**Supplementary Table 1 Scores assessing the methodological quality**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Eligibility criteriaspecified | Arndt J2012 | Cuff2012 | Kim2012 | Lee2012 | Keener2014 | Sheps2015 | Mazzocca2017 | Huang2015 | Guo2019 |
| Random allocation | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| ConcealedAllocation | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Groups similar atBaseline | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Subject blinding | N | N | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | N |
| Therapist blinding | N | N | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | N |
| Assessor blinding | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Less than %15Dropouts | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Intention to treatAnalysis | Y | N | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N |
| Between-groupstatisticalcomparisons | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Point measures andvariability data | N | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Total PEDro score | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 |