Supplementary Table 1. PRISMA checklist 2020

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	5
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	5
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	5
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	5
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	5
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	5
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	NA
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	5
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	NA
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	5
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	NA
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	NA
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	NA
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	NA
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	6
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	5
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	6
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	6
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	NA
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	6
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	NA
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	6
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	NA
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	6
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	NA
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	9
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	10
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	10
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	11
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Prospero ID – CRD42023478426
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Prospero ID – CRD42023478426
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	NA
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	11
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	NA
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	NA

Supplementary Table 2. Quality assessment

RoB 2 - Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials

Risk of bias arising from the randomization process

Signalling questions	Taylor-Cousar et al.,[21] (2017)	Rowe et al.[12] (2017)	Donaldson et al.,[9] (2018)	Munck et al.,[22] (2020)	Middleton et al.,[23] (2019)	Heijerman et al.,[24] (2020)	Sutharsan et al.[25] (2022)
1.1. Was the allocation sequence random?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1.2. Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	PY	Y	Y	Y	PY	PY	PY
1.3. Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention)							
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	N	N	N	N	N	N	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 trial context?							
2.4. If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?							
2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?							
2.6. Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	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?							
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (effect of adhering to intervention)							
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non- protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?							
2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?							
2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?							
2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to intervention?							
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk of bias due to missing outcome data							
3.1. Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.2. If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?			Y				
3.3. If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?							
3.4. If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?							
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome							
4.1. Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
4.2. Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

4.3. If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
4.4. If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?							
4.5. If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?							
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk of 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	Y	Y	Y	NI		
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from…					NI		
5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?							
5.3. ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?							
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate		

	Low	Some concerns	High
Randomization process	5	0	0
Effect of assignment to intervention	5	0	0
Effect of adhering to intervention	5	0	0
Missing outcome data	5	0	0
Measurement of the outcome	5	0	0
Selection of the reported result	4	1	0

	Low	Some concerns	High
Randomization process	100%	0%	0%
Effect of assignment to intervention	100%	0%	0%
Effect of adhering to intervention	100%	0%	0%
Missing outcome data	100%	0%	0%
Measurement of the outcome	100%	0%	0%
Selection of the reported result	80%	20%	0%