

Unique ID	Capato et.al. 2020	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y	Use a computer random number generator. Use of opaque sealed envelopes.	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		Y		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		N	Evaluators blinded to group designation.	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PN		
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		NA		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		Y		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		N	Use of opaque sealed envelopes Evaluators blinded to group designation 7 participants out of 25 dropped out, reasons	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		PN		
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		PN		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		N		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		PN		
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		PY	Evaluators blinded to group designation All pre-specified outcomes reported.	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		PN		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		

Unique ID	Calabrò et. al. 2019	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		PY	Random allocation to groups in a 1:1 ratio Use of opaque sealed envelopes	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		Y		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PN	Random allocation to groups in a 1:1 ratio, insufficient details Use of opaque sealed envelopes (prepared in advance and marked inside with signs + and)	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		N		
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		NA		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		PY		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		

Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	No missing outcome data.
	3.2 If N/PN/Ni to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA	
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA	
	3.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	4.5 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	PY	All pre-specified outcomes reported
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	PN	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	PN	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
Overall bias	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	

Unique ID	Braun Janzen et al. 2019	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y		randomization.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		NI		No information.
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Some concerns</b>		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PN		
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		N		Evaluators blinded to group designation
	2.3. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		NA		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		PY		
	2.7 If N/PN/Ni to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		PY		Only 4 participants out of 41 dropped out.
	3.2 If N/PN/Ni to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA		
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA		
	3.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		N		
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		PY		All pre-specified outcomes reported.
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		PN		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		PN		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
Overall bias	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Some concerns</b>		

Unique ID	Lee et al. 2018	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y	Use of Random Allocation Software	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		PY		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PN	Evaluators blinded to group designation.	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		
	2.3. If Y/PY/Nl to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		PN		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/Nl to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		PY		
	2.7 If N/PN/Nl to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		Y	Only 1 participants out of 45 dropped out. All pre-specified outcomes reported.	
	3.2 If N/PN/Nl to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA		
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA		
	3.4 If Y/PY/Nl to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		PN		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		N		
	4.4 If Y/PY/Nl to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/Nl to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		PY	Use of Random Allocation Software No information Evaluators blinded to group designation	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		PN		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		Low		

Unique ID	Thaut et al. 2019	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y	Use a computerized random selector program implemented by a computer specialist external to the study to assure allocation concealment Use a unique, computer-generated random	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		Y		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		N		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PN	Evaluators blinded to group designation.	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		N		
	2.3. If Y/PY/Nl to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		NA		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/Nl to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		PY		
	2.7 If N/PN/Nl to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		

	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
<b>Bias due to missing outcome data</b>	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N	Missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention and control group, with similar reasons for missing data across
	3.2 If N/PN/Ni to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	N	
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	PN	Missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention and control group, with similar reasons for missing data across groups
	3.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Some concerns</b>	
<b>Bias in measurement of the outcome</b>	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	4.5 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
<b>Bias in selection of the reported result</b>	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	Y	Use a computerized random selector program implemented by a computer specialist external to the study to ensure
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	PN	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	PN	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
<b>Overall bias</b>	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Some concerns</b>	

<b>Unique ID</b>	Murgia et al. 2018	<b>Study ID</b>		<b>Assessor</b>	
<b>Ref or Label</b>		<b>Aim</b>	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
<b>Experimental</b>		<b>Comparator</b>		<b>Source</b>	Journal article(s)
<b>Outcome</b>		<b>Results</b>		<b>Weight</b>	1
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Signalling question</b>		<b>Response</b>		<b>Comments</b>
<b>Bias arising from the randomization process</b>	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y		Use of block randomisation generated by an online sequence generator (described in detail).
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		PY		Described in sufficient detail to allow a
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
<b>Bias due to deviations from intended interventions</b>	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y		Observer-blind trial.
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PY		
	2.3. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		PN		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		PY		
	2.7 If N/PN/Ni to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
<b>Bias due to missing outcome data</b>	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		N		Use of block randomisation generated by an online sequence generator (described in detail).
	3.2 If N/PN/Ni to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		PN		
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		PN		
	3.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Some concerns</b>		
<b>Bias in measurement of the outcome</b>	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		N		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		N		
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
<b>Bias in selection of the reported result</b>	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		PY		All pre-specified outcomes reported.
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		PN		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		PN		
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Low</b>		
<b>Overall bias</b>	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>		<b>Some concerns</b>		

Unique ID	Mainka et al. 2018	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y		Use of block randomization (software randomist) by a person not involved in the study. Sealed, sequentially numbered envelopes.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		Y		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		PN		Evaluators blinded to group designation.
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		PN		
	2.3. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		NA		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		PY		
	2.7 If N/PN/Ni to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		N		Of the 45 participants, 10 dropped out and the reasons were described. Three groups of almost equal numbers took part in the
	3.2 If N/PN/Ni to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		N		
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		PN		
	3.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias in measurement of the outcome	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		N		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN		
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		N		
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		Y		The study protocol is available; all pre-specified outcomes reported.
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		PN		
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		

Unique ID	Bella et al. 2017	Study ID		Assessor	
Ref or Label		Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)		
Experimental		Comparator		Source	Journal article(s)
Outcome		Results		Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question		Response		Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		NI		No information.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		NI		
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns		
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		No information.
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		NI		
	2.3. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?		PN		
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA		
	2.5. If Y/PY/Ni to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		NI		

	2.7 If N/PN/Ni to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	NI	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>High</b>	
<b>Bias due to missing outcome data</b>	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	N	Of the 21 person intervention group, 7 subjects dropped out (reasons described). Controls' performance was assessed only.
	3.2 If N/PN/Ni to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	N	
	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	PN	
	3.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Some concerns</b>	
<b>Bias in measurement of the outcome</b>	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	PN	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	PN	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PN	
	4.4 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	4.5 If Y/PY/Ni to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
<b>Bias in selection of the reported result</b>	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	py	All pre-specified outcomes reported.
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	PN	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	PN	
	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>Low</b>	
<b>Overall bias</b>	<b>Risk of bias judgement</b>	<b>High</b>	