

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