# SMS-Based Interventions on Medication Adherence and Blood Pressure Control among Hypertensive Individuals in Low-Resource Settings: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

### Mark Kenneth R. Narca<sup>1</sup>, Jessica Jill B. Wee<sup>2</sup>, and Jaime Kristoffer Tan Punzalan<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ateneo de Zamboanga University - School of Medicine, Philippiness <sup>2</sup>Margosatubig Regional Hospital, Philippiness

### Abstract

This study examines the effect of SMS-based interventions on medication adherence and blood pressure. The inclusion criteria were randomized controlled trials and quasi-experimental designs for SMS-based interventions excluding online messaging applications between 2010 and 2022, in English, with participants clinically diagnosed with hypertension on anti-hypertensive medication, aged 18 and above, regardless of comorbidities. PubMed, Google Scholar, and EBSCOHost were used for the search. A risk of Bias assessment was done. Out of the 5,503 articles identified, 11 studies were quality-assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias tool and systematically reviewed. Seven studies were included for the quantitative assessment and analyzed using the continuous random effects model. SMS-based interventions are estimated to increase medication adherence scores by SMD 0.28 (95% Cl, 0.12 to 0.44, p = 0.0005) and decrease systolic blood pressure by SMD -0.11 (95% Cl, -0.20 to -0.02, p = 0.02). However, it has no benefit in diastolic blood pressure reduction SMD 0.00 (95% Cl, -0.25 to 0.24, p = 0.98). Thus, SMS-based interventions can be considered to improve adherence and BP outcomes among patients with hypertension, especially in low-resource settings.

Keywords: SMS-based interventions; Medication adherence; Blood pressure control; Low-resource setting

### Background

Hypertension is a medical condition known to affect 650 million to 1.28 billion adults worldwide in the last 30 years. It also increases the risk for life-threatening conditions such as cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases. However, despite the widely available evidence that supports the efficacy of antihypertensive medications in controlling blood pressure and preventing hypertensive complications, patient adherence is still reported to be as low as 20- 50% [1]. In low- and middle-income countries, the adherence rate is reported to be about 66% for those receiving treatment, while the hypertension control rate is only 20% [2]. Nonadherence to antihypertensive medications may be associated with many factors, such as medication cost, poor health literacy and awareness, and individual attitudes. Still, the most cited reason for nonadherence is a patient forgetting to take their medications [3].

The World Health Organization recommends utilizing mobile phones to provide remote health services as a practical solution for maintaining patient health in low-income countries or rural areas. This approach, called mHealth, involves using mobile phones to send text messages or access smartphone applications to improve health outcomes. As mobile phones are widely used globally, particularly in areas with limited resources, they are an excellent option for delivering healthcare services. Studies have

Submitted: 30 May 2024 | Accepted: 21 June 2024 | Published: 24 June 2024

\*Corresponding author: Jaime Kristoffer Tan Punzalan, Ateneo de Zamboanga University - School of Medicine, Philippiness, Tel: 09277707966

**Copyright:** © 2024 Narca MK, Wee JJ, Tan Punzalan JK, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Narca MK, Wee JJ, Tan Punzalan JK (2024) SMS-Based Interventions on Medication Adherence and Blood Pressure Control among Hypertensive Individuals in Low-Resource Settings: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. SM J Public Health Epidemiol 7: 7. shown that SMS-based interventions can enhance medication adherence and health outcomes [4-6]. Hypertension is a chronic health condition that can benefit from these interventions.

Therefore, with the established crucial role of medication adherence in the prevention of the complications of hypertension and with the low statistics on antihypertensive medication adherence, there is a necessity to explore, assess, and thus commit to the development and application of interventions that focus on improving antihypertensive medications adherence and blood pressure control in low-resource settings. This study aims to explore existing literature assessing the effect of SMSbased intervention on medication adherence and blood pressure.

