

| Study | Randomisation process | Deviations from the intended interventions | Missing outcome data | Measurement of the outcome | Selection of the reported result | Overall |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| Kant et al. 2008 | + | ! | - | + | - | - |
| Lexis et al. 2011 | ! | + | + | - | + | - |
| Garnter et al. 2013 | + | ! | ! | + | + | ! |
| Boiler et al. 2014 | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Wang et al. 2007 | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Farzanfar et al. 2011 | + | ! | - | + | - | - |
| Addley et al. 2014 | ! | + | - | ! | + | - |
| van Holland et al. 2017 | - | - | - | ! | + | - |
| Steel et al. 2022 | ! | - | ! | + | ! | - |

+ Low risk
! Some concerns
- High risk

Figure 1. Summary risk of bias judgements in each domain, and overall, for each study. Note. Farzanfar et al. (2012) and Addley et al. (2014) assess risk of bias pertaining to per-protocol effect. All other studies focus on intention to treat data.