

Supplementary Information 1

Quality Assessment (Dunne et al., 2017)

Criteria - quantitative studies	Ambler et al., 1999	Belleau et al., 2001	Brahmbhatt et al., 2020	Can et al., 2009	de Moor et al., 2008	de Paleville et al., 2007	Foley et al., 2010	Garssen et al., 2013	Li et al., 2017	Millstein et al., 2019	Singh et al., 2017	Zaman et al., 2021	Galantino et al., 2012
1. Clearly stated aims	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
2. Participant eligibility and recruitment strategy clearly documented	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
3. Main features of population/design described	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4. Non-responders (and non-participants) described	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	1	1	2	1
5. Presence of a control group	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	0
6. Main limitations identified and acceptable	2	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	1
7. Sample size justified	0	0	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	1
8. No evidence of selective reporting of results	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
9. Statistical methods described	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
10. Statistical methods appropriate	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
11. Measures relevant, validated and described adequately	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
12. Results discussed adequately	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Total score	16	18	21	24	21	14	22	22	17	21	18	24	15

Note. Score Key: Y (Yes) = Score of 2; P (Partial) = Score of 1; N (No) = Score of 0; DK (Don't know) = Score of 0, Scoring: 17-24 = good quality; 9-16 = acceptable quality; 0-8 = low quality