Study ID	**Gynecological cancer**	
	Donoyama 2013	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Patients are allocated by block randomization.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	N	No significant difference between the groups for baseline characteristics.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	One patient received the wrong intervention. All other patients underwent the correct intervention. However, the trialists did not explicitly state whether the deviation arose because of the trial context.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.
	Y	All patients who were randomised were included in the analysis
	NA	Not applicable.
	Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Data was reported for all the participants pre and post intervention.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.
	Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments
	PN	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded.
	Y	Included participant-reported outcome such as pain, anxiety, depression and quality of life could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.

	Gynecological cancer	
Study ID	**Donoyama 2013**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias in selection of the reported result	**Some concerns**	
	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are available and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PY	There are multiple publications from this study presenting different outcomes domains and measures, no main publication that lists all the outcome measures analysed in the study.
	PN	There is no evidence that authors select from multiple analyses.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Obesity		Obesity	
Study ID	**Guo 2015**		**Yan 2014**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
	Y	Patients were randomised using a random digit table.	Y	Patients are randomised by statistical analysis software.
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	N	No significant difference between the groups for baseline characteristics.	PY	Gender is not balanced between interventions groups
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	N	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.	PY	All patients recevied allocated intervention. However, 2 were lost to followup and 4 were not included in statistical analysis. The participants not included may have been rejected for reasons related to the intervention received.
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NA	Not applicable	NI	No information provided.
	NA	Not applicable	NI	No detail provided as to which patients rejected the intervention from each group. However, 4 patients were excluded from analysis in the control group and 2 patients were excluded from analysis in the intervention group.
	Y	Intention to treat	Y	Modified intention to treat
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		**Some concerns**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Data was reported for all the participants pre and post intervention	Y	Nearly all participants were included in the anlysis. 2 patients lost to follow up and 4 patients who rejected the intervention were exlcuded from analysis (6/60, 10%).
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		**Low**	

	Obesity		Obesity	
Study ID	**Guo 2015**		**Yan 2014**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
	N	Validated outcome measures were used for all outcomes (objective outcomes e.g. BMI, weight, blood pressure)	N	All outcomes are objective (body weight, BMI, waist and hip circumference) and can be accurately reported and measured.
	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	The patients were aware of the intervention received. It is not explicitely stated if trial researchers were blinded	PY	The patients were aware of the intervention received. It is not explicitely stated if trial researchers were blinded
	PN	Although participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, it is not possible for the knowing of meradian massage to influence the objective outcomes of body weight, body mass index, waist circumference and hip circumference	PN	Although participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, it is not possible for the knowing of meradian massage to influence the objective outcomes of body weight, body mass index, waist circumference and hip circumference
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		**Low**	
	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
Bias in selection of the reported result	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Diabetes	
Study ID	**Jie-era 2018**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The only information about randomisation is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.
	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	PN	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups (only those included in the analysis)
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	60 participants enrolled and analysed. There is no indication of dropouts/deviations (no CONSORT)
	NI	no information
	NI	no information
	PY	Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat model (or modified).
	PN	it is possible participants with missing data were not included in the analysis
	Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	The authors do not specify that there was missing data for any participants. (no CONSORT)
	NI	no information
	NI	no information
	NI	no information
	Some concerns	

	Diabetes	
Study ID	**Jie-era 2018**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measures were used for all outcomes (e.g. fasting blood glucose, blood pressure)
	PN	Not explicitely stated that the same measurement methods were used. However, it can be reasonably assumed that fasting blood glucose, blood pressure etc. were measured using the same methods. All participants were measured at the same time points.
	PY	The patients were aware of the intervention received. It is not explicitely stated if trial researchers were blinded
	PN	Although participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, it is not possible for the knowing of acupoint massage to influence the blood pressure, blood glucose etc
	NA	Not applicable
	Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial y
applicable
Source: Chapter 8 C
interventions.