### Methodology

# **Research Design:**

This paper reviewed studies on SMS-based interventions' impact on medication adherence and blood pressure among hypertensive individuals. Moreover, despite this paper's intent to find and assess all studies that meet the inclusion criteria, some studies may have been missed, which are attributable to limitations such as the (a) lack of access to other databases (i.e., EMBASE, etc.) which requires payment to access and (b) the limitation of only including studies written in the English language which may introduced language bias. The study also did not determine the best intervention or analyze the intervention duration and frequency's impact.

# Criteria

Studies included in this systematic review and meta-analysis were those with randomized controlled trials and quasi-experimental designs that utilized isolated or in-combination SMS-based interventions to improve anti-hypertensive drug compliance and blood pressure between 2010 and 2022. The types of participants that are included in these studies are those (a) clinically diagnosed with hypertension who are on anti-hypertensive medications, (b) 18 years of age and above, and (c) with or without known comorbidities, (d) studies that include participants with other forms of chronic diseases, but the majority are those with hypertension. The outcome variables of the studies included



# 

are (a) Morisky Medications Adherence Scale (MMAS-8), (b) Medication Adherence Questionnaire (MAQ), (c) Systolic blood pressure (SBP) and Diastolic blood pressure (DBP) quantified in mmHG scale and measured using calibrated anabolic sphygmomanometers and stethoscopes, and (4) Pill count. The control variable of the included studies is the absence of SMS-based intervention in the standard of care or those control that does not have a conclusive and direct consequence on assessing the effect of SMS-based interventions on medication adherence and blood pressure outcomes.

### **Exclusion Criteria**

Studies on SMS-based interventions for medication adherence were included only if they provided analysis for specific populations or supplementary materials. Lastly, to focus on interventions appropriate for low-resource settings, studies that utilized SMS-based format interventions integrated into platforms requiring internet access (i.e., WeChat or Viber) were also excluded.

### Search Methods for Identification of Studies

The studies were searched and identified through 3 databases, PubMed, Google Scholar, and EBSCOHost. The preliminary index search term used was "hypertension" OR "hypertensive" AND "medication adherence" OR "medication compliance" AND "SMS" OR "text messages" OR "SMS-based interventions." The complete index search terms used for each database are presented in Supplementary Table 1.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

**Selection of Studies:** An independent review of each paper's title, abstract, and full text was conducted. Data that were reviewed and extracted were coded into the RevMan 5.4.1 software. The supplementary materials for each study were also utilized whenever available.

**Risk of Bias Assessment:** Critical appraisal includes (1) random sequence generation; (2) allocation concealment; (3) blinding of participants and personnel; (4) blinding of outcome assessment; (5) incomplete data outcome; (6) selective reporting; and (7) other biases. The review did not assess publication bias due to insufficient included trials for proper assessment through funnel plots or regression-based assessments.

**Data Analysis:** The RevMan 5.4.1 software was used to synthesize the data. The mean difference, standard deviation, 95% confidence interval, and sample size were extracted from the studies included in the quantitative review. A continuous random effects model was used to calculate the standard mean difference between groups.

**Measurement of Treatment Effect:** The outcome results were calculated for each study using inverse variance and a total confidence interval of 95%. Continuous outcomes such as scores from adherence scales, SBP, and DBP were expressed as mean difference (MD) and were then converted to be evaluated as standardized mean differences (SMD). The interpretation of the standard mean difference is per the recommendations that an SMD value of 0.2 represents minor effects, 0.5 represents moderate effects, and 0.8 represents significant effects [7]. Furthermore, the evaluation of SMD is based on the presentation relative to the outcome being examined.

**Assessment of Heterogeneity:** The Chi-squared and I2 assessed statistical heterogeneity. Chi-squared results with a p-value of p = >0.05 were interpreted to have a low probability of sampling error. Analysis with I<sup>2</sup> results of 0%-40%; 30%-60%; 50%-90%; 75%-100% were interpreted as having insignificant, moderate, substantial, and considerable heterogeneity, respectively.

