**Table B**

*Risk of Bias Assessment (N = 8 studies)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | Bias from randomisation | Bias arising from intended interventions | Bias arising from missing data | Bias arising from measurement of outcome | Bias arising from the selection of results reported | Overallbias rating |
| Andersson et al. (2015)1  | Low | Some | Low | Low | Some | Some |
| Kyrios et al. (2018) | Low | Low | High | Low | Some | High |
| Nakatani et al. (2005) | Some | Some | High | Low | Some | High |
| Neziroglu et al. (2001) | NA | NA | Low | High | Some | High |
| Seol et al. (2016)  | NA | NA | High | High | Some | High |
| Tjelle et al. (2021) | NA | NA | Low | Low | Some | Some |
| Wheaton et al. (2018)2 | Low | Low | High | Low | Some | Some |
| Wheaton et al. (2021)3 | NA | NA | Low | Low | Some | Some |

*Note*. NA is reported for domains where studies cannot be rated as they are open trial.

1 Data analyzed by this study were combined data from Andersson et al. (2014) and Andersson et al. (2012).

2 Data analyzed by this study was a secondary analysis of data from Simpson et al. (2013).

3 Data analyzed by this study was a secondary analysis of data from Patel et al. (2018).