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*If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

*Records identified from: Databases (n = 4011) Registers (n = 0)

Records removed before screening:
- Duplicate records removed (n = 71)
- Records marked as ineligible by automation tools (n = 0)
- Records removed for other reasons (n = 0)

Records identified from:
- Websites (n = 0)
- Organisations (n = 0)
- Citation searching (n = 2) etc.

Records screened (n = 3940)

Records excluded** (n = 3832)

Reports sought for retrieval (n = 108)

Reports not retrieved (n = 11)

Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 97)

Reports excluded:
- Not relevant outcome (n = 55)
- Not relevant publication type (n = 32)
- Not in English (n = 3)

Studies included in review (n = 9)
Reports of included studies (n = 9)