|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions | | | | | | | | |
| Study ID | Confounding | Selection of participants into the study | Classification of interventions | Deviations from intended interventions | Missing outcome data | Measurement of the outcome | Selection of the reported result | Overall Bias |
| Carhart-Harris 2018 | Serious Risk | Low | N/A (single arm trial) | Low | Low | Serious Risk | Serious Risk | Serious Risk |
| Anderson 2020 | Serious Risk | Low | N/A (single arm trial) | Low | Low | Serious Risk | Low | Serious Risk |
| Zeifman 2020 | Serious Risk | Low | N/A (single arm trial) | Low | Low | Serious Risk | Low | Serious Risk |
| Gasser 2014 (Phase 2) | Serious Risk | Serious Risk | N/A (single arm trial) | Low | Low | Low | Serious Risk | Serious Risk |
| **Supplemental Table 2** *Risk of Bias Assessment using the Cochrane Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool*. Assessments for the non-randomized trials included in this meta-analysis, across the 7 domains used by the ROBINS-I tool are listed. As all of the above represent open-label, single arm trials, in which there was only one intervention group, no bias was present due to misclassification of subjects in different interventions. Similarly to the RCT’s, much of the appreciated bias in these trials was due to the use of multiple scales being used to assess the same outcomes (i.e. depression & anxiety) as well as the potential for patients’ knowledge of the interventions’ purposes to influence measurement of the outcomes. | | | | | | | | |