

Table S1. Methodology quality assessments by RoB2 of the included studies

Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process		
Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Gesslbauer [2020] 1.1: <u>Y</u> 1.2: <u>PY</u>	<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Karataş [2019] 1.1: <u>N</u> 1.2: <u>N</u> Ke [2016] 1.1: <u>Y</u> 1.2: <u>PY</u> Notarnicola [2015] 1.1: <u>Y</u> 1.2: NI Raissi [2016] 1.1: <u>Y</u> 1.2: <u>PY</u> Ulucaköy [2019] <u>Y</u> 1.2: <u>PY</u> Vahdatpour [2016] 1.1: <u>PY</u> 1.2: NI Wu [2016] 1.1: <u>Y</u> 1.2: <u>PY</u>	<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	Gesslbauer [2020] 1.3: <u>N</u> Karataş [2019] 1.3: <u>N</u> Ke [2016] 1.3: <u>N</u>	<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI

	Notarnicola [2015] 1.3: N Raissi [2016] 1.3: N Ulucaköy [2019]: N Vahdatpour [2016] 1.3: N Wu [2016] 1.3: N	
Risk-of-bias judgement	Gesslbauer [2020] Low Karataş [2019] High Ke [2016] Low Notarnicola [2015] some concerns Raissi [2016] Low Ulucaköy [2019] Low Vahdatpour [2016] Low Wu [2016] Low	Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (<i>effect of assignment to intervention</i>)		
Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Gesslbauer [2020] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y	Y / PY / PN / N / NI

<p>2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?</p>	<p>Karataş [2019] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y Ke [2016] 2.1: PN 2.2: Y Notarnicola [2015] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y Raissi [2016] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y Ulucaköy [2019] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y Vahdatpour [2016] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y Wu [2016] 2.1: NI 2.2: Y</p>	<p>Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI</p>
<p>2.3. If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?</p>	<p>Gesslbauer [2020] 2.3: N Karataş [2019] 2.3: N Ke [2016] 2.3: N Notarnicola [2015] 2.3: N Raissi [2016] 2.3: N Ulucaköy [2019] 2.3: N Vahdatpour [2016] 2.3: N</p>	<p>NA / Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI</p>

	Wu [2016] 2.3: <u>N</u>	
2.4 If <u>Y/PY</u> to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
2.5. If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Gesslbauer [2020] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Karataş [2019] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Ke [2016] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Notarnicola [2015] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Raissi [2016] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Ulucaköy [2019] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Vahdatpour [2016] 2.6: <u>Y</u> Wu [2016] 2.6: <u>Y</u>	<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
2.7 If <u>N/PN/NI</u> 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?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement	Gesslbauer [2020] Low Karataş [2019] Low Ke [2016] Low Notarnicola [2015] Low Raissi [2016] Low Ulucaköy [2019] Low	Low / High / Some concerns

	Vahdatpour [2016] Low Wu [2016] Low	
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Domain 3: Missing outcome data		
Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Gesslbauer [2020] 3.1: <u>Y</u> Karataş [2019] 3.1: <u>PY</u> Ke [2016] 3.1: <u>Y</u> Notarnicola [2015] 3.1: <u>Y</u> Raissi [2016] 3.1: <u>Y</u> Ulucaköy [2019] 3.1: <u>Y</u> Vahdatpour [2016] 3.1: <u>Y</u> Wu [2016] 3.1: <u>Y</u>	<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
3.2 If <u>N/PN/NI</u> to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u>
3.3 If <u>N/PN</u> to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
3.4 If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA / <u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI

Risk-of-bias judgement	Gesslbauer [2020] Low Karataş [2019] Low Ke [2016] Low Notarnicola [2015] Low Raissi [2016] Low Ulucaköy [2019] Low Vahdatpour [2016] Low Wu [2016] Low	Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome		
Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	Gesslbauer [2020] 4.1: N Karataş [2019] 4.1: N Ke [2016] 4.1: N Notarnicola [2015] 4.1: N Raissi [2016] 4.1: N Ulucaköy [2019] 4.1: N Vahdatpour [2016] 4.1: N Wu [2016] 4.1: N	Y / PY / PN / N / NI

4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	Gesslbauer [2020] 4.2: N Karataş [2019] 4.2: N Ke [2016] 4.2: N Notarnicola [2015] 4.2: N Raissi [2016] 4.2: N Ulucaköy [2019] 4.2: N Vahdatpour [2016] 4.2: N Wu [2016] 4.2: N	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Gesslbauer [2020] 4.3: N Karataş [2019] 4.3: NI Ke [2016] 4.3: N Notarnicola [2015] 4.3: NI Raissi [2016] 4.3: N Ulucaköy [2019] 4.3: N	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

	Vahdatpour [2016] 4.3: NI Wu [2016] 4.3: <u>N</u>	
4.4 If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	Karataş [2019] 4.4: PY Notarnicola [2015] 4.4: PY Vahdatpour [2016] 4.4: PY	NA / Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
4.5 If <u>Y/PY/NI</u> to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	Karataş [2019] 4.5: <u>PN</u> Notarnicola [2015] 4.5: <u>PN</u> Vahdatpour [2016] 4.5: <u>PN</u>	NA / Y / PY / <u>PN / N</u> / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement	Gesslbauer [2020] Low Karataş [2019] Some concerns Ke [2016] Low Notarnicola [2015] Some concerns Raissi [2016] Low	Low / High / Some concerns

	Ulucaköy [2019] Low Vahdatpour [2016] Some concerns Wu [2016] Low	
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result		
Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
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?	Gesslbauer [2020] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Karataş [2019] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Ke [2016] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Notarnicola [2015] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Raissi [2016] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Ulucaköy [2019] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Vahdatpour [2016] 5.1: <u>Y</u> Wu [2016] 5.1: <u>Y</u>	<u>Y</u> / <u>PY</u> / <u>PN</u> / <u>N</u> / NI
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...		

<p>5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?</p>	<p>Gesslbauer [2020] 5.2: N</p> <p>Karataş [2019] 5.2: N</p> <p>Ke [2016] 5.2: N</p> <p>Notarnicola [2015] 5.2: N</p> <p>Raissi [2016] 5.2: N</p> <p>Ulucaköy [2019] 5.2: N</p> <p>Vahdatpour [2016] 5.2: N</p> <p>Wu [2016] 5.2: N</p>	<p>Y / PY / PN / N / NI</p>
<p>5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?</p>	<p>Gesslbauer [2020] 5.3: N</p> <p>Karataş [2019] 5.3: N</p> <p>Ke [2016] 5.3: N</p> <p>Notarnicola [2015] 5.3: N</p> <p>Raissi [2016] 5.3: N</p> <p>Ulucaköy [2019] 5.3: N</p> <p>Vahdatpour [2016] 5.3: N</p> <p>Wu [2016] 5.3: N</p>	<p>Y / PY / PN / N / NI</p>

Risk-of-bias judgement	Gesslbauer [2020] Low Karataş [2019] Low Ke [2016] Low Notarnicola [2015] Low Raissi [2016] Low Ulucaköy [2019] Low Vahdatpour [2016] Low Wu [2016] Low	Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Overall risk of bias		
Risk-of-bias judgement	Gesslbauer [2020] Low Karataş [2019] High Ke [2016] Low Notarnicola [2015] Some concerns Raissi [2016] Low Ulucaköy [2019] Low Vahdatpour [2016] Some concerns Wu [2016] Low	Low / High / Some concerns

Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
---	--	--



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).