|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplement A: Risk of bias assessment table | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Adjamian 2009 | Y | N | N | CD | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A |
| Gopalakrishnan 2013 | Y | Y | N/A | Y | Y | Y | Y | N/A | Y | N/A |
| Machado 2014 | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N |
| Gopalakrishnan 2015 | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Gopalakrishnan 2016a | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N |
| Gopalakrishna 2016b | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N |
| Gopalakrishnan 2018 | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N |

1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated? 2 Was the study population clearly and fully described, including case definition? 3. Were the cases consecutive? 4. Were the subjects comparable? 5. Was the experimental procedure clearly described? 6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable and implemented consistently across all study participants? 7. Was the duration of the experiment appropriate? 8. Were the statistical methods well-described? 9. Were the results well-described? 10. Were the conditions sufficiently counterbalanced or randomised? Y = Yes, N = No, N/A = Not applicable, CD = Cannot determine.