

Table S3

Risk of bias assessment results

	Bamba	Burnard	Demattè	Fell	Nakamura	Sakuragawa	Tsunetsugu (2002/2005)	Tsunetsugu (2007)	Zhang
Domain 1: Randomization process									
Random allocation sequence	NI	NI	NI	N	NI	NI	NI	NI	Y
Allocation sequence concealed	PY	PY	PY	N	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
Baseline differences	N	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Equal proportion of participants allocated to each group (within-subject trials)	Y	Y	PY		Y	Y	PY	PY	PY
Period effects included (within-subject trials)	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N
<i>Risk-of-bias judgement</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>high risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>
Domain 2: Bias due to deviations from intended interventions									
<u>Effect of assignment to intervention</u>									
2.1 Participant aware of their assigned intervention (during each period)?	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN
2.2 Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during (each period of) the trial?	PY	PY	PY	Y	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY

2.3 Were important co-interventions balanced across the two interventions?									
2.4 Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?									
2.5 Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen? (reversed scoring between two appraisal tools)									
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of starting and adhering to the intervention?									
2.7 Was there sufficient time for any carry-over effects to have disappeared before outcome assessment in the second period (within-subject trials)?									
<i>Risk-of-bias judgement</i>									
Domain 3: Risk of bias due to missing outcome data									
3.1 Data available for (nearly) all participants	PY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	PY
3.2 Evidence that result not biased due to missing data (between-subject trials)							N	N	
3.3 Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value (between-subject trials)?							PY	PY	

<i>Risk-of-bias judgement</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>
Domain 5: 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?	PY	Y	PY	Y	PY	NI	PY	PY	NI
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from ...									
5.2 ... multiple outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	PY
5.3 ... multiple analyses of the data?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	NI
5.4 ... the outcome of a statistical test for carry-over (within-subject trials)?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
<i>Risk-of-bias judgement</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>high risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>high risk</i>
Overall risk of bias									
<i>Risk-of-bias judgement</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>high risk</i>	<i>low risk</i>	<i>high risk</i>	<i>some concerns</i>	<i>some concerns</i>	<i>high risk</i>

Note. N = no; PN = probably no; NI = no information; PY = probably yes; Y = yes