Notes: For the precis
answering each one

	Stress		Depression	
Study ID	**Kurebayshi 2020**		**Lanza 2018**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The only information is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.	Y	Randomised through computer-generated random numbers by an independent operator.
	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	PN	No significant difference in terms of age, stress level or quality of life. No other baseline details provided	PN	Small sample size (N=12). Other than gender (control group 100% female & active group 83% female), there was no significant difference in terms of clinical and cognitive features.
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	All participant receive the allocated intervention, with dropouts (21/122) considered consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.	NI	12 participants enrolled and analysed. There is no indication of dropouts/deviations (no CONSORT).
	NA	Not applicable	NI	no information
	NA	Not applicable	NI	no information
	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	Y	Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat model.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	Data was not available for all participants. There were 21 patients (17.2%) who had dropped out from the trial after being randomised. Reasons were loss of treatment continutity and did not respond to questionnaire.	PY	There was no reported attrition over the course of the study and no missing data was reported by the authors.
	NI	There is no evidence that the results were not biased by missing outcome data	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	It is plausible dropouts were health-related and could affect the outcome (details not provided).	NA	Not applicable.
	NI	Missingness of the data considered likely to affect true value of the outcome.	NA	Not applicable.
	High		**Low**	
	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments	N	Validated outcome measures were used

	Stress		Depression	
Study ID	**Kurebayshi 2020**		**Lanza 2018**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points. For one of the secondary outcomes, one patient opted to use a different langauge version of the SF-12 (validated for the portugese language).	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded.	PN	Once the participant was considered eligible for the study, patients were followed-up from another investigator (SSC) who was blind to treatment allocation for the entire duration of the study.
	PY	Included participant-reported outcome such as stress that could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	NA	Not applicable
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	NA	Not applicable
	Some concerns		**Low**	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described. The trial registry indicates that anxiety was measured with STAI, but the results were not reported or mentioned in the published study.	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**High**	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Insomnia		Insomnia	
Study ID	**Kao 2017**		**Yue 2016**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The only information is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.	Y	Patients were randomised using a random numbers table.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	PN	No significant difference in baseline characteristics between groups in terms of age, marital status, educational attainment, work seniority, individual monthly income and chilren.	PN	No significant difference in baseline characteristics between groups in terms of gender, height, body weight, age, disease course and severty of illness.
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	6/132 (4.5%) of participants did not receive the intervention which is consistent with what is expected within the trial context, and any impact on outcomes is expected to be slight.	PY	The authors do not report whether deviations arose because of the trial context. (no CONSORT)
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	pariticipants who did not complete the intervention because they became pregnant (2/132, 1.5%), because of work (3/132, 2.3%) or personal reasons (1/132, 0.8%) were not included in the final analysis.	PY	The authors do not provide sufficient information (no consort). It is presumed all randomised participants were included in the analysis
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		**Some concerns**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Data from 6/132 (<5%) of participants were missing from the final analysis. This was considered sufficiently small that outcomes were not affected.	PN	The authors do not specify that there was missing data for any participants. (no CONSORT)
	NA	Not applicable.	NI	No information.
	NA	Not applicable.	NI	No information.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	No information.
	Low		**High**	
	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	PN	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	PN	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.

	Insomnia		Insomnia	
Study ID	**Kao 2017**		**Yue 2016**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded.	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded.
	PY	Participant-reported outcome such as QoL could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PY	Participant-reported outcome such as HRQoL, anxiety and sleep quality could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns	Acupoint massage is the comparator group. Bias may be against the intervention	**Some concerns**	Acupoint massage is the comparator group. Bias may be against the intervention
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns	Acupoint massage is the comparator group. Bias may be against the intervention	**Some concerns**	Acupoint massage is the comparator group. Bias may be against the intervention
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**High risk**	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Headache disorders, primary (refractory)		Stroke recovery	
	Villani 2017		Tian 2020	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The only information about randomisation is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.	NI	The only information about randomisation is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.
	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	N	No significant difference in terms of gender age and duration of symptoms.	N	No significant difference in terms of gender age and duration of symptoms.
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	4/41 (9.7%) did not complete the trial. This was considered consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.	NI	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported. The authors sate that "no cases dropped out during treatment".
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	Modified ITT. Participants without final assessment data were excluded from the final analysis.	Y	Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat model.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	Data from 4/41 (>10%) participants missing from the final analysis, which may affect the outcomes measured.	Y	Outcome data was available for all patients. Authors noted that "no cases dropped out during treatment".
	N	No analyses were conducted to test for missingness of the outcome data	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.	NA	Not applicable.
	PN	Missingness of the data considered not likely to be affect true value of the outcome, given it is balanced between groups.	NA	Not applicable.
	Some concerns		**Low**	
	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments	N	Validated outcome measures were used
	PN	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.

