Study	TE seTE	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	Weight
Chainey et al.	0.70 0.3394	=	0.70	[0.04; 1.37]	7.6%
Kazemi et al.	0.84 0.5836	 	0.84	[-0.31; 1.98]	7.1%
Francis et al.	0.98 0.3354	==	0.98	[0.32; 1.64]	7.6%
Moorthy et al.	1.42 0.5490	-	1.42	[0.34; 2.49]	7.2%
Harada et al.	1.55 0.3547		1.55	[0.86; 2.25]	7.5%
O'Toole et al.	1.71 0.5366		1.71	[0.66; 2.76]	7.2%
Koskinen et al.	1.84 0.2183	+	1.84	[1.41; 2.27]	7.7%
Law et al.	2.03 0.3498		2.03	[1.34; 2.71]	7.6%
Van Sickle et al.	2.14 0.5696		2.14	[1.02; 3.25]	7.2%
Vedula et al.	2.21 0.2475	+	2.21	[1.73; 2.70]	7.7%
Xeroulis et al.	2.55 0.6569	-	2.55	[1.27; 3.84]	7.0%
Judkins et al.	5.40 0.8038	-	5.40	[3.82; 6.97]	6.6%
Huffman et al.	6.51 0.8134	-	6.51	[4.92; 8.11]	6.6%
Smith et al.	8.06 1.2760	-	- 8.06	[5.56; 10.56]	5.4%
Random effects modern Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 87\%$		1	2.55	[1.33; 3.77] ⁷ [-1.76; 6.86]	100.0%
rieterogeneity. r = 61 /	6, 1 = 3.0292, p < 0.0		0		

Standardised Mean