# Results

# **Study Selection**

The Preferred Reporting of Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guides the data collection and analysis process and is depicted in Figure 1. A total of 5,053 studies were identified from the following databases: PubMed (n = 650), EBSCOHost (n = 113), and Google Scholar (n = 4,290). 11 RCTs were included in this review after a systematic search of 5,053 studies from various databases. Three thousand nine hundred forty-six studies were excluded during the title and abstract screening for being irrelevant, and 77 more were excluded for various reasons.



# JSM Centra

### **Description of Studies Included**

Out of the 2,854 participants from eleven randomized controlled trials that met the inclusion criteria, the majority (72%) of the studies showed promising results in this area [8-15]. Two (18%) studies utilized other interventions, such as nurse-led programs. The results of the review indicate that reminder text messaging, coupled with educational content on medication, lifestyle habits (such as diet, exercise, smoking cessation, abstinence from alcohol, and weight management), and the consequences of nonadherence, can positively impact medication adherence and reduce blood pressure among hypertensive individuals.

### **Quality Assessment of Included Studies**

Quality assessment of the studies includes (1) random sequence generation; (2) allocation concealment; (3) blinding of participants and personnel; (4) blinding of outcome assessment; (5) incomplete data outcome; (6) selective reporting; and (7) other biases. The classification schemes are reported based on the evaluation of the various components and are as follows:

**Selection Bias:** In two studies [12,14], the method for randomization and allocation concealment needed to be specified, resulting in an unclear selection bias. As a result, it is difficult to make a judgment due to a lack of information. One study was determined to have a high risk for selection bias because the principal investigator administering the intervention conducted the randomization and allocation process [16]. This could lead to bias as the knowledge could impact the delivery of the intervention and the allocation of participants. The remaining eight studies (72%) reported a low risk for selection bias, as proper measures were taken to eliminate or minimize selection bias and were duly reported.

**Performance Bias:** In 10 (91%) of the studies, performance bias was reported as "low risk" because either the participants, key study personnel, and outcome assessors were blinded or the included studies underwent no blinding. Still, outcome assessments were deemed unlikely to introduce bias. 1 (9%) was assessed with unclear risk for performance bias because the article presented insufficient information to permit judgment of either low or high risk of bias [12].

**Attrition Bias:** In 10 (91%) studies, the judgment is "low risk" for attrition bias because there are (a) no missing outcomes, (b) the reason for missing outcome data is unlikely to be related to the actual outcome, (c) missing outcome data is balanced in number across intervention groups, or (d) plausible effect size among missing outcomes is not enough to have a clinically relevant impact on observed effect size. Finally, 2 (18%) of the studies had insufficient reporting of attrition and are therefore judged as having "unclear risk [17,18].

**Detection Bias:** In 10 (91%) studies, detection bias was assessed to have a low risk of bias because either an independent person who was not part of the study or involved in the intervention was tasked with outcome assessment, or no blinding was done. Still, outcome assessments were deemed unlikely to introduce bias. Moreover, 1 (9%) had no blinding of outcome assessment, and it was not indicated whether it affected the result overall. Therefore, insufficient information permits judgment [12]. Thus, it was judged as having an "unclear risk for detection bias."

**Reporting Bias:** Of 10 studies, 91% reported all the expected primary and secondary outcomes thoroughly. The results of all studies included relevant information like confidence intervals. However, one study (9%) is at high risk for reporting bias because they used the Hill-Bone Compliance to High Blood Pressure Therapy Scale within their study [11].

**Overall Risk of Bias:** Two of the 11 studies included were deemed high risk for selection and reporting bias. In comparison, four studies considered an unclear risk for selection, performance, detection, and attrition bias. Several studies had unclear or high risks of bias in

allocation, random sequence generation, selection, blinding, attrition, and reporting. However, five studies had a low risk of bias for all domains, indicating a range of high to low-quality studies. Supplementary Figures 1 and 2 depict the bias graph and summary risk, respectively.