	Headache disorders, primary (refractory)		Stroke recovery	
Study ID	**Villani 2017**		**Tian 2020**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded.	PY	The patients were aware of the intervention received. It is not specified if the outcome assessors were aware of the intervention received
	PY	Included participant-reported outcome such as pain, number of days with a headache that could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	N	Outcomes were objective and as outcomes are related to swallowing, even if the patient was aware of the intervention, it is difficult to manipulate the results.
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	NA	Not applicable.
	Some concerns		**Low**	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results.	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results.
	NI	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	NI	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Hypertension	
Study ID	**Lei 2015 (objective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	patients randomised via an excel spreadsheet but no other details about method of randomisation provided (e.g., number table, alternate allocation).
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	No significant differences between the two groups
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.
	NA	not applicable
	NA	not applicable
	Y	All randomised participants are included in the analysis (ITT)
	NA	not applicable
	Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Data was available for all participants
	NA	not applicable
	NA	not applicable
	NA	not applicable
	Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measures were used
	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	PY	The patients were aware of the intervention received. It is not explicitely stated if trial researchers were blinded
	N	Sleep quality/MMSE are subjective outcome measures and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	NA	Participants in this study may have elected to participate in the study because of preconceived view of the beneficial effects of acupoint massage, therefore it is possible that the outcome was influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns	
	PN	No pre-specified analysis plan was available.

	Hypertension	
Study ID	**Lei 2015 (objective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias in selection of the reported result	PN	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.
	NI	No pre specified analysis plan makes it difficult to assess
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Constipation (chronic)		Functional constipation (chronic)	
Study ID	**Chen 2021**		**Ho 2020**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	No mention of the randomisation method	PN	Quasi experimental - participants were assigned according to the location of nursing homes, then participants were alternately allocated based on order of consent obtained.
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	PN	Reason to suspect that participants had knowledge of the forthcoming intervention (alternate allocation). 12 participants withdrew consent because of diarrhoea prior to the intervention and 8 participants ddid not participant because they felt uncertain about the intervention.
	N	No significant difference in terms of gender age and duration of symptoms	PY	Imbalance in one or more key prognostic factors, or baseline measures of outcome variable (chronic disease, fluid and fruit intake).
	Some concerns		**High**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that people delivering the intervention were aware of their allocated interventions.
	NI	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.	PN	Changes to intervention that are consistent with trial context
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Modified intention to treat	Y	Intent to treat specified.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Overall, 3 patients (2.9%) of 104 randomised dropped out from the trial after being randomised	N	90/110 (82%) of participants completed the intervention. Authors don't report on the number of participants missing per intervention arm.
	NA	Not applicable	PY	ITT (modified) - GEE model used to correct for missing data
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		**Low**	
	N	Validated outcome measures were used	N	Validated outcome measures were used
	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	PY	The patients were aware of the intervention received. It is not explicitely stated if trial researchers were blinded	N	RN's who were responbile for data collection were blinded

	Constipation (chronic)		Functional constipation (chronic)	
Study ID	**Chen 2021**		**Ho 2020**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	Participants in this study may have elected to participate in the study because of preconceived view of the beneficial effects of shiatsu, therefore it is possible that knowledge of the intervention affected self-reported outcomes.	NA	Not applicable
	PY	No evidence to suggest outcome assessment is substantially influencedd by the intervention received.	NA	Not applicable
	Some concerns		**Low**	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PN	No pre-specified analysis plan was available.	PY	No pre-specified analysis plan was available.
	PN	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.	PN	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.
	NI	No pre specified analysis plan makes it difficult to assess	NI	No pre specified analysis plan makes it difficult to assess
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**High risk**	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Neck and shoulder stiffness (chronic)		Fibromyalgia	
Study ID	**Donoyama 2010**		**Faull 2005**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The only information about randomisation is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.	NI	The only information about randomisation is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	N	No significant difference between the groups for baseline characteristics.	PY	There is reason to suspect problems with the randomisation process. A breakdown of baseline demographics was not provided for patients in each group.
	Some concerns		**High**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	3/8 (37.5%) participants randomised to the rest group first (before crossing over to Shiatsu) dropped out. Reasons provided were consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.	PN	4/8 (50%) participants randomised to the Aix arm first (before crossing over to the Watsu arm) withdrew or were excluded before receiving their watsu treatment. Reasons provided were consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	N	Modified ITT. Participants without final assessment data were excluded from the final analysis.	Y	Modified ITT. Participants without final assessment data were excluded from the final analysis.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	2/17 patients (>10%) dropped out after being randomised to the rest group.	PN	4/17 patients (23.5%) dropped out or were excluded after recieiving Aix as their first treatment
	PN	No analysis was conducted to assess the impact of not including these participants.	PN	No analysis was conducted to assess the impact of not including these participants.
	PN	There is no evidence to suggest that missing outcome data depended on its true value	PY	Missingness of the data considered possibly related to true value outcome (medical reasons)
	NA	Not applicable.	PY	Missingness of the data considered probably related to true value outcome, given that it was unbalanced between groups.

