

**TABLE 2.** Risk of bias assessment across included studies

<b>Study</b>	<b>1. Random sequence generation and allocation concealment.</b>	<b>2. Blinding of participants, personnel, and outcome assessment.</b>	<b>3. Incomplete outcome data or follow up and intention to treat.</b>	<b>4. Selective outcome reporting and publication bias.</b>	<b>5. Confounding and other bias</b>	<b>Score  RoB within studies</b>
Chambers et al. 2012	High risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	High risk	<b>0/5</b> High risk
Chambers et al. 2017	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	<b>3/5</b> Moderate risk
Nelson et al. 2019	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	High risk	<b>2/5</b> Moderate risk
Victorson et al. 2017	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	High risk	<b>2/5</b> Moderate risk
<b>RoB across studies</b>	<b>Low risk</b>	<b>High risk</b>	<b>Moderate risk</b>	<b>Low risk</b>	<b>High risk</b>	<b>Moderate Quality</b>
RoB across studies with respect to number of recorded high risk: (0-30% = low risk; 30-70% = moderate risk; 70-100% = high risk)						
RoB within studies with respect to numbers of recorded low risk: (5/5 = low risk; 4/5 <sup>a</sup> = low risk; 3/5 <sup>b</sup> = moderate risk; 2/5 <sup>c</sup> = moderate risk; 1/5 = high risk)						

<sup>a</sup> Did not record high/unclear risk in domains 1 and 2.

<sup>b,c</sup> Did not record high/unclear risk in domains 1.