### **Restriction of primary analysis**

This review established a threshold for the restriction of primary analysis to exclude studies with high or unclear risk of bias for three domains:selection, performance, and detection. The results of the primary analysis can be found in Figure 2. Therefore, 3 of the studies judged as having high/unclear risk for selection bias, performance bias, and detection bias have been excluded from the primary analysis [12,14,16]. The study of Varleta et al., also needed to provide supplementary information that allowed the computation of medication adherence-mean difference between study groups. Additionally, one study that was judged a high risk for reporting bias due to inconsistent data presentation, which may affect the overall effect of interventions, has also been excluded. Hence, four studies were excluded from the primary analysis [11].

### **Meta-Analysis Results on Medication Adherence Scores**

Five studies in the review measured medication adherence using validated standardized scales, four used the Morisky Medication Adherence Scale (MMAS-8), and one used the Hill-Bone Compliance to High Blood Pressure Therapy Scale (HB-HCT). The five studies included and their corresponding study weight is as follows: (1) Akhu-Zaheya et al., 14.6%, (2) Bhandari et al., 24.0%, (3) Buis et al., 15.1%, (4) Pour et al., 8.4%, and Zhai et al., 37.9%. The meta-analysis through a continuous random-effects model found a small but statistically significant estimate of the improvement in adherence scale score 0.28 (95% CI, 0.12 to 0.44, p = <0.05), which favors the experimental (intervention). Furthermore, the test for overall effect is Z = 3.48 (p = 0.0005), indicating a significant pooled effects difference between the two groups, favoring the intervention. Lastly, the test for heterogeneity revealed that Chi-squared = 5.04, df = 4 (p = 0.28), which indicates that there is no significant heterogeneity between studies that are attributable to sampling error, and an  $I^2 = 21\%$ indicates that there is negligible heterogeneity and the studies included in the review are homogenous.

### **Meta-Analysis Results on Systolic Blood Pressure**

Six studies in the review measure the participants' pre-intervention and post-intervention systolic blood pressures. The six studies included, and their corresponding weight are as follows: (1) Bhandari et al., 8.3%, (2) Bobrow et al., 57.7%, (3) Buis et al., 6.0%, (4) Mehta et al., 4.2%, (5) Pour et al., 3.0%, and (6) Zhai et al., 20.9%. The meta-analysis through a continuous random-effects model found a small, statistically significant estimate of the improvement in systolic blood pressure -0.11 (95% CI, -0.20 to -0.02, p = <0.05), favoring the intervention for reducing systolic blood pressure. Furthermore, the test for overall effect is Z = 2.38 (p = 0.02), indicating a significant pooled effects difference between the two groups, favoring the intervention. Lastly, the test for heterogeneity revealed that Chi-squared = 3.44, df = 5 (p = 0.63), which indicates that there is no significant heterogeneity between studies that are attributable to sampling error and an I<sup>2</sup> = 0% suggests that there is no heterogeneity and that the studies included in the review are homogenous.

# **Meta-Analysis Results on Diastolic Blood Pressure**

Five studies in the review measure the participants' pre-intervention and post-intervention diastolic blood pressure. The five studies included and their corresponding weight are as follows: (1) Bhandari et al., 22.2%, (2) Buis et al., 19.4%, (3) Mehta et al., 16.1%, (4) Pour et al., 13.4%, and (5) Zhai, et al., 28.9%. The meta-analysis through the continuous random-effects model found no significant estimate of the improvement in diastolic blood pressure SMD 0.00 (95% CI, -0.25 to 0.24, p = 0.98). This indicates that the intervention has no significant effect in lowering



Figure 2: Forest plot using continuous random effects model on the effect of SMS interventions on medication adherence, systolic, and diastolic blood pressure.

diastolic blood pressure compared to control. Moreover, the test for overall effect is Z = 0.03 (p = 0.98), indicating a statistically insignificant pooled effects difference between groups. Lastly, the test for heterogeneity revealed that Chi-squared = 9.60, df = 4 (p = 0.05), which indicates a statistically significant risk for sampling error, and I<sup>2</sup> = 58%, which translates to moderate heterogeneity.

