SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

sTable 1.The search strategies for Pubmed, OVID Medline, Embase, Cochrane central register of controlled trials and WanFang

#1	Steroids [Mesh] OR topical steroids OR corticosteroids OR corticosteroids therapy
#2	Oral Lichen Planus[MeSH) OR Lichen Planus, Oral OR lichen planus OR OLP OR Oral Lichen Planus
#3	Platelet-rich plasma [Mesh] OR PRP OR Platelet OR Platelet gel
#4	Injectable platelet-rich fibrin [Mesh] OR i-PRF OR Growth factor concentrate OR PRF OR Liquid
	platelet-rich fibrin
#5	plasma rich in growth factors [Mesh] OR PRGF
#6	#3 OR #4 OR #5
#7	#6 AND #1 AND #2

WanFang: [All Fields] "Oral Lichen Planus" AND [All Fields] "Platelet-rich plasma"

sTable 2. Th	e Rob results				
Unique ID	1	Study ID	ElGhareeb, 2023	Assessor	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	10.1111/jocd.15622	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
Experimental	PRP	Comparator	ТА	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial
Outcome	VAS, REU	Results	0-10	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			N	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until p	participants were enrolled	and assigned to interventions?	N	Not mention
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention	groups suggest a problem	n with the randomization process?	N	There were no statistically significant differences between thestudied groups in
	Risk of bias judgement		High	REU and pain score (NRS) before treatment.	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned inte	rvention during the trial?		Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interven	ntions aware of participar	nts' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations context?	s from the intended interv	NI		
Bias due to	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to	have affected the outcom	e?	NA	
deviations from intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from	intended intervention bal	anced between groups?	NA	
interventions	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate	the effect of assignment	N		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a sulgroup to which they were randomized?	bstantial impact (on the re	NI		
	Risk of bias judgement		Some concerns	Because of the specific nature of the treatment	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or	r nearly all, participants ra	Y		
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result	was not biased by missing	NA		
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outco	ome depend on its true va	NA		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in	n the outcome depended	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome in:	appropriate?	N		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the o	outcome have differed bet	N		
Bias in measurement of	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the interve	ention received by study p	NI		
the outcome	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			PN	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of	f the outcome was influen	NA	-	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	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?			Y	
Diag in 11 11	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?				
Bias in selection of the reported result				N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement		High		
Unique ID	2	Study ID	Hijazi, 2022	Assessor	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	10.1002/cre2.550	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
		1		1	1

Experimental	PRP	Comparator	TA	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial
Outcome	VAS, Sign score	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
		Results	2020/1/10	_	'
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	Simple randomization using computer-base
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until	participants were enrolled	and assigned to interventions?	Y	sequence generationsoftware was used after patients' consent of enrollment.
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention	groups suggest a proble	N		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned into	ervention during the trial?		Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interve	entions aware of participan	nts' assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	PRP was prepared in the same visit
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviation	s from the intended interv	ention that arose because of the experimental	N	
	context?				
Bias due to	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to	have affected the outcom	ie?	NA	
deviations from intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from	intended intervention bal	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate	the effect of assignment	Y		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a su group to which they were randomized?	bstantial impact (on the re	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, o	r nearly all, participants ra	andomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that resul	was not biased by missin	ng outcome data?	NA	
Bias due to missing outcome	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outo	ome depend on its true va	lue?	NA	
data	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness i	n the outcome depended	NA	_	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome in	appropriate?		N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the	outcome have differed bet	ween intervention groups?	N	
Bias in measurement of	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervent	ention received by study p	participants?	Y	The assessor of outcomes was blinded
the outcome	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the ou	tcome have been influence	ced by knowledge of intervention received?	N	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analy unblinded outcome data were available for analyst		pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before	Y	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e	e.g. scales, definitions, time	e points) within the outcome domain?	N	
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	

Low

YM Zhang

Journal article(s) with results of the trial

Assessor

Source

Overall bias

Unique ID

Ref or Label

Experimental

Risk of bias judgement

I-PRF

Efficacy of injectable platelet-rich fibrin in the treatment of symptomatic oral lichen planus

