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. The 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**	TA	**Source**	Journal article(s) with results of the trial
Outcome	VAS, REU	**Results**	0-10	**Weight**	1

Domain	Signalling question	Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	N	Not mention
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	N	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N	There were no statistically significant differences between thestudied groups in REU and pain score (NRS) before treatment.
	Risk of bias judgement	**High**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?	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 context?	NI	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA	
	2.5. If Y/PY 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?	N	
	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?	NI	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**	Because of the specific nature of the treatment
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	NI	
	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**	
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?	Y	
	5.2 ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	PN	
	5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	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)		

Experimental	PRP	Comparator	TA	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial
Outcome	VAS, Sign score	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1

Domain	Signalling question	Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Y	Simple randomization using computer-based sequence generationsoftware was used after patients' consent of enrollment.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Y	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Y	PRP was prepared in the same visit
	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 context?	N	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	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?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Y	The assessor of outcomes was blinded
	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 influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**	
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?	Y	
	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**	**Low**	

Unique ID	3	Study ID	Al-Hallak N, 2022	Assessor	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	Efficacy of injectable platelet-rich fibrin in the treatment of symptomatic oral lichen planus	Aim	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
Experimental	I-PRF	Comparator	TA	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial

Outcome	VASREUPercentage of OLP recurrence	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1

Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	For randomization, every participant was asked to choose a cardfrom opaque box which included 12 cards with consecutive numbersfrom 1 to 12.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			N	
	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	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			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?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			Y	
	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 influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
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?			Y	
	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**			**Low**	

Unique ID	4	Study ID	LH Zheng 2021	Assessor	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	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	TA	Source	Journal article(s) with results of the trial

Outcome	VASSign score, lesion sizeeffective rate, recurrence rate	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1
Domain	**Signalling question**			**Response**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	Using STATA generates a randomized number
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?			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 context?			N	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			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?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			Y	
	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 influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
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?			Y	
	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**			**Low**	
Unique ID	5	**Study ID**	Saglam, 2021	**Assessor**	YM Zhang
Ref or Label	Efficacy of injectable platelet-rich fibrin in the erosive orallichen planus: a split-mouth, randomized, controlled clinicaltrial	**Aim**	assignment to intervention (the 'intention-totreat' effect)		
Experimental	i-PRF	**Comparator**	methylprednisolone acetate	**Source**	Journal article(s) with results of the trial

Outcome	VAS, lesion size, OHIP-14	Results	2023/1/10	Weight	1

Domain	Signalling question		Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?		Y	The lesions of the patients were randomly divided into two groups by an independent researcher (T.U.) using a computer-assisted randomization table
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		PY	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		N	
	Risk of bias judgement		**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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?		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 context?		N	Assignments were hidden from thephysician performing the treatment (Z.B.Ö.) until the first treatment session, from the physician
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		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?		NA	
	Risk of bias judgement		**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		N	
	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**	
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?		Y	
	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**		**Low**	

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

Domain	Signalling question			Response	Comments
Bias arising from the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			Y	Each treatment (PRF and TA) wasassigned to the specific site (right or left) by choosing betweenone of two identical, opaque envelopes containing both possiblecombinations. Each site always
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			Y	
	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?			N	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?			PY	
	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 context?			N	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?			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?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?			Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?			NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?			Y	
	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 influenced by knowledge of intervention received?			NA	
	Risk of bias judgement			**Low**	
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?			Y	
	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**			**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-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 the randomization process	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?			PY	13 systemically healthypatients with bilateral EOLP were randomly treated with IPRF,and corticosteroids.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?			NI	

	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	PN	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**	

Domain	Signalling question	Response	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	2.1.Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	NI	
	2.2.Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	PY	
	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	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	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?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	
	3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 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**	
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?	Y	
	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	1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	PY	The study sample consisted of a totalnumber of 20 patients of erosive OLP; randomly divided into twogroups of 10 patients each.
	1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	NI	

	1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	N	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Some concerns**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	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	
	2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	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?	NA	
	Risk of bias judgement	**Low**	
	3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Y	

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	
	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**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	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	
	4.3 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	PN	
	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**	
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?	Y	
	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**	