	Neck and shoulder stiffness (chronic)		Fibromyalgia	
Study ID	**Donoyama 2010**		**Faull 2005**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	**Some concerns**		**Some concerns**	
	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded to treatment allocation.	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded to treatment allocation.
	PY	The key outcomes such as pain and anxiety were subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The outcomes were subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
Bias in selection of the reported result	**Some concerns**		**Some concerns**	
	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**High risk**	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Chronic lower back pain	
Study ID	**Kobayashi 2019**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Randomisation was done by an independent person via a computer-generated randomisation list.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	N	No significant difference between the groups for baseline characteristics.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	9/59 (15.3%) did not complete the trial. Reasons for dropout were not provided. However, it was balanced between arms and is considered consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.
	Y	Intention to treat analysis, last observation carried forward was used for those lost to follow up. A per protocol analysis also occurred.
	NA	Not applicable.
Bias due to missing outcome data	**Low**	
	PN	9/59 (15.3%) participants dropped out in total. End of treatment data was available for 8/59 (13.6%) (>10% in each group).
	Y	Missing outcome data imputed using last observation carried forward. Also per-protocol analysis using complete cases only yielded similar results.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.

	Chronic lower back pain	
Study ID	**Kobayashi 2019**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias in measurement of the outcome	**Low**	
	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	N	Outcome assessors were blinded.
	PY	Included participant-reported outcome such as QoL, the short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, and are not sufficiently described, making it difficult to judge.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial y
applicable
Source: Chapter 8 C
interventions.

Notes: For the precis
answering each one

	Fibromyalgia	
Study ID	**Yuan 2013**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Participants were randomised into the intervention or control group based on the rehabilitation clinic they attended.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the allocation of each rehabilitation clinic.
	N	No significant difference between the groups for baseline characteristics.
	Some concerns	
Bias arising from the timing of identification and recruitment of individual participants	NI	The authors do not report whether the participants were identified and recruited before randomisation of the clusters.
	PN	There is no evidence to suggest that the selection of individual participants was affected by knowledge of the intervention assigned to the cluster.
	N	No significant difference between the groups for baseline characteristics.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	6/40 (15.0%) participants randomised to the intervention or control discontinued. Reasons provided were consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.
	N	Modified ITT. Participants without final assessment data were excluded from the final analysis.
	NA	Not applicable.
	Low	
Bias due to missing outcome	PN	6/40 (15.0%) of participants dropped out or were excluded from the final analysis after being randomised to the intervention or control group.
	PN	No analysis was conducted to assess the impact of not including these participants.

	Fibromyalgia	
Study ID	**Yuan 2013**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
data	PN	There is no evidence to suggest that missing outcome data depended on its true value
	NA	Not applicable.
	Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded to treatment allocation.
	PY	The key outcomes such as pain and anxiety were subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	**The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.**

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Primary Dysmenorrhea	
Study ID	**Soliman 2017**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	Participants were allocated at enrolment based on Group study levels (even/odd) Subjects selected based on convenience. Selection into the study was before the start of the intervention.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	PN	Key baseline characteristics did not appear to differ between the groups,
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	No mention of discontinuations or switches.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	Modified ITT. Participants without final assessment data were excluded from the final analysis.
	NA	Not applicable.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	NI	No information to make a judgement (no CONSORT)
	N	No information to make a judgement (no CONSORT)
	PY	Monthly diarys
	PN	No information to make a judgement (no CONSORT)
	Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	Participant/observer reported outcomes could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received as they require judgement that is susceptible to measurement bias.