Study ID

Comparator

Al-Hallak N, 2022

TA

assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)

Outcome	VASREUPercentage of OLP recurrence	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	For randomization, every participant was
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until p	participants were enrolled	and assigned to interventions?	Y	asked to choose a cardfrom opaque box which included 12 cards with consecutive numbersfrom 1 to 12.
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention	groups suggest a problen	n with the randomization process?	N	numbersholl 1 to 12.
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned inter	rvention during the trial?		N	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interver	ntions aware of participant	ts' assigned intervention during the trial?	NI	-
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations context?	from the intended interve	ention that arose because of the experimental	N	
Bias due to	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to h	NA			
deviations from intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from	intended intervention bala	NA		
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate	the effect of assignment t	Y		
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a subgroup to which they were randomized?	ostantial impact (on the res	NA		
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
				1	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or	nearly all, participants rar	Y		
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result	was not biased by missing	NA		
data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outco		NA		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in Risk of bias judgement	the outcome depended of	NA Low		
	ruok or blad jaugement				
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome ina	appropriate?	N		
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the or	utcome have differed betv	N		
Bias in measurement of	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the interver	ntion received by study pa	Y		
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the out	come have been influence	N		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	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?			Y	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.	g. scales, definitions, time	e points) within the outcome domain?	N	
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	ble analyses of the data?			
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	pias Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Unique ID	4	Study ID	LH Zheng 2021	Assessor	YM Zhang
	Therapeutic effect of injection of platelet-rich fibrin on erosive oral lichen planus	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
Experimental	i-PRF	Comparator	ТА	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial

Domain Signalling question Response Co 1.1 Was the allocation sequence random? 1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions? 1.3 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions? 1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process? Risk of bias judgement 2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? 2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?	omments ates a randomized
Bias arising from the randomization process 1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions? 1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process? N Risk of bias judgement 2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? 2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? Y 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental N	ates a randomized
Bias arising from the randomization process 1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions? 1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process? N Risk of bias judgement 2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? 2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? Y 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental N	ates a randomized
the randomization process 1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process? Risk of bias judgement 2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? 2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? Y 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental N	
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? 2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental	
2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental N	
2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental N	
l solitoria	
2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome? NA Bias due to	
deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups? NA 2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups? NA	
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention? Y	
2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	
Risk of bias judgement Low	
3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	
3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data? NA	
Bias due to missing outcome data 3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value? NA	
3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value? NA	
Risk of bias judgement Low	
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups? N	
4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants? Y	
Bias in measurement of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received? N 4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received? N	
une outcome	
4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received? NA	
Risk of bias judgement Low	
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?	
5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	
Bias in selection of the reported result 5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	
Risk of bias judgement Low	
Overall bias Risk of bias judgement Low	
Ref or Label Efficacy of injectable platelet-rich fibrin in the erosive orallichen planus: a split-mouth, randomized, controlled clinicaltrial assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)	
Experimental i-PRF Comparator methylprednisolone acetate Source Journal article(s) w	vith results of the trial

Outcome	VAS, lesion size, OHIP-14	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	The lesions of the patients were randomly divided into two groups by an independent
Bias arising from	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until	participants were enrolled	d and assigned to interventions?	PY	researcher (T.U.) using a computer-assisted randomization table
the randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention	groups suggest a proble	em with the randomization process?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned into	ervention during the trial?		Y	
	2.2. Were carers and people delivering the intervent	ntions aware of participa	nts' assigned intervention during the trial?	N	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviation context?	s from the intended inter	vention that arose because of the experimental	N	Assignments were hidden from thephysician performing the treatment (Z.B.Ö.) until the first treatment session, from the physician
Bias due to	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to	have affected the outcome	ne?	NA	
deviations from intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from	intended intervention ba	alanced between groups?	NA	
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate	the effect of assignment	t to intervention?	Y	
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a su group to which they were randomized?	bstantial impact (on the r	result) of the failure to analyse participants in the	NA NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, o	r nearly all, participants r	andomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result	was not biased by missi	ng outcome data?	NA	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outco	ome depend on its true v	alue?	NA	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness i	n the outcome depended	on its true value?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome in	appropriate?		N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the	outcome have differed be	N		
Bias in measurement of	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?				
_	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the ou	tcome have been influen	NA		
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysunblinded outcome data were available for analyst		pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before	Y	
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e	.g. scales, definitions, tin	N		
Bias in selection of the reported result	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?		N		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
				l	
Unique ID	6	Study ID	Bennardo, 2021	Assessor	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	EMBASE 634074370	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
Experimental	i-PRF	Comparator	TA	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial
Outcome	VAS, lesion size	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments

