Study	TE	seTE	Diffe	rence	SMD	959	%–CI	Weight
Sullivan et al.	-0.53	0.2185	-		-0.53	[-0.96; -	0.10]	9.9%
Di et al.	-0.09	0.3790		<del>                                     </del>	-0.09	[-0.83;	0.65]	7.7%
Suvarna et al.	-0.09	0.2639	-	<u> </u>	-0.09	[-0.61;	0.43]	9.3%
Zhang et al.	-0.09	0.2066		<u> </u>	-0.09	[-0.49;	0.32]	10.0%
Babacic et al.	-0.08	0.4393		<del>                                     </del>	-0.08	[-0.95;	0.78]	6.9%
Overmyer et al.	0.03	0.2164	-		0.03	[-0.39;	0.46]	9.9%
Shen et al.	0.10	0.2393			0.10	[-0.37;	0.57]	9.6%
Geyer et al.	0.21	0.1901	_	-	0.21	[-0.16;	0.58]	10.2%
Shu et al.	0.64	0.4216			0.64	[-0.18;	1.47]	7.1%
Messner-Discovery et al.	0.92	0.2181			0.92	[ 0.49;	1.35]	9.9%
Messner-Validation et al.	1.54	0.2475		-	1.54	[ 1.06;	2.03]	9.5%
Random effects model			-		0.24	[-0.12;	0.591	100.0%
Prediction interval				_	<b>V</b> .	[-1.05;	_	1001070
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 83\%$ , $p < 10$	< 0.01					<b>L</b> 1100,	<b>-</b> _	

-2 -1 0 1

2

**Standardised Mean**