

The risk of bias contents of the included trials

Bi SZ 2007[23]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups" and author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)			√	No specific blind method was described and author was not contacted.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)		√		Based on checking the outcome measures in Analysis and Method sections, there might be no selective report.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Chang MJ 2013[25]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)			√	No specific blind method was described and author was not contacted.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)		√		Based on checking the outcome measures in Analysis and Method sections, there might be no selective report.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Ding XY 2006[20]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Gu XX 2005[16]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)		√		Based on checking the outcome measures in Analysis and Method sections, there might be no selective report.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

He P 2013[21]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Jia ZC 2011[29]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Li DR 2003[31]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)		√		We observed through the paper that random number table grouping was used.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)		√		We observed the use of single-blind method through the paper.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)		√		Based on checking the outcome measures in Analysis and Method sections, there might be no selective report.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Li JK 2013[26]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Liang Y 2012[27]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Shen HJ 2010[30]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Wang SJ 2017[33]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

WangWP 2010[32]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)			√	No specific blind method was described and author was not contacted.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Zhang AM 2008[22]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	√			Adverse events were not described in detail, there might be selective reporting.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Zhou JM 2008[24]

Bias \ Authors' judgement	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding was used.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)		√		Based on checking the outcome measures in Analysis and Method sections, there might be no selective report.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.

Zhu Y 2011[28]

Authors' judgement Bias	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)			√	Unclear based on "randomized into two groups", author was not contacted.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)			√	No mention was in the paper and author was not contacted.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)			√	No specific blind method was described and author was not contacted.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	√			We observed through the paper that no blinding on outcomes assessors in the trials.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition)		√		Based on checking the number of patients in Analysis section and randomized number, there might be no missing data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)		√		Based on checking the outcome measures in Analysis and Method sections, there might be no selective report.
Other bias			√	Unclear due to lack of eligible information.