

Unique ID	V1	Study ID	Agostini et al, 2006	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		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?		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?		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?		PY		
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		PY		
	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?		PN		
	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		Some concerns		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		

Unique ID	V2	Study ID	Allam et al, 2015	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		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?		PN		
	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		
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		Y		

Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	PN	
	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	

Unique ID	V3	Study ID	Baekelandt et al, 2019	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		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		

Unique ID	V4	Study ID	Balakrishnan et al, 2016	Assessor	
-----------	----	----------	--------------------------	----------	--

Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			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?			PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			PN	
	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?			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?			PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			PN	
	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?			Y	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Low	

Unique ID	V5	Study ID	benassi et al, 2002	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			PY	
	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?			PY	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			PN	
	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			Some concerns	
Bias due to	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	

Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	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	

Unique ID	V6	Study ID	Candiani et al, 2009	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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?			PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			PY	
	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	

Unique ID	V7	Study ID	Chakraborty et al, 2011	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		

Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			PY	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			Y	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			N	
	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			Some concerns	
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?			Y	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			N	
	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	

Unique ID	V8	Study ID	Chen et al, 2011	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			Y	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			Y	
	2.5. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?			Y	
	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			Some concerns	
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?	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	

Unique ID	V9	Study ID	Chrysostomou et al, 2021	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		N		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		Y		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		Y		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		N		
	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?		N		
	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?		N		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
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?		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		High		

Unique ID	V10	Study ID	Chung et al, 2015	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	

Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		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		

Unique ID	V11	Study ID	Darai et al, 2001	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		Y		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		N		
	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		Some concerns		
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?	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	

Unique ID	V12	Study ID	Deimling et al, 2016	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		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?		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?		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		

Unique ID	V13	Study ID	Drahonovsky et al, 2010	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1

Domain	Signalling question	Response	Comments
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?	Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	
	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?	N	
	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?	Y	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	N	
	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	

Unique ID	V14	Study ID	Eggemann et al, 2018	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response	Comments	
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?	NI	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	N	
	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	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	

Unique ID	V15	Study ID	Ekanayake et al, 2021	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		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?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
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?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	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		High		

Unique ID	V16	Study ID	Falcone et al, 1999	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments

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?	PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	NI	
	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?	PN	
	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	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	

Unique ID	V17	Study ID	Ferrari et al, 1999	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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		
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		N		

Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	NI	
	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	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	

Unique ID	V18	Study ID	Garry et al, 2004	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		Y		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NI		
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		Y		
	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		Some concerns		
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?		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		

Unique ID	V19	Study ID	Garry et al, 2004	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y		

Bias arising from the randomization process	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?	PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	PY	
	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?	PN	
	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?	PN	
	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?	PN	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
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?	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	

Unique ID	V29	Study ID	Ghezzi et al, 2010	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		NI		
	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?		N		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
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		
	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?		PN		

Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	

Unique ID	V30	Study ID	Hendawy et al, 2019	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		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?		NI		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	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		Some concerns		
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?		NI		
	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?		PN		
	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		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		

Unique ID	V20	Study ID	Hwang et al, 2002	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y		
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		PY		

the randomization process	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?	Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	
	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?	N	
	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?	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	

Unique ID	V21	Study ID	Jung et al, 2011	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		PY		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	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?		PY		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		PN		
	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?		PN		
	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?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
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	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?		PN		
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		PN		

Measurement of the outcome	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	

Unique ID	V22	Study ID	Kim et al, 2015	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		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		

Unique ID	V23	Study ID	Kluivers et al, 2006	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?	PY	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	PY	
	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?	PY	
	2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	PN	
	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?	PN	
	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?	PN	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
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?	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	

Unique ID	V24	Study ID	Kongwattanakul et al, 2011	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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?			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	

Unique ID	V25	Study ID	Langebrekke et al, 1996	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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?			PN	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
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?			PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	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			Some concerns	

Unique ID	V27	Study ID	Long et al, 2002	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			PY	
	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?			PY	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	

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?	NI	
	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?	PN	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
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?	PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	PN	
	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	

Unique ID	V28	Study ID	Lönnfors et al, 2015	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		PY		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	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?		N		
	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?	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	

Unique ID	V31	Study ID	Mara et al, 1999	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		PN		
	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		

Unique ID	V32	Study ID	Martinez-martinez et al, 2014	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		PY		
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		PN		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		

Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	PY	
	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?	PY	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	PN	
	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	Some concerns	
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?	PN	
	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	High	