	Primary Dysmenorrhea	
Study ID	**Soliman 2017**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
measurement of the outcome	PY	The key outcomes such as pain and anxiety were subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis was performed accordingly.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Pregnancy induction		Preterm infants	
Study ID	**Teimoori 2014**		**Sheng 2021**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Participants were randomised using the random table method.	Y	Participants were randomised using computer generated random table method.
	NI	Not reported	NI	Not reported
	N	Baseline characteristics were simlar across both the intervention and control groups. There was also no meaningful difference regarding number of previous labours, type of delivery and child weight.	PY	No statisitical difference between experimental and control groups
	Low		**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	no information provided regarding is patients were lost to follow up, deviated from the intended intervention	PN	Not reported, but no deviations according to CONSORT diagram
	NA	Not applicable	NA	NA
	NA	Not applicable	NA	NA
	Y	Intent to treat - modified.	Y	Intent to treat - modified
	N		NA	NA
	Some concerns		**Low**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Data was available for all participants	Y	Nearly all participants were included in the anlysis. 4 patients (retention rate 82%) withdrew from the intervention group, and 3 from the control group (retention rate 80%).
	NA	Not applicable	NA	NA
	NA	Not applicable	NA	NA
	NA	Not applicable	NA	NA
	Low		**Low**	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures

	Pregnancy induction		Preterm infants	
Study ID	**Teimoori 2014**		**Sheng 2021**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
	PN	It is not specified how the study calculated the frequency of spontaneous delivery of both groups. It is assumed they used the mean labour duration, mean labour initiation, bishop score results.	PN	Same methods of outcome measures were used between groups, but it is likely that time points varied between groups - as outcomes are related to milk expression. participants were guided by the same measurement guidelines and women are unable to control expression times
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	No information is provided on the blinding of assessors	Y	No blinding was used due to the nature of the intervention. Both researchers and participants were aware of the intervention
	N	Although participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, it is not likley that this influenced the objective outcomes of labour induction.	N	it is not possilble for the knowing of shiatsu to influence objective outcomes of milk expression
	N	No - as both the outcome and outcome measures are objective	N	No - as both the outcome and outcome measures are objective
	Low		**Low**	
	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan was available.	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan was available.
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).	N	There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).
	N		N	
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Premature infants	
Study ID	**Chen 2008**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	The only information is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	PN	Baseline characteristics were simlar across both the intervention and control groups.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants (baby and their parents) were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that the parents who administered the procedures were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	1/40 did not complete the trial. This was considered consistent with what would occur outside trial context.
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	PY	Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat model (or modified).
	PN	it is possible participants with missing data were not included in the analysis. How the authors included the participant with missing information is unknown.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	Data from 1/40 (<5%) participants missing from the final analysis. This was considered sufficiently small that outcomes were not affected.
	NA	not applicable
	NA	not applicable
	NA	not applicable
	Low	
	Y	Study used validated methods for outcome measures

	Premature infants	
Study ID	**Chen 2008**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
	PN	As described by the researchers 'the accuracy of weight measuring instrument was calibrated and tested to ensure accuracy'. Only one weight was used so it is likely to be accurate and not differ between intervention groups
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	The nurse who measured the weights of the babies were blind to which group the individual belonged to
	N	Although the baby and their parent were aware of the intervention they were receiving, it is not possible for the knowing of accupressure and merdian massage intervention to influence the objective outcomes of weight.
	N	The outcome is objective and the nurse was blinded to intervention groups.
	Low	
	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan was available.
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	Weight was measured everyday. However, the same scale was used and all key time points were reported
	N	
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial y
applicable
Source: Chapter 8 C
interventions.

Notes: For the precis
answering each one

	Burns	
Study ID	**Ardabili 2014**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The only information about randomisation is a statement that the study is randomised. There is an absence of specific information about generation of the randomisation sequence.
	NI	Allocation concealment not described. It is likely that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	NI	Baseline characterestics are not reported.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that instructors were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	The authors do not report whether deviations arose because of the trial context. (no CONSORT).
	NI	No information.
	NI	No information.
	Y	Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat model.
	PN	It is possible participants with missing data were not included in the analysis.
	Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	The authors do not specify that there was missing data for any participants. (no CONSORT).
	NI	No information.
	NI	No information.
	NI	No information.
	High	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	PN	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The study does not specify if assessors were blinded.
	PY	Participant-reported outcomes (pain) are subjective and could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns	
	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, and are not sufficiently described, making it difficult to judge.

