#### Cover page

Journal: Clinical Drug Investigation

Title: Effects of cannabidiol on appetite and body weight: a systematic review

Authors: Joaquim S. Pinto<sup>1</sup>, Fátima Martel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal
<sup>2</sup>Department of Biomedicine – Unit of Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

## Supplementary Table 1 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Aran et al. (2021) [19]

Ref or Label		assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Domain	Signalling question		Response	
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence rand	dom?	Y	
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation sequence con to interventions?	cealed until participants were enrolled and assigned	Y	
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		N	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low	
	S.1 Was the number of participants a nearly equal?	allocated to each of the two sequences equal or	Y	
Domain S: Risk of bias arising	S.2 If N/PN/NI to S.1: Were period	effects accounted for in the analysis?	NA	
from period and carryover effects	S.3 Was there sufficient time for any outcome assessment in the second p	v carryover effects to have disappeared before eriod?	Y	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		N	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?			
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			
		tential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the group to which they were randomized?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome avail	able for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that value?	t missingness in the outcome depended on its true	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring th	e outcome inappropriate?	N	

	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	Ν
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Ν
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	Y
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Ν
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	5.4 Is a result based on data from both periods sought, but unavailable on the basis of carryover having been identified?	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low

## Supplementary Table 2 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Crippa et al. (2021) [20]

Ref or Label	Crippa et al. (2021) [20]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
	1.1 Was the allocation seq	uence rand	om?	Y
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation seq interventions?	uence conc	cealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to	Y
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline difference randomization process?	es between	intervention groups suggest a problem with the	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	2.1.Were participants awa	re of their a	assigned intervention during the trial?	Ν
	2.2.Were carers and peopl intervention during the tria		g the interventions aware of participants' assigned	Ν
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2 because of the experiment		nere deviations from the intended intervention that arose	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were t	hese deviat	ions likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			NA
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this out	come availa	able for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Ν
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			Ν
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		Ν	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it	t likely that	missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	4.1 Was the method of me	asuring the	e outcome inappropriate?	PN
	4.2 Could measurement or groups?	ascertainn	nent of the outcome have differed between intervention	N
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.3 Were outcome assesso	rs aware of	f the intervention received by study participants?	Ν
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is in knowledge of intervention		assessment of the outcome was influenced by	NA

	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	Y
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low

#### Supplementary Table 3 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of de Bruijn et al. (2017) [23]

Ref or Label	de Bruijn et al. (2017)Aimassignment to intervention (the 'intention-to- treat' effect)			
Domain	Signalling question	Response		
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y		
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y		
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	NI		
	Risk of bias judgement			
	S.1 Was the number of participants allocated to each of the two sequences equal or nearly equal?	Y		
Domain S: Risk of bias arising	S.2 If N/PN/NI to S.1: Were period effects accounted for in the analysis?	NA		
from period and carryover effects	S.3 Was there sufficient time for any carryover effects to have disappeared before outcome assessment in the second period?	РҮ		
	Risk of bias judgement	Low		
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Ν		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Ν		
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?			
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			
	Risk of bias judgement	Low		
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N		
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	Ν		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			
	Risk of bias judgement	Low		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	Ν		

Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns
	5.4 Is a result based on data from both periods sought, but unavailable on the basis of carryover having been identified?	NI
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Ν
	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre- specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	NI
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Ν
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N

## Supplementary Table 4 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Devinsky et al. (2017) [14]

Ref or Label	Devinsky et al. (2017) [14]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
	1.1 Was the allocation sequ	ience rando	om?	Y
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation sequ to interventions?	ience conce	ealed until participants were enrolled and assigned	Y
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences randomization process?	s between i	intervention groups suggest a problem with the	N
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	2.1.Were participants aware	e of their a	ssigned intervention during the trial?	Ν
	2.2.Were carers and people intervention during the trial		the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.1 arose because of the experimental experi		ere deviations from the intended intervention that text?	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were th	ese deviati	ons likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Wer between groups?	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			Y
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was failure to analyse participan	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this outco	ome availal	ble for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is the data?	here evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome		N
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could m	uld missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		РҮ
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it value?	likely that	missingness in the outcome depended on its true	PN
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns
	4.1 Was the method of mea	suring the	outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or a intervention groups?	ascertainm	ent of the outcome have differed between	N
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.3 Were outcome assessors	s aware of	the intervention received by study participants?	PN
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Coul knowledge of intervention		ent of the outcome have been influenced by	NA
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it knowledge of intervention it		assessment of the outcome was influenced by	NA

	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	РҮ
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	PN
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns

# Supplementary Table 5 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Devinsky et al. (2018) [17]

Ref or Label	Devinsky et al. (2018) [17]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
	1.1 Was the allocation sequ	ence rando	pm?	Y
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation sequence to interventions?	ence conce	caled until participants were enrolled and assigned	РҮ
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences randomization process?	between	ntervention groups suggest a problem with the	N
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	2.1.Were participants aware	e of their a	ssigned intervention during the trial?	N
	2.2.Were carers and people intervention during the trial		the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2 arose because of the experim		ere deviations from the intended intervention that text?	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were the	ese deviati	ons likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were between groups?	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate anal	Y		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was failure to analyse participan	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this outco	ome availal	ble for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is the data?	If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome a?		N
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could m	issingness	in the outcome depend on its true value?	Y
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it I value?	ikely that	missingness in the outcome depended on its true	PN
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns
	4.1 Was the method of meas	suring the	outcome inappropriate?	Ν
	4.2 Could measurement or a intervention groups?	ascertainm	ent of the outcome have differed between	N
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.3 Were outcome assessors	aware of	the intervention received by study participants?	N
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could knowledge of intervention r	NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it I knowledge of intervention r		assessment of the outcome was influenced by	NA

