Study	SMD	SE(SMD)	Standardised Mean Difference	SMD	95%-CI	Weight
Olday	SIMID	OL(ONID)	Dillelelice	SIVID	93 /0-CI	veigiii
Zhang et al.	-1.5181	0.2347		-1.52	[-1.98; -1.06]	5.8%
Shu–Discovery et al.	-0.5386	0.4190	- 	-0.54	[-1.36; 0.28]	4.7%
Shu–Validation et al.	-0.3903	0.5007		-0.39	[-1.37; 0.59]	4.2%
Overmyer et al.	-0.2162	0.2169	-	-0.22	[-0.64; 0.21]	5.8%
Suvarna et al.	-0.2015	0.2644	- 	-0.20	[-0.72; 0.32]	5.6%
Sullivan et al.	0.0194	0.2153	+	0.02	[-0.40; 0.44]	5.9%
Geyer et al.	0.1036	0.1900	 	0.10	[-0.27; 0.48]	6.0%
Messner-Discovery et al.	0.1222	0.2106	-	0.12	[-0.29; 0.53]	5.9%
Di et al.	0.1571	0.3793	- ii -	0.16	[-0.59; 0.90]	4.9%
Feng et al.	0.2289	0.5796	- i -	0.23	[-0.91; 1.36]	3.8%
Spick et al.	0.2359	0.2612	-	0.24	[-0.28; 0.75]	5.6%
Byeon et al.	0.2833	0.3102	-	0.28	[-0.32; 0.89]	5.4%
Shen et al.	0.2878	0.2404	-	0.29	[-0.18; 0.76]	5.7%
Ahern et al.	0.3007	0.2254	-	0.30	[-0.14; 0.74]	5.8%
Sameh et al.	0.3253	0.2687	 i 	0.33	[-0.20; 0.85]	5.6%
Messner-Validation et al.	0.5990	0.2225	+	0.60	[0.16; 1.04]	5.8%
Babacic et al.	0.8576	0.4553	 	0.86	[-0.03; 1.75]	4.5%
Mohammed et al.	1.8669	0.2385	-	1.87	[1.40; 2.33]	5.7%
Sahin et al.	2.5634	0.6915		2.56	[1.21; 3.92]	3.2%
Random effects model			♦	0.22	[-0.12; 0.57]	100.0%
Prediction interval					[-1.30; 1.74]	
			-2 0 2			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 86\%$, $p < 1$	< 0.01		2 0 2			