	Burns	
Study ID	**Ardabili 2014**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	There are multiple publications from this study presenting different outcomes domains and measures, it is not clear if all the outcome measures have been reported.
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	High	
Overall risk of bias	**High risk**	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Post operative pain		Recovery after minimally invasive surgery	
Study ID	**Xia 2014**		**Ruan 2021**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
	Y	Patients were numbered by the admission sequence and then randomized into a treatment group and a control group	PY	Authors state the patients were randomised but there is no description of randomisation method
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	No information provided. Authors only report that participants were 'randomly assigned'.
	N	There were no significant differences in comparing age, gender, or calculus site between the two groups	N	No significant differences in baseline characteristics
	Low		**Some concerns**	
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that practitioners who administered acupoint massage were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that practitioners who administered acupoint massage were aware of the allocated interventions.
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NI	Not reported	PN	Assumed no deviations or dropouts. The same number of participants were in each treatment arm in the baseline characteristics table and the final outcomes table
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Intent to treat
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Some concerns		**Low**	
	Y	Data was available for all participants	Y	Data was available for all participants
Bias due to missing outcome data	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Low		**Low**	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures
	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	Y	Participants reported own outcomes	NI	The authors to not report details about the assessors or if the assessors were blinded.
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	The assessment of outcome is potentially influenced by knowledge of intervention received, leading to a judgement of at least 'Some concerns'.	PN	Key outcomes were objective so it is unlikely that assessment could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention

	Post operative pain		Recovery after minimally invasive surgery	
Study ID	**Xia 2014**		**Ruan 2021**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	No evidence the outcome assessment was substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	NA	Not applicable
	Some concerns		**Low**	
	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.
	N	There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).	N	There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Recovery after minimally invasive surgery		Recovery after minimally invasive surgery	
	Sui 2019		Zhenqing 2019 (objective)	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Patients were numbered by SPSS random generator and then randomized into a treatment group and a control group	PY	Authors state the randomisation method was reported in a previous study (Li-Li 2016) - 1:1 computer generated random number by third party personnel
	Y	Participants were allocated by an external unit, SPSS	Y	Participants were allocated by external personnel that was uninvolved in recruitment
	PN	Despite gender being imbalanced within each group, the gender composition and average age did not differ significicatly between groups.	N	No significant differences in baseline characteristics
	Low		**Low**	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that practitioners who administered acupoint massage were aware of the allocated interventions.	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that practitioners who administered acupoint massage were aware of the allocated interventions.
	PN	Assumed no deviations or dropouts were reported. The outcome tables states 'number of patients were 198 and 200, respectively'. It is assumed that these are consistent with what would occur outside the trial context.	NI	Not reported and no PRISMA chart available to validate.
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Intent to treat
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Low		**Some concerns**	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Data was available for all participants. Authors do not report on missing data	PY	Data was available for nearly all participants. Authors do not report on missing data
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Low		**Low**	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures
	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	NI	The authors to not report details about the assessors or if the assessors were blinded.	NI	The authors to not report details about the assessors or if the assessors were blinded.
	PN	Key outcomes were objective so it is unlikely that assessment could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention	PN	It is unlikely that assessment could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention for objective outcomes (ABG, DVT)

	Recovery after minimally invasive surgery		Recovery after minimally invasive surgery	
Study ID	**Sui 2019**		**Zhenqing 2019 (objective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in selection of the reported result	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		**Low**	
	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.
	N	There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).	N	There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).
	Some concerns		**Some concerns**	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial y
applicable
Source: Chapter 8 C
interventions.

Notes: For the precis
answering each one

	Recovery after minimally invasive surgery	
Study ID	**Zhenqing 2019 (subjective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	Authors state the randomisation method was reported in a previous study (Li-Li 2016) - 1:1 computer generated random number by third party personnel
	Y	Participants were allocated by external personnel that was uninvolved in recruitment
	N	No significant differences in baseline characteristics
	Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that participants were aware of their allocated interventions.
	Y	The nature of the interventions meant that practitioners who administered acupoint massage were aware of the allocated interventions.
	NI	Not reported and no PRISMA chart available to validate.
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	Y	Intent to treat
	NA	NA
	Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	Data was available for nearly all participants. Authors do not report on missing data
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures
	N	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	NI	The authors to not report details about the assessors or if the assessors were blinded.
	Y	The outcomes of pain and nause are subjective (by the patient) and could be influenced by knowledge of the intervention.

