Additional file 1. PRISMA 2020 checklist

Page and line numbers refer to the main manuscript file.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title page, p. 1, lines 1–3
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract, pp. 1–2, lines 15–45
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Background, pp. 2–4, lines 47–86
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Background, p. 4, lines 87–89; Methods, p. 5, lines 111–113
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Eligibility criteria, p. 6, lines 140–149; PICOS, p. 5, lines 105–110; grouping for syntheses, p. 7, lines 170–174
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Data sources, p. 6, lines 130–138; Additional file 2
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Search strategy, pp. 5–6, lines 115–128; p. 6, lines 137–138; Additional file 2
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Study selection, p. 7, lines 151–155
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Data extraction, p. 7, lines 159–167
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Eligibility criteria, p. 6, lines 143–144; Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 175–176
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Data extraction, p. 7, lines 160–167
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Quality and risk of bias assessment, p. 8, lines 191–199
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 181–182

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Meta-analysis, p. 7, lines 170–174
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Meta-analysis, p. 7, lines 170–172 (only trials reporting means and standard deviations were pooled; no data conversions were required)
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 181–184; Table 1 (p. 13, line 285); Fig. 2 (p. 15, line 308)
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 175–189
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 186–188; Study design, p. 5, lines 102–104
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 186–189
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Meta-analysis, p. 8, lines 185–186
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Not performed (GRADE not applied)
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Study identification, p. 9, lines 205–212; Fig. 1 (p. 10, line 214)
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Fig. 1 (p. 10, line 214) (reasons for exclusion at the full-text stage)
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Characteristics of included studies, pp. 11–13, lines 216–277; Additional file 3
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Study quality, pp. 15–16, lines 317–321; p. 16, lines 329–338; Fig. 3 (p. 17, line 339); Additional file 3
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Meta-analysis, p. 13, lines 279–284; Table 1 (p. 13, line 285); Fig. 2 (p. 15, line 308)
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Meta-analysis, p. 13, lines 279–284; pp. 14–15, lines 294–306; p. 16, lines 329–338
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Meta-analysis, pp. 14–15, lines 294–306; Fig. 2 (p. 15, line 308)
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Sensitivity analysis, pp. 17–18, lines 343–354; Table 2 (p. 18, line 356); Fig. 4 (p. 19, line 359)
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Sensitivity analysis, pp. 17–18, lines 343–354; Table 2 (p. 18, line 356)

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Risk of publication bias, p. 16, lines 323–328
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Not performed (GRADE not applied)
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Discussion, pp. 19–22, lines 365–438
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Strengths and limitations, pp. 23–24, lines 461–467
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Strengths and limitations, p. 23, lines 455–461
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Strengths and limitations, p. 23, lines 447–454; Conclusions, p. 24, lines 470–484
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Abstract, p. 2, line 42; Study design, p. 4, lines 95–96 (PROSPERO CRD420261369569)
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Study design, p. 4, lines 95–96 (protocol available in the PROSPERO record CRD420261369569)
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Study design, pp. 4–5, lines 97–104
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Declarations, Funding, p. 26, lines 534–536
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Declarations, Competing interests, p. 26, lines 531–532
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Declarations, Availability of data and materials, p. 26, lines 527–529

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71