### **Sensitivity Analysis**

•

Figure 3 depicts the sensitivity analysis conducted with the inclusion of studies at high or unclear risk for the domains of selection bias, performance bias, and detection bias. The seven studies included and their corresponding weight are as follows: (1) Akhu-Zaheya, et al., 14.3%, 2017, (2) Bhandari et al., 15,1%, 2022, (3) Buis et al., 2017, 14.4%, (4) Kes, et al., 2022, 12.2%, (5) Movahedi, et al., 14.8%, 2019, (6) Pour, et al., 2020, 13.2%, and (7) Zhai et al., 2020, 15.5%. The meta-analysis through the continuous random-effects model found a moderate effect in improving medication adherence scores among individuals with hypertension SMD, 0.68 (95% CI, 0.23 to 1.14; p = 0.003). The test for overall effect is Z = 2.94 (p = 0.003), indicating a statistically significant improvement in medication adherence scores. However, the test for heterogeneity revealed that Chi-squared = 75.37, df = 6 (p = <0.00001), which indicates a statistically significant risk for sampling error and an  $1^2 = 92\%$ , which translates to considerable heterogeneity.

Eight studies in the sensitivity analysis measure the participants' pre-intervention and post-intervention systolic blood pressure. The eight studies included and their corresponding weight are as follows: (1) Bhandari et al., 2022, 13.1%, (2) Bobrow et al., 2016, 16.0%, (3) Buis et al., 2017, 12.1% (4) Kes, et al., 2022, 9.9%, (5) Mehta, et al., 2019, 10.9%, (6) Movahedi, et al., 2019, 13.5% (7) Pour, et al., 2020, 9.6%, and (8) Zhai et al., 2020, 15.0%. The continuous random effects model

meta-analysis found a small effect in reducing systolic blood pressure among individuals with hypertension SMD - 0.35 (95% CI, -0.60 to -0.10; p = 0.006). The test for overall effect is Z = 2.74 (p = 0.006), indicating a statistically significant reduction in systolic blood pressure. The test for heterogeneity Chi-squared = 42.36, df = 7 (p = <0.0001) indicates a statistically significant risk for sampling error, and an  $I^2 = 83\%$  indicates considerable heterogeneity.

The sensitivity analysis measured the pre-intervention and postintervention of diastolic blood pressure included seven studies. The seven studies included and their corresponding weight are as follows: (1) Bhandari et al., 2022, 15.4%, (2) Buis et al., 2017,14.3%, (3) Kes et al., 2022, 12.4%, (4) Mehta, et al., 2019, 12.9%, (5) Movahedi, et al., 2019, 16.0%, (6) Pour et al., 2020, 11.5%, and (7) Zhai et al., 2020, 17.5%. The meta-analysis through the continuous random effects model found a small but statistically insignificant effect in the reduction of diastolic blood pressure among hypertensive individuals with SMD of -0.13 (95% CI, -0.41 to 0.15; p = 0.36). The test for overall effect is Z = 0.92 (p = 0.36), which indicates a statistically insignificant reduction in diastolic blood pressure. The test for heterogeneity reveals a Chi-squared = 27.84, df = 6 (p = 0.00001), indicating a statistically significant risk for sampling error and an I2 = 78% representing considerable heterogeneity between studies.

