Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Food & Function. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2023

Supplementary Table 1: Results of assess the methodological quality of meta-analysis.

Study	Q1 ¹	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q 7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Quality assessment
Zhou et al. 2019	No	Yes	No	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Zheng et al. 2013	No	Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	No	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Moderate
Szajewska et al. 2010	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	No	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Szajewska et al. 2015	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	High
Szajewska et al. 2015	No	Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Part ial Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Yu et al. 2019	No	Partia 1 Yes	No	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Moderate
Zhang et al. 2015	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Moderate
McFarland et al. 2015	No	Partia 1 Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Muhan Lu et al. 2016	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Moderate
McFarland et al. 2016	No	Partia 1 Yes	No	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Dang et al. 2014	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Moderate
Lau et al. 2016	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Moderate
ZHIFA et al. 2015	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Partial Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Moderate

Sachdeva et al.2009	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	High								
Tong et al.2007	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	No	High							
Zhang et al.2020	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	No	High							
Gong et al.2015	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	High								
Wang et al. 2013	No	Partia 1 Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Part ial Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	High

Each question was answered with "Yes", "Partial Yes" or "No". When no meta-analysis was done, question 11, 12 and 15 were answered with "No meta-analysis conducted

^{* 1.} Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO? 2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? 4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? 5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? 6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? 8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? 9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? 10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review? 11. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? 12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis? 13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review? 14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review? 15. If they performed quantitative synthesis, did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?