			Standardised Mean			
Study	SMD	SE(SMD)	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	Weight
Zhang et al.	-1.2893	0.2322	-	-1.29	[-1.74; -0.83]	6.0%
Shu–Validation et al.	-0.6231	0.5055		-0.62	[-1.61; 0.37]	3.9%
Byeon et al.	-0.4915	0.3134		-0.49	[-1.11; 0.12]	5.4%
Babacic et al.	-0.3728	0.4423		-0.37	[-1.24; 0.49]	4.4%
Feng et al.	-0.2987	0.5811		-0.30	[-1.44; 0.84]	3.4%
Messner-Validation et al.	-0.2152	0.2183		-0.22	[-0.64; 0.21]	6.1%
Suvarna et al.	-0.1597	0.2642		-0.16	[-0.68; 0.36]	5.8%
Sameh et al.	-0.1322	0.2672	-	-0.13	[-0.66; 0.39]	5.7%
Di et al.	-0.0816	0.3789		-0.08	[-0.82; 0.66]	4.8%
Sullivan et al.	0.1794	0.2156	-	0.18	[-0.24; 0.60]	6.1%
Shu-Discovery et al.	0.2548	0.4142		0.25	[-0.56; 1.07]	4.6%
Spick et al.	0.3469	0.2623	+	0.35	[-0.17; 0.86]	5.8%
Ciccosanti et al.	0.4879	0.3927	+		[-0.28; 1.26]	
Geyer et al.	0.5166	0.1912		0.52	[0.14; 0.89]	6.3%
Messner-Discovery et al.	0.5192	0.2251	 +	0.52	[0.08; 0.96]	6.0%
Mohammed et al.	0.6206	0.2117	-	0.62	[0.21; 1.04]	6.1%
Overmyer et al.	0.8533	0.2229	-	0.85	[0.42; 1.29]	6.1%
Shen et al.	0.8758	0.2506	-	0.88	[0.38; 1.37]	5.9%
Sahin et al.	2.3073	0.6633		- 2.31	[1.01; 3.61]	3.0%
Random effects model			: ♦	0.15	[-0.14; 0.45]	100.0%
Prediction interval					[-1.09; 1.40]	
			-3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 81\%$, $p < 1$	< 0.01					