	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y	Each treatment (PRF and TA) wasassigned to	
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until p	participants were enrolled	Y	the specific site (right or left) by choosing betweenone of two identical, opaque	
Bias arising from					envelopes containing both possiblecombinations. Each site always
the randomization process	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention	groups suggest a problen	n with the randomization process?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	2.1 Was participants aways of their assigned into	munition during the trial?		D)/	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned inte			PY	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interve			Y	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations context?	s from the intended interve	ention that arose because of the experimental	N	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to	have affected the outcome	e?	NA	
Bias due to deviations from	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from	intended intervention bala	anced between groups?	NA	
intended interventions				101	
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate	the effect of assignment t	to intervention?	Y	
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a sul group to which they were randomized?	ostantial impact (on the re	sult) of the failure to analyse participants in the	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or	nearly all, participants ra	ndomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result	was not biased by missin	g outcome data?	NA	
Bias due to					
missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outco	me depend on its true val	NA		
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?			N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			N	
	4.2 Could measurement of ascertainment of the c	atcome have unlered bett	IN .		
Bias in	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervent	ntion received by study pa	Y		
measurement of the outcome	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			N	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of	the outcome was influen	NA	_	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
	5.1 Were the data that produced this result analys unblinded outcome data were available for analys		Y		
	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.	g. scales, definitions, time	N		
Bias in selection of the reported result			N		
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
Unique ID	7	Study ID	M. Tunalı 2018	Assessor	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	10.1111/jcpe.123 12914	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-		
	777		totreat' effect)		
Experimental	i-PRF	Comparator	TA	Source	Conference abstract(s) about the trial
Outcome	VASSign	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question	· 	Response	Comments	
Bias arising from	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			PY	13 systemically healthypatients with bilateral
the randomization process	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until p	participants were enrolled	and assigned to interventions?	NI	EOLP were randomly treated with IPRF,and corticosteroids.

	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			PN	
	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned inter	rvention during the trial?		NI	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interver	ntions aware of participant	ts' assigned intervention during the trial?	PY	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations context?	from the intended interve	ention that arose because of the experimental	N	
Bias due to	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to I	nave affected the outcome	e?	NA	
deviations from intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from	intended intervention bala	anced between groups?	NA	
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate	the effect of assignment t	to intervention?	Y	
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or	nearly all, participants rai	ndomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result	was not biased by missing	g outcome data?	NA	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?			NA	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?			N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?			N	
Bias in measurement of	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			PY	
	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			PN	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			Low	
	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?			Y	
Bias in selection of	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?			N	
	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement		Low		
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement			Some concerns	
Unique ID	8	Study ID	Ahuja 2020	Assessor	Yuanmei
Ref or Label	Journal of Oral Biology and Craniofacial Research	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
Experimental	PRP	Comparator	TA	Source	
Outcome	VASerythema scores	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process				PY NI	The study sample consisted of a totalnumber of 20 patients of erosive OLP; randomly divided into twogroups of 10 patients each.
					<u> </u>

	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	
	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	NI	
	2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the experimental context?	N	
Bias due to	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA	
deviations from intended interventions	2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	NA	
	2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Y	
	2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	
1			
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA	
uata	3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA	
	3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
	4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	N	
	4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	N	
Bias in measurement of	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PN	
the outcome	4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
	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?	Y	
Bias in selection	5.2 multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	N	
of the reported result	5.3 multiple eligible analyses of the data?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	Low	
Overall bias	Risk of bias judgement	Some concerns	