

## Supplementary Materials

**Supplementary Table S1.** Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) scores for the selected studies. It has three domains namely selection, comparability, and outcome to evaluate cross-sectional studies. Each dimension is rated individually, the maximum score for '*selection*' is 3 and minimum is 0, for '*comparability*' the maximum score is 2 and minimum is 0, and for '*outcome*' the maximum is 2 and minimum is 0. For '*selection*' domain a score of 3 is good, 2 is fair, and 0-1 is poor. For '*comparability*' and '*outcome*' domains, a score of 2 is good, 1 is fair, and 0 is poor.

Selected studies	Selection	Comparability	Outcome
Rajarethinam et al. (1985) [19]	Fair	Poor	Fair
Bersani et al. (2002) [28]	Good	Fair	Fair
Takahashi et al. (2019) [29]	Good	Fair	Good
Takahashi et al. (2022) [17]	Good	Fair	Fair
Findikli et al. (2015) [16]	Good	Good	Fair
Sarrazin et al. (2012) [31]	Good	Good	Fair
Zhao et al. (2019) [18]	Good	Good	Fair
Takahashi et al. (2020) [30]	Good	Good	Fair
Ferrier et al. (1982) [45]	Good	Good	Fair
Beckman et al. (1984) [44]	Good	Fair	Fair
Fanget et al. (1989) [46]	Good	Poor	Fair
Monteleone et al. (1992) [49]	Good	Good	Fair
Rao et al. (1994) [51]	Good	Poor	Good
Jiang & Wang (1998) [47]	Good	Good	Fair
Vigano et al. (2001) [48]	Good	Good	Fair
Wulff et al. (2012) [50]	Good	Good	Fair
Beck-Friis et al. (1984) [52]	Good	Poor	Fair
Claustrat et al. (1984) [54]	Good	Fair	Fair
Brown et al. (1985) [55]	Good	Fair	Fair
Beck-Friis et al. (1985) [53]	Good	Poor	Good
Thompson et al. (1988) [62]	Good	Good	Fair
McIntyre et al. (1989) [56]	Good	Poor	Fair
Kennedy et al. (1996) [66]	Good	Poor	Fair
Shafii et al. (1996) [64]	Good	Poor	Fair
Voderholzer et al. (1997) [61]	Good	Good	Fair
Crasson et al. (2004) [59]	Good	Good	Fair
Carvalho et al. (2006) [63]	Good	Good	Fair
Buckley & Schatzberg (2010) [57]	Good	Fair	Fair
Khalegipour et al. (2012) [58]	Good	Fair	Fair

---

Bumb et al. (2016) [65]	Good	Good	Fair
Parry et al. (2019) [60]	Good	Good	Good
Steiner et al. (1990) [67]	Fair	Poor	Fair

**Supplementary Table S2.** Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) scores. CASP consists of four domains with 11 items evaluating randomised trials. Response to each item is recorded as 'yes', 'no', and 'can't tell'. The first three items are eliminatory; and only if the response is 'yes', the rater continues with remaining items (assessing design, methodology, results, and benefits/importance of research).

CASP Items (for information)												
1. Did the study address a clear focused research question? 2. Was the assignment of the participants to intervention randomised? 3. Were all participants who entered the study accounted for at its conclusion? 4. Was the study methodologically sound? 5. Were the study groups similar at the start of the randomised controlled trial? 6. Apart from the experimental intervention, did each study group receive the same level of care? 7. Were the effects of the intervention reported comprehensively? 8. Was the precision of the estimate of the intervention or treatment effect reported? 9. Do the benefits of the experimental intervention outweigh the harms and costs? 10. Can the results be applied to your local population/in your context? 11. Would the experimental intervention provide greater value to the people in your care than any of the existing intervention? <i>Each item scored after reading selected papers. A score of 2 was given for 'yes', 1 for 'no', and 0 for 'cannot tell'.</i>												
CASP Ratings for Selected Studies												
Study	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Funding Source
Kennedy & Brown (1992) [68]	2	0	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	0	Funder Not reported
Childs et al. (1995) [69]	2	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	Wessex medical trust and Eli Lilly limited
Szymanska et al. (2001) [70]	2	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	Funder Not reported
Tan et al. (2007) [71]	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	Nature science foundation