|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section and****Topic** | **Item #** | **Checklist item** | **Location****where item is reported** |
| **TITLE** |  |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | Page 1, lines1-2 |
| **ABSTRACT** |  |
| Abstract | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. | Page 2, lines 27-52 |
| **INTRODUCTION** |  |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | Page 3, lines 58-72 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | Page 3, lines 73-79 |
| **METHODS** |  |
| Eligibility criteria | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | Page 4, lines 90-98 |
| Informationsources | 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. | Page 4, lines 85-89 |
| Search strategy | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | Page 4, lines 85-89 |
| 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. | Page 4, lines 99-106 |
| Data collectionprocess | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they workedindependently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | Page 4,lines 99-106 |
| 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. | Page 5, lines 126-136 |
| 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. | Page 5, lines 126-136 |
| 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. | Page 5-6, lines 143-150 |
| 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. | Page 4-5, lines 112-123 |
| Synthesismethods | 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)). | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| 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. | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| Reporting biasassessment | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | Page 4, lines 107-112 |
| Certaintyassessment | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | Page 4-5, lines 107-123 |
| **RESULTS** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section and****Topic** | **Item #** | **Checklist item** | **Location****where item is reported** |
| 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. | Page 5, lines 116-120 |
| 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | Page 5, lines 116-120; Figure 1 |
| Studycharacteristics | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | Page 5， lines 120-127 |
| Risk of bias instudies | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | Page 5-6, lines 134-141; Figure 3 |
| Results ofindividual 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. | Page 6-7, lines 142-193 |
| Results ofsyntheses | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | Page 6-7, lines 142-193 |
| 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. | Page 7, lines 188-193 |
| 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | Page 7, lines 186-187 |
| 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | Al Page 7, lines 188-193l  |
| Reporting biases | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | Page 5-6, lines 135-141 |
| Certainty ofevidence | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | Page 5-6, lines 135-141； Figure 2 |
| **DISCUSSION** |  |
| Discussion | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | Page 8, lines 204-209 |
| 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | Page 9-10, lines 262-272 |
| 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | Page 9-10, lines 248-260 |
| 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | Page 10, lines 274-289 |
| **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. | Page 2, lines 50 |
| 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | Page 3, lines 81-84 |
| 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | Page 3, lines 81-84 |
| Support | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | Page 13, lines 389-394 |
| Competinginterests | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | Page 13, liens 388 |
| Availability ofdata, code andother 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. | Page 13, lines 396-398 |
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