Standardised Mean					
Study	TE seTE	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	Weight
Aggarwal at al	0.10, 0.2106	ata :	0.10	[ 0 44, 0 94]	6 10/
Aggarwal et al.	0.19 0.3196			[-0.44; 0.81]	6.1%
Chainey et al.	0.70 0.3394			[ 0.04; 1.37]	6.1%
Kazemi et al.	0.84 0.5836			[-0.31; 1.98]	5.7%
Francis et al.	0.98 0.3354			[ 0.32; 1.64]	6.1%
Moorthy et al.	1.42 0.5490		1.42	[ 0.34; 2.49]	5.7%
Harada et al.	1.55 0.3547		1.55	[ 0.86; 2.25]	6.0%
O'Toole et al.	1.71 0.5366	=	1.71	[ 0.66; 2.76]	5.8%
Koskinen et al.	1.84 0.2183	+	1.84	[1.41; 2.27]	6.2%
Zheng et al.	1.94 0.6372		1.94	[0.69; 3.19]	5.6%
Law et al.	2.03 0.3498		2.03	[1.34; 2.71]	6.0%
Van Sickle et al.	2.14 0.5696	-	2.14	[1.02; 3.25]	5.7%
Datta et al.	2.18 0.5117	-	2.18	[ 1.18; 3.18]	5.8%
Vedula et al.	2.21 0.2475	-	2.21	[ 1.73; 2.70]	6.2%
Xeroulis et al.	2.55 0.6569	<del>   </del>	2.55	[1.27; 3.84]	5.5%
Judkins et al.	5.40 0.8038	-	- 5.40	[3.82; 6.97]	5.2%
Pagador et al.	6.37 1.9630			[ 2.52; 10.22]	2.9%
Huffman et al.	6.51 0.8134	-	6.51	-	5.2%
Smith et al.	8.06 1.2760			[5.56; 10.56]	4.2%
				[,]	
Random effects mod		2.45	[ 1.42; 3.48]	100.0%	
Prediction interval			ı	[-1.53; 6.43]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 87\%$ , $\tau^2 = 3.3104$ , $p < 0.01$					
<b>J</b> ,	-1		10		