

Sensitivity Analysis	Heterogeneity test	Effect size: SMD (95%CI)
Previous result	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 18.67$ , $df = 13$ ( $P = 0.13$ ); $I^2 = 30\%$	-0.60 [-0.79, -0.41]
Method 1:		
Changing the analysis model	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.06$ ; $\chi^2 = 18.67$ , $df = 13$ ( $P = 0.13$ ); $I^2 = 30\%$	-0.62 [-0.86, -0.39]
Method 2:		
Altmann 2016 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 18.37$ , $df = 11$ ( $P = 0.07$ ); $I^2 = 40\%$	-0.58 [-0.78, -0.38]
Cheung 2018 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 18.11$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.11$ ); $I^2 = 34\%$	-0.61 [-0.81, -0.42]
Cugusi 2015 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 18.64$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.10$ ); $I^2 = 36\%$	-0.60 [-0.79, -0.41]
De Lima 2019 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 15.40$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.22$ ); $I^2 = 22\%$	-0.55 [-0.75, -0.36]
Hashimoto 2015 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 14.33$ , $df = 11$ ( $P = 0.22$ ); $I^2 = 23\%$	-0.67 [-0.87, -0.46]
Lee 2015 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 18.04$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.11$ ); $I^2 = 33\%$	-0.58 [-0.77, -0.39]
Picelli 2016 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 18.59$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.10$ ); $I^2 = 35\%$	-0.60 [-0.80, -0.41]
Solla 2019 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 14.41$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.28$ ); $I^2 = 17\%$	-0.56 [-0.75, -0.37]
Tollár 2019 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 15.34$ , $df = 11$ ( $P = 0.17$ ); $I^2 = 28\%$	-0.51 [-0.72, -0.30]
Van der Kolk 2018 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 16.42$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.17$ ); $I^2 = 27\%$	-0.64 [-0.84, -0.44]
Wu 2021 excluded	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 16.92$ , $df = 12$ ( $P = 0.15$ ); $I^2 = 29\%$	-0.67 [-0.88, -0.45]