Cover page

Journal: Clinical Drug Investigation

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

Authors: Joaquim S. Pinto[1], Fátima Martel[2]

[1]Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

[2]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	Aran et al. (2021) [19]	**Aim**	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)

Domain	**Signalling question**	**Response**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Domain S: Risk of bias arising from period and carryover effects	S.1 Was the number of participants allocated to each of the two sequences equal or nearly equal?	Y
	S.2 If N/PN/NI to S.1: Were period effects accounted for in the analysis?	NA
	S.3 Was there sufficient time for any carryover effects to have disappeared before outcome assessment in the second period?	Y
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	PY
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	N
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N

	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N
	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**
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?	N
	5.4 Is a result based on data from both periods sought, but unavailable on the basis of carryover having been identified?	N
	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**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?			N
	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?			NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			NA
	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?			PY
	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?			NA
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?			N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			N
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			NA
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?			PN
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			N
	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**
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?	N
	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) [23]	**Aim**	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)

Domain	**Signalling question**	**Response**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	NI
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Domain S: Risk of bias arising from period and carryover effects	S.1 Was the number of participants allocated to each of the two sequences equal or nearly equal?	Y
	S.2 If N/PN/NI to S.1: Were period effects accounted for in the analysis?	NA
	S.3 Was there sufficient time for any carryover effects to have disappeared before outcome assessment in the second period?	PY
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	PY
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	N
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N

	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N
	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**
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?	N
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	N
	5.4 Is a result based on data from both periods sought, but unavailable on the basis of carryover having been identified?	NI
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**
Overall bias	**Risk of bias judgement**	**Some concerns**

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**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	Y
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	PY
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PN
	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**
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?	PY
	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**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	PY
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	Y
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	Y
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N
	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**
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?	N
	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**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	PY
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned 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 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	PY
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	PY
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PN
	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**
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?	N
	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 randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	Y
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	PY
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PN
	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**
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?	N
	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**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?			N
	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?			NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			NA
	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?			Y
	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?			NA
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available 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?			NA
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			NA
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			NA
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?			N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			N
	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**
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?	PY
	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?	N
	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**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	Y
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	PY
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	PN
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N
	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**
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?	PY
	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?	N
	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 randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	PY
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	Y
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	NI
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	Y
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	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?	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?	N
	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 randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	N
	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?	NA
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
	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?	Y
	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?	NA
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	N
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	Y
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N
	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**
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?	PY
	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?	PN
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**
Overall bias	**Risk of bias judgement**	**Some concerns**