**Table 2. Risk of bias assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Random sequence generation (selection****bias)** | **Allocation concealment (selection bias)** | **Blinding of participants and personnel****(performance bias)****All outcomes** | **Blinding of outcome assessment (detection****bias)****All outcomes** | **Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)****All outcomes** | **Selective reporting (reporting bias)** | **Other bias** | **Note** |
| Chopra 2014 (44) | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear  | Low | Low | High |  |
| De Lamballerie2008 (41) | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear | Unclear |  |
| Ahmed 2012 (45) | Low | Unclear  | High | High | Low | High | Bias in the presentation of the data.  | After formation of the groups the white capsule group was givenchloroquine and the red capsule group was given paracetamol |
| Ravindran 2011 (43) | Unclear | Unclear | High | High | Unclear | Unclear | Low | Only the abstract was available. Drug doses not reported. |
| Padmakumar 2009 (42) | Unclear | Unclear | High | High | Low | High | High |  |