	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	Y
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns

Supplementary Table 6 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Devinsky et al. (2018) [15]

Ref or Label	Devinsky et al. (2018) [15]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
	1.1 Was the allocation sequ	ence rando	om?	Y
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation sequ to interventions?	ence conce	ealed until participants were enrolled and assigned	РҮ
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences randomization process?	s between :	intervention groups suggest a problem with the	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	2.1.Were participants award	e of their a	ssigned intervention during the trial?	PN
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PN	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2. arose because of the experim		ere deviations from the intended intervention that text?	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were th	ese deviati	ons likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			NA
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?			
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this outco	ome availa	ble for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	РҮ
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is the data?	ere eviden	ee that result was not biased by missing outcome	NA
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could n	nissingness	in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it value?	likely that	missingness in the outcome depended on its true	NA
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	4.1 Was the method of mea	suring the	outcome inappropriate?	Ν
	4.2 Could measurement or a intervention groups?	ascertainm	ent of the outcome have differed between	Ν
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.3 Were outcome assessor	s aware of	the intervention received by study participants?	PN
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Coul knowledge of intervention		ent of the outcome have been influenced by	NA
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it knowledge of intervention		assessment of the outcome was influenced by	NA

	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	NI
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Ν
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns

### Supplementary Table 7 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Hundal et al. (2018) [22]

Ref or Label	Hundal et al. (2018) [22]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Domain	Signalling question			Response	
Bias arising from the	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?				
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?				
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	2.1.Were participants awar	e of their a	ssigned intervention during the trial?	N	
	2.2.Were carers and people intervention during the tria		g the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2 because of the experimenta		ere deviations from the intended intervention that arose	NA	
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were the	nese deviat	ions likely to have affected the outcome?	NA	
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?				
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?				
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?				
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			РҮ	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?				
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?				
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?				
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?				
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?				
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?				
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?				

	Risk of bias judgement	
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low

### Supplementary Table 8 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Jadoon et al. (2016) [13]

Ref or Label	Jadoon et al. (2016) [13]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)			
Domain	Signalling question			Response		
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?					
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?					
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?					
	Risk of bias judgement			Low		
	2.1.Were participants awar	e of their a	assigned intervention during the trial?	N		
	2.2.Were carers and people intervention during the tria		g the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N		
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2 because of the experimentation		nere deviations from the intended intervention that arose	NA		
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were the	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?				
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?					
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?					
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?					
	Risk of bias judgement			Low		
	3.1 Were data for this outc	ome availa	ble for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y		
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?					
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?					
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?					
	Risk of bias judgement			Low		
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?					
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?					
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?					
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?					
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?					

	Risk of bias judgement	
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Low

## Supplementary Table 9 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Miller et al. (2020) [16]

Ref or Label	Miller et al. (2020) [16]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y
Bias arising from the	1.2 Was the allocation set to interventions?	Y		
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differen randomization process?	ices betwee	en intervention groups suggest a problem with the	N
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	2.1.Were participants aw	vare of thei	r assigned intervention during the trial?	N
	2.2.Were carers and peop intervention during the th		ing the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or arose because of the exp		there deviations from the intended intervention that context?	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were	NA		
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: W between groups?	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate a intervention?	Y		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: W failure to analyse particip	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			N
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is data?	N		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could	РҮ		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is value?	PN		
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns		
	4.1 Was the method of m	PN		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.2 Could measurement intervention groups?	N		
	4.3 Were outcome assess	N		
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Co knowledge of intervention	NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is knowledge of intervention	NA		

	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Ν
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns

#### Supplementary Table 10 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Taylor et al. (2020) [21]

Ref or Label	Taylor et al. (2020) [21]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
Bias arising from the	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y
	1.2 Was the allocation set to interventions?	Y		
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differen randomization process?	PN		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	2.1.Were participants aw	are of their	r assigned intervention during the trial?	N
	2.2.Were carers and peop intervention during the tr		ng the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or arose because of the expe		there deviations from the intended intervention that ontext?	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were	NA		
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: W between groups?	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate a intervention?	РҮ		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: W failure to analyse particip	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			N
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is data?	N		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could	Y		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is value?	PN		
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns		
	4.1 Was the method of m	N		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.2 Could measurement of intervention groups?	N		
	4.3 Were outcome assess	NI		
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Co knowledge of intervention	Y		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is knowledge of intervention	PN		

	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Ν
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns

### Supplementary Table 11 - Summary table of risk of bias assessment using Cochrane's RoB2 tool of Thiele et al. (2018) [18]

Ref or Label	Thiele et al. (2018) [18]	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)	
Domain	Signalling question			Response
Bias arising from the	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y
	1.2 Was the allocation so to interventions?	Y		
randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differer randomization process?	N		
	Risk of bias judgement	;		Low
	2.1.Were participants aw	vare of thei	r assigned intervention during the trial?	N
	2.2.Were carers and peo intervention during the t		ing the interventions aware of participants' assigned	N
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 of arose because of the exp		there deviations from the intended intervention that context?	NA
Bias due to deviations from	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were	NA		
intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Wetween groups?	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate a intervention?	Y		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: W failure to analyse partici	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low
	3.1 Were data for this ou	N		
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is data?	N		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Coul	Y		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is value?	PN		
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of n	N		
	4.2 Could measurement intervention groups?	N		
	4.3 Were outcome assess	N		
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: C knowledge of intervention	NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is knowledge of intervention	NA		

	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Ν
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	Low
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns