

Table S1 Results of quality assessment of randomized and non-randomized studies with Modified Downs and Black checklist *

Reference	Modified Downs and Black checklist				
	Reporting	External validity	Internal validity	Power	Total
Martellucci J, 2018 [32]	10	3	9	0	22
McCutchan GM, 2018 [33]	9	2	8	0	19
Enriquez-Navascues JM, 2020 [34]	11	3	9	0	23
Dalsgaard P, 2021 [35]	9	2	6	0	16
Bianco F, 2022 [36]	6	2	6	0	14
Rodrigues BDS, 2022 [37]	10	2	8	0	20
Falletto E, 2023 [38]	8	2	7	1	18
Meurette G, 2023 [39]	11	3	8	0	22
Pieniowski EHA, 2023 [40]	11	3	11	1	26

* Modified Downs and Black checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality of both randomized and non-randomized studies [31], for each question, one point was awarded if the study fulfilled the question (item 5 ranges from 0–2 points) (Summarize items: Reporting 0–11, External validity 0–3 , Internal validity 0–13, Power 0–1). Studies were classified as being excellent (26–28), good (20–25), fair (15–19) or poor (≤ 14)