

Online supplementary file 5. Assessment of risk of bias in the analysed trials using the Cochrane risk-of-bias assessment tool

Trial	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Jones et al., 2003 (22)	Low ^a	Low ^a	High	Low	High	Unclear ^a	Unclear ^b
Cuthbertson et al., 2009 (23)	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Unclear ^b
Elliott et al., 2011 (24)	Low	Low	High	Low	High	High	Unclear ^c
Salisbury et al., 2010 (25)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Unclear	High ^d
Batterham et al., 2014 (26)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Unclear ^e
Connolly et al., 2015 (11)	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	Unclear ^e
Walsh et al., 2015 (12)	Low	Low	High	Low	High	High	High ^d
McWilliams et al., 2016 (13)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Unclear ^e
Shelly et al., 2017 (27)	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear ^e
McDowell et al., 2017 (15)	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High ^f

^aUnpublished data (reply from the authors: the randomization was undertaken the old-fashioned way, with 6 slips of paper, 3 marked interventions and 3 controls, put in 6 sequentially numbered opaque envelopes and sealed and shuffled to mix them, but protocol was not published)

^bDose of physical rehabilitation was unknown

^cAdherence to the intervention was unknown

^dIntervention included nutritional therapy

^eVery little detail given regarding the therapy received in the control group

^fAdherence to the intervention was 70%