			.		•	-	
Shen et al.	-0.4839	0.2427	-	0.48	[-0.96; -	-0.01]	12.6%
Sullivan et al.	0.1648	0.2156	-	0.16	[-0.26;	0.59]	13.0%
Spick et al.	0.2258	0.3238		0.23	[-0.41;	0.86]	11.3%
Feng et al.	0.5150	0.5885	- •	0.51	[-0.64;	1.67]	7.3%
Suvarna et al.	0.5386	0.3129	 	0.54	[-0.07;	1.15]	11.4%
Byeon et al.	0.5917	0.3155	-	0.59	[-0.03;	1.21]	11.4%
Shu-Validation et al.	0.9937	0.5176	-	0.99	[-0.02;	2.01]	8.2%
Shu-Discovery et al.	1.8366	0.4794		1.84	[0.90;	2.78]	8.8%
Dandam effects made	. 1			0 00	F 0.44-	0.701	400.00/
Random effects mode	31			U.3U	1-0.14:	0.731	100.0%

SMD SE(SMD)

0.6271

0.4474

-0.6117

-0.6080

Study

Sahin et al.

Babacic et al.

Prediction interval

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 70\%$, p < 0.01

Standardised Mean

Difference

0

2

SMD

-0.61 [-1.84; 0.62]

-0.61 [-1.48; 0.27]

[-1.14; 1.73]

95%-CI Weight

6.8%

9.3%