

Supplementary table 3. (continued)

Reference	AMSTAR 2 checklist																Overall assessment quality
	NO.1	NO.2	NO.3	NO.4	NO.5	NO.6	NO.7	NO.8	NO.9	NO.10	NO.11	NO.12	NO.13	NO.14	NO.15	NO.16	
Armstrong et al, 2012	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Critically low
Mamizadeh et al, 2019	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Low
Qiao et al, 2021	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Xie et al, 2021	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Ungprasert et al, 2018	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Li et al, 2020	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Chen et al, 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Low
Alvarez et al, 2019	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Islam et al, 2019	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Wu et al, 2018	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critically low
Yu et al, 2020	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Critically low
Ungprasert et al, 2018	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Critically low
Zusman et al, 2020	Y	N	Y	pY	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Critically low
Sepehri et al, 2021	Y	N	Y	pY	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Critically low
Chi et al, 2017	Y	N	Y	pY	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Critically low
Hillary et al, 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Low

AMSTAR 2 checklist (items in *italic* are considered critical):

1, PICO description; 2, protocol registered before the commencement of the review; 3, study design included in the review; 4, adequacy of the literature search; 5, two authors study selection; 6, two authors study extraction; 7, list for excluding individual studies; 8, included studies described in detail; 9, risk of bias for the single studies that included in the review; 10, source of funding of primary studies; 11, appropriateness of meta-analytical methods; 12, impact of risk of bias of single studies on the results of the meta-analysis; 13, consideration of risk of bias when interpreting the results of the review; 14 explanation and discussion of the heterogeneity observed; 15, assessment of presence and likely impact of publication bias; 16, funding sources and conflict of interest declared.

Abbreviations: Y, yes; pY, partial yes; N, no.

Footnotes:

High: 0–1 non-critical weakness. The systematic review provides an accurate and comprehensive summary of the results of the available studies that address the question of interest.

Moderate: >1 non-critical weakness. The systematic review has more than one weakness, but no critical flaws. It may provide an accurate summary of the results of the available studies that were included in the review.

Low: 1 critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses. The review has a critical flaw and may not provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies that address the question of interest.

Critically low: >1 critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses. The review has more than one critical flaw and should not be relied on to provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies.

No2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 are the critical items.