	Recovery after minimally invasive surgery	
Study ID	**Zhenqing 2019 (subjective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	No evidence the outcome assessment was substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	Some concerns	
	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.
	NI	Pain analysis intentions are not available, and there is more than one way in which the outcome measurement could have been analysed.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	**Some concerns**	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial y
applicable
Source: Chapter 8 C
interventions.

Notes: For the precis
answering each one

	Symptoms of stress		Symptoms of stress	
Study ID	**Lucini 2009 (objective outcomes)**		**Lucini 2009 (subjective outcomes)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
	PY	Baseline characteristics appear matched across the three treatment arms, but there is a difference between the subjective and some of the objective outcomes being measured (at baseline). There is potential that confounding may effect the intervention.	PY	There was no significant difference between baseline characteristics across the three treatment arms.
	N	Participants could not switch between intervention groups. There is no association between intervention and outcome that may be biased by time-varying confounding.	N	Participants could not switch between intervention groups. There is no association between intervention and outcome that may be biased by time-varying confounding.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
Bias due to confounding	PY	Authors used an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding domains.	PY	Authors used an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding domains.
	PY	The presence of concomitant diseases, pharmacological treatment or cigarette smoking, alcohol or food abuse was excluded by standard medical exam. An additional group of 110 healthy participants provided reference control values.	PY	The presence of concomitant diseases, pharmacological treatment or cigarette smoking, alcohol or food abuse was excluded by standard medical exam. An additional group of 110 healthy participants provided reference control values.
	N	No, the trialists did not control for any post intervention variables.	N	No, the trialists did not control for any post intervention variables.
	NA	Authors used an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding domains.	PY	Authors used an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding domains.
	NA	Not applicable	PY	
	Moderate		Moderate	
	N	70 consecutive patients assessed by semi-structured interview for presence of chronic stress. Key baseline characteristics were assessed before the start of the intervention.	Y	70 consecutive patients assessed by semi-structured interview for presence of chronic stress. Key baseline characteristics were assessed before the start of the intervention.
Bias of selection of participants into the study	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Participant outcome observations occurred at comparable time points.	Y	Participant outcome observations occurred at comparable time points.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low	
	Y	The intervention groups are clearly defined by type, setting, frequency, intensity and/or timing of intervention.	Y	The intervention groups are clearly defined by type, setting, frequency, intensity and/or timing of intervention.
	PY	Brief inclusion and exclusion criteria was described.	PY	Brief inclusion and exclusion criteria was described.
Bias in				

	Symptoms of stress		Symptoms of stress	
Study ID	**Lucini 2009 (objective outcomes)**		**Lucini 2009 (subjective outcomes)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**	**Judgement**	**Comments**
Bias in classification of interventions	PY	Patients were offered to follow an active or passive paradigm. Participants who declined received the inactive/educational advice. Preference for interventions offerred likely to influence outcome assessment.	PN	Patients were offered to follow an active or passive paradigm. Participants who declined received the inactive/educational advice. Preference for interventions offerred likely to influence outcome assessment.
	Moderate		Moderate	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	PN	There is an imbalance between treatment arm numbers, but the number of participants in each treatment arm did not change from prelimary assessment to end of treatment assessment at 3 months.	PN	There is an imbalance between treatment arm numbers, but the number of participants in each treatment arm did not change from prelimary assessment to end of treatment assessment at 3 months.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NI	The investigators did not report the use of co-intervention sin this study.	NI	The investigators did not report the use of co-interventions in this study.
	PY	Presumably yes as all participants completed the study, however not explicitly stated.	PY	Presumably yes as all participants completed the study, however not explicitly stated.
	PY	Presumable yes, as the number of participants in each treatment arm remained the same in the baseline and end of treatment results.	PY	Presumable yes, as the number of participants in each treatment arm remained the same in the baseline and end of treatment results.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low	
Bias due to missing data	Y	All participants results was included in the final outcome data	Y	All participants results was included in the final outcome data
	NI	The trial report provides no information about the extent of missing outcome data.	NI	The trial report provides no information about the extent of missing outcome data.
	NI	The trial report provides no information about the extent of missing outcome data.	NI	The trial report provides no information about the extent of missing outcome data.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of outcomes	PN	Measures such as heart rate, respiratory rate andd bloodd pressure not likely influenced by knowledge of intervention received.	Y	Patients used self rated scales to report subjective outcomes. When there are strong levels of belief in either beneficial or harmful effects of the intervention, it is more likely that the outcome was influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	NI	The investigators did not report if objective outcome assessors were blinded	Y	Participants self reported outcomes
	Y	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.	Y	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.

