

Table S1. Methodological quality assessment

RCTs (n = 29)	Internal validity			Descriptives			Statistics			H H H M M L H L	
	Eligibility criteria specified	Method of randomization described	Treatment allocation concealed	Interventions described	Outcome measurements blinded	Withdrawal or dropout described	Sample size description	Intention to treat analysis**	Point estimate and variability	Statistical comparison treatment effects	
Fossat et al. (20), 2018	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Peng et al. (21), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Schuster-Amft et al. (22), 2018	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Tanaka et al. (23), 2018	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Fotakopoulos & Kotila (24), 2018	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Kim et al. (25), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Charusius et al. (26), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Erbil et al. (27), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Cha et al. (28), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Klomjai et al. (29), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Martens et al. (30), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Zintchouk et al. (31), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Hsieh et al. (32), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Chen et al. (33), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Manji et al. (34), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Wu et al. (35), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Cho et al. (36), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Sunamura et al. (37), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Munari et al. (43), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Maciaszek (44), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Lewthwaite et al. (45), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Picelli et al. (46), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Bergmann et al. (47), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Nazlighi et al. (38), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Farias-Godoy et al. (39), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Jansen et al. (40), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Horton et al. (41), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Cannell et al. (42), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Blitz et al. (48), 2018	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

*A total of 10 points of methodological quality assessment for each study, 9–10, 6–8 and 5 or below are considered as high, moderate and low quality accordingly.

**Both modified intention to treat analysis (ITT) and no description on ITT are rated as no