Study	SMD	SE(SMD)	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	Weight
Shu-Discovery et al.	-2.8304	0.5581		-2.83	[-3.92; -1.74]	5.8%
Shu–Validation et al.	-1.1506	0.5242		-1.15	[-2.18; -0.12]	6.0%
Overmyer et al.	-0.9388	0.2243		-0.94	[-1.38; -0.50]	7.9%
Sullivan et al.	-0.6564	0.2202	- - 	-0.66	[-1.09; -0.22]	7.9%
Babacic et al.	-0.5584	0.4461		-0.56	[-1.43; 0.32]	6.5%
Ciccosanti et al.	-0.4656	0.3922		-0.47	[-1.23; 0.30]	6.9%
Di et al.	-0.3120	0.3808		-0.31	[-1.06; 0.43]	7.0%
Mohammed et al.	-0.2882	0.2092	-	-0.29	[-0.70; 0.12]	7.9%
Geyer et al.	-0.2132	0.3111	-	-0.21	[-0.82; 0.40]	7.4%
Shen et al.	-0.0795	0.2392	-	-0.08	[-0.55; 0.39]	7.8%
Byeon et al.	0.3723	0.3114	 •	0.37	[-0.24; 0.98]	7.4%
Spick et al.	0.6805	0.2812	i -	0.68	[0.13; 1.23]	7.6%
Tepasse et al.	1.0074	0.4242		1.01	[0.18; 1.84]	6.7%
Messner-Validation et al.	1.0865	0.3219	-	1.09	[0.46; 1.72]	7.3%
Random effects model				-0.27	[-0.74; 0.20]	100.0%
Prediction interval					[-2.15; 1.62]	

-2

0

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 84\%$, p < 0.01

Standardised Mean