Study ID	Symptoms of stress		Symptoms of stress	
	Lucini 2009 (objective outcomes)		Lucini 2009 (subjective outcomes)	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	There is no evidence to suggest that the outcome assessors may have been influenced to bias the outcome data.	PN	There is no evidence to suggest that the outcome assessors may have been influenced to bias the outcome data.
	Low		Moderate	
	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.	N	Measurements were made at the same time point for each of the outcomes in each intervention group.
	PN	Several different analytical methods to analyse the effect of the intervention, which was pre-specified andd appropriate for exploratory NRSI.	PN	Several different analytical methods to analyse the effect of the intervention, which was pre-specified andd appropriate for exploratory NRSI.
	PN	Probably not, given that all outcomes for all participants is reported (i.e. no overt evidence that subgroup analyses were conducted).	PN	Probably not, given that all outcomes for all participants is reported (i.e. no overt evidence that subgroup analyses were conducted).
	Low		Low	
Overall bias of the study	Moderate risk	The study appears to provide sound evidence for a nonrandomised study but cannot be considered comparable to a well-performed randomised trial.	Moderate risk	The study appears to provide sound evidence for a nonrandomised study but cannot be considered comparable to a well-performed randomised trial.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Pregnancy, prenatal	
Study ID	**Schitter 2015 (subjective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias due to confounding	PY	There is no evidence that pre-intervention variables (i.e. breech presentation and primiparious) that have the potential for confounding of the effect of the intervention in this study, have been controlled for.
	PN	No switching between groups, therefore no time varying confouding. All assessments occurred on day 4 (end of treatment) and day 8 (followup)
	NA	Not applicable.
	PN	Important confounding domains were not accounted for. In particular, 8/9 (88%) participant in the control group had breech presentation, some of whom received external cephalic version . This is compared with 2/8 (25%) in the control group.
	NA	Not applicable.
	NI	There is no evidence to suggest that the trialists controlled for any post intervention variables.
	NI	There is no information suggesting that the authors used an appropriate analysis method that adjusted for all the important confounding domains and for timevarying confounding.
	NA	Not applicable.
	Serious	
Bias of selection of participants into the study	PN	Selection was based on the charateristics observed before the start of the intervention and potential confounding was controlled for at baseline.
	NA	
	NA	
Bias in classification of interventions	Y	Participant outcome observation occurred at comparable time points.
	NA	
	Low	
	Y	The intervention groups are clearly defined by type, setting, frequency, intensity and/or timing of intervention.
	Y	Interventions are clearly defined at start
	N	Classification of intervention status is clearly defined
	Low	

	Pregnancy, prenatal	
Study ID	**Schitter 2015 (subjective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	PY	Participants were allocated to the passive control group, if they refused to undergo intervention - prior to commencement of study
	PY	No significant differences between baselines characteristics, besides breech presentation.
	NI	There were no co-interventions discussed in this study.
	Y	There is no reason to believe the interventions were not delivered as intended
	Y	Once allocated, participants adhered to assigned intervetion regimen
	NA	N/A
	Moderate	
Bias due to missing data	N	Overall, 3 (38%) of 8 participants dropped out from the control group
	N	Authors report that all drop out participants lost interest in the studyt
	N	Authors report that all drop out participants lost interest in the study
	N	38% of participants dropped out from the control group only
	PY	Analysis methods were performed to correct for bias, last value carried forward
	Serious	
Bias in measurement of outcomes	PY	Subjective outcomes could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	PY	It is likely that outcome assors weren't blinided and some of the subjective outcomes were self reported.
	Y	The same measurement methods and thresholds are used at comparable time points.
	N	No reason to suspect misclassification of outcomes
	Moderate	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PN	There is clear evidence in the results that all eligible reported data for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements. Although stresswas measured using multiple scales (VAS and PSS) at multiple time points, all data was reported.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	N	No subgroups
	Low	
Overall bias of the study	Serious risk	The study has some important problems

	Pregnancy, prenatal	
Study ID	**Schitter 2015 (subjective)**	
	Judgement	**Comments**

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of

Notes: For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.