Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Table S1. PRISMA Checklist.

Section/Topic	#	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including the following, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	1,2,3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	3,4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists as well as if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	N/A
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	3,4,5
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	3,4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	4

Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility included in the systematic review and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	3,4,5
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	5
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	5
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level) and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	4,5
Summary measure	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	4,5
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	4,5
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	5
Additional analysis	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	5
RESULTS	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	4, Figure 1
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	3,4,5,6 Table2
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see Item 12).	4,5,6 Table2, Supplementary table2
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study, the following: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group and (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	4,5,6 Table2

Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	10, 11, 12, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, Table 6
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	10, 11, 12, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, Table 6
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	5,6
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarise the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policymakers).	12,13,14
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome levels (e.g., risk of bias) and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	12,13,14
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence and implications for future research.	14,15
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); include role of funders for the systematic review.	15

Supplementary Table S2. Quality Assessment.

No.	Researcher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
1	Song (2009)	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
2	Ahn et al. (2009)	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
3	Kim & Lim (2009)	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
4	Park et al. (2010)	Y	U	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6
5	Choi & Jang (2010)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	6
6	Gwon (2011)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
7	Park (2011)	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
8	Lee (2011)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
9	Kim & Park (2012)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
10	Lee (2012)	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
11	Kim et al. (2013)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
12	Lee & Kim (2015)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
13	Lee & Lee (2015)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
14	Kim (2018)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	6
15	Kim (2018)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
16	Gang & Kim (2020)	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5

Abbreviations: N: No; Y: Yes; U: Unclear; 1: Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population? 2: Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way? 3: Was the sample size adequate? 4: Were the study subjects and setting described in detail? 5: Was data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample? 6: Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition? 7: Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants? 8: Was there appropriate statistical analysis? 9: Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?