Study	TE	seTE		Di	fferenc	е		SMD	95	5%–CI	Weight
Shu et al.	-1.57	0.4623		-	:			-1.57	[-2.47; -	-0.66]	7.8%
Babacic et al.	-0.98	0.4600			<del></del>			-0.98	[-1.88; -	-0.07]	7.8%
Shen et al.	-0.41	0.2417		-	•			-0.41	[-0.88;	0.06]	9.4%
Di et al.	-0.26	0.4002			-			-0.26	[-1.05;	0.52]	8.3%
Overmyer et al.	-0.25	0.2170		_	-			-0.25	[-0.67;	0.18]	9.6%
Sullivan et al.	-0.12	0.2154		-				-0.12	[-0.54;	0.31]	9.6%
Geyer et al.	-0.08	0.1900						-0.08	[-0.45;	0.30]	9.7%
Zhang et al.	0.00	0.2271						0.00	[-0.44;	0.45]	9.5%
Suvarna et al.	0.03	0.2646						0.03	[-0.49;	0.55]	9.3%
Messner-Validation et al.	0.05	0.2177			_			0.05	[-0.38;	0.47]	9.6%
Messner-Discovery et al.	2.14	0.2518					-	2.14	[ 1.65;	2.64]	9.4%
Random effects model				<				-0.09	[-0.61;	0.43]	100.0%
Prediction interval							_		[-2.06;	1.87]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 89\%$ , $p < 6$	< 0.01		1	ı	I		I				
			-2	<b>–1</b>	0	1	2				

**Standardised Mean**