**Identification of studies via databases and registers**

**Identification of studies via other methods**

Records identified from\*:

PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, EBSCO, and IEEExplore Databases (n =1922)

Records removed *before screening*:

Duplicate records removed

(n =379)

Records identified from:

Websites (n = 10)

Citation searching (n =5)

etc.

**Identification**

Records screened

(n = 1553)

Records excluded

(n =1317)

Reports sought for retrieval

(n =236)

Reports not retrieved

(n =22)

Reports sought for retrieval

(n =15)

Reports not retrieved

(n =5)

**Screening**

Reports assessed for eligibility

(n =214)

Reports excluded:

Duplicates (n = 53)

Text conversation (n =36 )

Context (n = 35)

No conversation (n=10)

Databases (n=12)

Not using ML or DL (n=3)

Conversation with robot (10)

Non-English text (n=4)

Reports assessed for eligibility

(n =10 )

Reports excluded:

Duplicate (n=2)

Used context (n = 3)

Used text conversation (n = 4)

Databases (n = 1)

Studies included in the review

(n =51)

Reports of included studies in the meta-analysis

(n = 27)

**Included**

\*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

\*\*If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

*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. For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>