		Standardised Mean			
Study	TE seTE	Difference	SMD	95%–CI Weig	ht
Aggarwal et al.	0.19 0.3196		0.19	[-0.44; 0.81] 5.5	5%
Chainey et al.	0.70 0.3394	-	0.70	[0.04; 1.37] 5.5	5%
Kazemi et al.	0.84 0.5836	+-	0.84	[-0.31; 1.98] 5.1	%
Francis et al.	0.98 0.3354	-	0.98	[0.32; 1.64] 5.5	5%
Wilson et al.	1.33 0.6036		1.33	[0.15; 2.52] 5.1	%
Hofstad et al.	1.38 0.5404		1.38	[0.32; 2.44] 5.2	2%
Moorthy et al.	1.42 0.5490		1.42	[0.34; 2.49] 5.2	2%
Harada et al.	1.55 0.3547	-	1.55	[0.86; 2.25] 5.5	5%
O'Toole et al.	1.71 0.5366	-	1.71	[0.66; 2.76] 5.2	2%
Koskinen et al.	1.84 0.2183	+	1.84	[1.41; 2.27] 5.6	3%
Zheng et al.	1.94 0.6372	-	1.94	[0.69; 3.19] 5.0)%
Law et al.	2.03 0.3498		2.03	[1.34; 2.71] 5.5	5%
Van Sickle et al.	2.14 0.5696	-	2.14	[1.02; 3.25] 5.1	%
Datta et al.	2.18 0.5117	- 	2.18	[1.18; 3.18] 5.2	2%
Vedula et al.	2.21 0.2475	-	2.21	[1.73; 2.70] 5.6	3%
Xeroulis et al.	2.55 0.6569	 	2.55	[1.27; 3.84] 5.0)%
Judkins et al.	5.40 0.8038		5.40	[3.82; 6.97] 4.7	′%
Pagador et al.	6.37 1.9630		6.37	[2.52; 10.22] 2.4	! %
Huffman et al.	6.51 0.8134	-	6.51	[4.92; 8.11] 4.6	;%
Smith et al.	8.06 1.2760	-	8.06	[5.56; 10.56] 3.6	; %
Random effects mode	el	\Diamond	2.32	[1.40; 3.24] 100.0	۱%
Prediction interval	0			[-1.35; 5.99]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 86\%$,	$\tau^2 = 2.8844, p < 0$				
	_	10 -5 0 5 10)		