

## Supplementary Table 2. Bias assessment of observational studies

	Puga et al.2018 <sup>20</sup>	Aburajab et al.2018 <sup>21</sup>	Ali et al.2019 <sup>22</sup>	Haddad et al.2023 <sup>23</sup>	Shamah et al.2022 <sup>24</sup>	Aujla et al.2023 <sup>26</sup>	Perez et al.2022 <sup>27</sup>	AbiMansour et al.2024 <sup>19</sup>
1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study popula- tion prespecified and clearly described?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. Was the sample size suf- ficiently large to provide confi- dence in the findings?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
6. Was the test/service/inter- vention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
7. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/inter- ventions?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
9. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?	Yes/NA	Yes/NA	Unknown	Yes/yes	Yes/NA	Unknown	Unknown	Yes/NA
10. Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statisti- cal tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11. Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)?	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA