in selection of the reported result</b>	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	<b>N</b>
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	<b>N</b>
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	<b>N</b>
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>
<b>Overall bias</b>	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>High</b>

[illegible]

[illegible]