

Unique ID	dubey2007	Study ID		Assessor	Iu
Ref or Label	10.1016/j.juro.2007.08.010	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental	Buccal Mucosa	Comparator	Penile skin flap	Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome	success rate	Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?			N	
	2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			NA	
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			NA	
	2.6. Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			N	
	2.7. If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1. Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			Y	
	3.2. If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	
	3.3. If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			NA	
	3.4. If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1. Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?			N	
	4.2. Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			N	
	4.3. Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			Y	
	4.4. If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			N	
	4.5. If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	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?			Y	
	5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?			N	
	5.3. ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	

Unique ID	hosseini2004	Study ID		Assessor	Iu
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental	Buccal Mucosa	Comparator	Penile skin flap	Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome	success rate	Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			NI	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			NI	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?			N	
	2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			NA	
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			NA	
	2.6. Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			N	
	2.7. If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to	3.1. Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			Y	
	3.2. If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	

missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NI	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	PN	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	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?	Y	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	

Unique ID	Soliman2014	Study ID		Assessor	lu
Ref or Label	10.3109/21681805.2014.888474	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental	Buccal Mucosa	Comparator	Penile skin flap	Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?			N	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			NA	
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			NA	
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			N	
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			NA	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?			N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			Y	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			N	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	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?			Y	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?			N	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	

Unique ID	Tawakol2017	Study ID		Assessor	lu
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental	buccal mucosa dorsal onlay graft	Comparator	ventral onlay local penile skin flap	Source	Journal article(s)

Outcome	Results	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question	Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	PY	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	PY	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	PN	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?	N	
	2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA	
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	NA	
	2.6. Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	N	
	2.7. If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1. Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	
	3.2. If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA	
	3.3. If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA	
	3.4. If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1. Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	
	4.2. Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N	
	4.3. Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Y	
	4.4. If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	N	
	4.5. If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	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?	Y	
	5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N	
	5.3. ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	

Unique ID	Ali2019	Study ID	Assessor	lu
Ref or Label		Aim		
Experimental	Buccal Mucosa Graft	Comparator	Source	
Outcome		Results	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question	Response	Comments	
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y		
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N		
	Risk of bias judgement	Low		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Y		
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y		
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?	N		
	2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	NA		
	2.6. Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	N		
	2.7. If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	N		
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1. Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N		
	3.2. If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	PY		
	3.3. If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA		
	3.4. If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement	Low		

Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Y	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	N	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	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?	Y	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	