Supplemental Table S1. Risk of Bias Assessment Table

Study	Risk of bias	Author judgement
Ahn et al. (2017) [15]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized double blinded placebo controlled, parallel group study
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Stratified block randomization was done.
Blinding of participants & personal (performance bias)	Low risk	Yes, double blinded RCT.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Yes, double blinded RCT.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	219 Patients were randomized, of which data from 216 patients were analysed after 24 weeks follow-up (attrition rate 0.01%).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	The study was funded by LG Life Sciences Ltd. One of the authors is an employee of LG Life science.
Bae et al. (2019) [20]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized, double-blind, multicentre, parallel group, phase 3 trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization done using random sequence generated by a blinded statistician with use of an interactive web response system (IWRS).
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	290 Patients were randomized, of which 267 patients completed the study. Hence attrition rate was 7.93%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All Pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	The sponsor (LG Chem Ltd.) and all authors agreed on the study design. The sponsor was involved in data analysis.
Cho et al. (2020) [16]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Placebo-controlled, randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, phase 3 clinical trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized 2:1, using an interactive web response system
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	290 Patients were randomized out of which 281 patients completed the study. Hence the attrition rate was 3.1%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	Low risk	Nothing significant noted.
Han et al. (2018) [21]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized, multicentre, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization codes were prepared by a statistician.
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	121 Patients from the initially randomized 132 patients completed the 12 week double blind RCT.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	LG Life Sciences funded and coordinated the study. Three out of 17 authors were employees of LG Life Sciences.

(*Continued to the next page*)

Supplemental Table S1. Continued

Study	Risk of bias	Author judgement
Kwak et al. (2020) [11]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	12-Week, phase 4, multicentre, parallel group, randomized, open-labelled study
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization was performed using the interactive web response system (cubeIWRS, CRScube Inc.).
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	High risk	Open labelled study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Open labelled study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	67 Patients from the initially randomized 71 patients completed the study. Hence attrition rate was 5.63%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	One of the authors was an employee of LG Chem Ltd. This study was coordinated and funded by LG Chem Ltd.
Lim et al. (2017) [12]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized, parallel group, double-blind, phase III trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Stratified block randomization
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blind RCT
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	From the initially randomized 433 patients, data from 389 patients completed the 24 week study. Hence the attrition rate was only 10.6%. Any attrition rate of less than 20% was considered to be low.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	The study was funded by LG Life Sciences Ltd. One of the authors was an employee of LG Life Sciences Ltd.
Park et al. (2017) [14]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	RCT; open labelled trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomization method has not been clearly elaborated in the manuscript or the supplementary material.
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	High risk	Open labelled study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Open labelled study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	69 Patients were randomized of which 66 patients completed the study.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	LG Life Sciences coordinated and funded this study.
Rhee et al. (2010) [17]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	RCT; double blinded; parallel group
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomization method has not been clearly elaborated in the manuscript or the supplementary material.
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	From the initially randomized 145 patients, data from 141 patients were analysed at the end of the study. Hence the attrition rate was 2.75%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	This study was supported by LG Life Sciences Ltd. One of the authors was an employee of LG Life Sciences Ltd.

(*Continued to the next page*)

Supplemental Table S1. Continued

Study	Risk of bias	Author judgement
Rhee et al. (2013) [13]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized, active-controlled, parallel group, double-blind, phase III trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Randomization method unclear
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	From the initially randomized 425 patients, 90% completed the study. Hence the attrition rate was 10%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	This study was supported by LG Life Sciences Ltd. One of the authors was from LG Life Sciences Ltd.
Yang et al. (2013) [18]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Double blinded placebo controlled, parallel group trial
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method of randomization not clear
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	From initially randomized 182 patients, data from 167 patients were analysed at the end. Hence the attrition rate was only 8.24%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	The study was funded by LG Life Sciences Ltd. Dr. Mita Nandy and Dr. Deepali Mittal (LG Life Sciences) contributed managing India sites. One of the authors is an employee of LG Life Sciences Ltd.
Yoon et al. (2017) [19]		
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	RCT; double blind
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization codes were generated by a statistician using SAS software version 9.2. Interactive web response system was used for randomization.
Blinding of participants & personel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double blinded study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	From the initially randomized 132 patients, data from 121 patients were analysed at the end of the study. Hence the attrition rate was 8.33%.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes were reported.
Other biases	High risk	LG Life Sciences for coordination and funding of the study. One of the authors is an employee of LG Life Sciences.

RCT, randomized controlled trial.