Unique ID	V33	Study ID	Miskry et al, 2003	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?	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	

Unique ID	V34	Study ID	Mohammed et al, 2017	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		PY		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	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?		PN		
	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?		NI		
	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?		PY		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
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?		Y		
	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		High		

Unique ID	V35	Study ID	Muzil et al, 2007	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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		
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		

Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	PN	
	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?	Y	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	N	
	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	

Unique ID	V36	Study ID	Nanavati et al, 2016	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		NI		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
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?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	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?		PN		
	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		

Bias in selection of the reported result	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	High	

Unique ID	V37	Study ID	Olsson et al, 1996	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		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		

Unique ID	V38	Study ID	ottosen et al, 2000	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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		
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		

Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.4 If Y/IPY 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?	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	

Unique ID	V39	Study ID	panda et al, 2015	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		NI		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	2.4 If Y/IPY 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?		NI		
	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?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
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?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		NI		
	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?		PN		
	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		Some concerns		
Bias in selection of	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		

the reported result	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	High	

Unique ID	V40	Study ID	Paraíso et al, 2013	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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?			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	

Unique ID	V41	Study ID	Park et al, 2021	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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	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	

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?	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?	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?	PN	
	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?	PN	
	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	

Unique ID	V42	Study ID	Parveen et al, 2013	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		N		
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		N		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		N		
	Risk of bias judgement		High		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		N		
	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?		N		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
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?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		NI		
	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?		PN		
	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		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	High	

Unique ID	V43	Study ID	Perino et al, 1999	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		NI		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	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?		PN		
	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?		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?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	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?		NI		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		

Unique ID	V44	Study ID	Person et al, 2006	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?	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?	NI	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	NI	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	

Unique ID	V45	Study ID	Raju et al, 1994	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		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	
--------------	------------------------	-----	--

Unique ID	V46	Study ID	Ribeiro et al, 2003	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			NI	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			NI	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	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?			N	
	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?			PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			PN	
	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	

Unique ID	V47	Study ID	Richardson et al, 1995	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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	

Unique ID	V48	Study ID	Roy et al, 2011	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			NI	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			NI	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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?			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	

Unique ID	V49	Study ID	Roy et al, 2012	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		NI		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		Y		
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		NI		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		

Unique ID	V50	Study ID	Sarlos et al, 2012	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?	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	

Unique ID	V51	Study ID	schutz et al, 2002	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?		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		

Unique ID	V52	Study ID	Serracchioli et al, 2002	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response	Comments	
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?		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		

Unique ID	V53	Study ID	Sesti et al, 2008	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response	Comments	
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?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?	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?	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	

Unique ID	V54	Study ID	Sesti et al, 2008b	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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?		PN		
	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		

Unique ID	V55	Study ID	Sesti et al, 2014	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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		
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?		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?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	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		

Unique ID	V56	Study ID	Song et al, 2013	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
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		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	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?		N		
	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		
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		Y		

Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	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	

Unique ID	V57	Study ID	Summit et al, 1992	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			PY	
	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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			PY	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			N	
	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?			PN	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			NI	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			PN	
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			NI	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			N	
	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?			PN	
	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			Some concerns	

Unique ID	V58	Study ID	Summit et al, 1998	Assessor	
-----------	-----	----------	--------------------	----------	--

Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			Y	
	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?			N	
	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?			NI	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?			NI	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?			NI	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	

Unique ID	V59	Study ID	Yuen et al, 1998	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	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?			N	
	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?			NI	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to	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	

Bias due to missing outcome data	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?	PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	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	Some concerns	

Unique ID	V60	Study ID	Zhu et al, 2009	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			NI	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			NI	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			NI	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	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?			PN	
	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?			NI	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
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?			PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	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?			NI	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?			NI	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	

Unique ID	V61	Study ID	Tsai et al, 2003	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		

Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	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?			PN	
	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?			NI	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
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?			PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			PN	
	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?			PN	
	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	

Unique ID	V62	Study ID	Tormena et al, 2017	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
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?			NI	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			NI	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			NI	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			NI	
	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?			PN	
	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?			NI	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
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?	NI	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	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?	PN	
	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	

Unique ID	V63	Study ID	Wakhloo et al, 2015	Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			N	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			N	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			High	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			NI	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?			NI	
	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?			NI	
	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?			NI	
	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?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
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?			NI	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			NI	
	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			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?			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			High	