### Discussion

Studies have shown that SMS-based interventions can improve medication adherence for hypertensive individuals. The interventions often include educational content about hypertension, covering information on medication, lifestyle changes (such as diet, exercise, smoking cessation, and weight loss), and the consequences of not adhering to treatment. Reminder text messages are also commonly

1.1.2 Adherence scale           Akhu-Zaheya 2017         0           Bhandari 2022         4           Buis 2017         0           Kes 2022         20.0           Movahedi 2019         12.4           Pour 2020         5.1           Zhai 2020         0	).3 2.0488		The second	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEF
Akhu-Zaheya 2017         0           Bhandari 2022         4           Buis 2017         0           Kes 2022         20.0           Movahedi 2019         12.4           Pour 2020         5.1           Zhai 2020         0	0.3 2.0488						,,		
Bhandari 2022         4           Buis 2017         0           Kes 2022         20.0           Movahedi 2019         12.4           Pour 2020         5.1           Zhai 2020         0	2.0.00	52	-0,76	2.2595	56	14,3%	0,49 [0.10. 0.87]	- <b>-</b> -	
Buis 2017         0           Kes 2022         20.0           Movahedi 2019         12.4           Pour 2020         5.1           Zhai 2020         0	16 / 00000	100	1.6	7 4004	100	15 1 04	0 47 [0 10 0 74]	_ <b>_</b> _	
Kes 2017         0           Kes 2022         20.0           Movahedi 2019         12.4           Pour 2020         5.1           Zhai 2020         0	+	.00	1.3	1.4001	.00	14 40	0.33 [0.16, 0.73]		
Kes 2022 20.0 Movahedi 2019 12.4 Pour 2020 5.1 Zhai 2020 0	.a 2	57	0.5	1.5	53	14.4%	0.22 [-0.15, 0.60]		
Movahedi 2019 12.4 Pour 2020 5.1 Zhai 2020 0	US 6.97	39	6.11	4.94	38	12.7%	2.28 [1.70, 2.86]		
Pour 2020 5.1 Zhai 2020 0	45 9.4943	97	-0.48	10.7509	91	14.8%	1.27 [0.96, 1.59]		
Zhai 2020 0	17 10.5223	42	4.48	15.874	21	13.2%	0.05 [-0.47, 0.58]		
	).5 1.915	192	0.2	1.8328	192	15.5%	0.16 [-0.04, 0.36]	<del> _</del>	
Subtotal (95% CI)		579	0.2	1.0020	551	100.0%	0.68 [0.23, 1.14]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.34; Test for overall effect: Z = 2	; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 75.3 94 (P = 0.00	7, df = 6 13)	(P < 0.0	10001); I <sup>z</sup> =	92%	1001070	0.00 [0.20, 111]	•	
Total (95% CI)		579			551	100.0%	0.68 [0.23, 1.14]	•	
Heterogeneity Tour = 0.34	- Chiř – 75 3	7 df - 6	(P < 0.0	100011:18-	97%	1001070	0.00 [0.20, 1.14]	++	
Tration events and a close	, on m = 70.0	2, ui – 0 20	() = 0.0	10001),1 =	32.0			-4 -2 0 2 4	
Testilor overall ellect. Z = 2.								Favours [control] Favours [experimenta	1]
rest for subgroup dilierenc	ces. Not app	icable							
<u>Risk of bias legend</u>									
(A) Random sequence ger	neration (sel	ection b	ias)						
(B) Allocation concealment	t (selection b	ias)							
(C) Blinding of participants	and nerson	nel (ner	formand	e bias)					
(D) Blinding of outcome as	sessment (	letection	hias)	0 0100)					
(E) Incomplete outcome de	ata (attrition h	iae'	, Jiaa)						
(E) incomplete outcome da	ata (attrition b	105)							
(F) Selective reporting (repo	orting bias)								
(G) Other bias									
Study or Subgroup M	Experiment lean S	al D Tota	l Mean	Control SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Riskof Bia ABCDEF
1.2.2 SBP assessed	-								
Bhandari 2022 -7	7 09 20 569	4 70	.077	14 1002	75	13.1%	-0.35[-0.67]-0.041		
Pobrow 2016 2.0-	607 24 417	2 000	. 0.77	24 6747	200	16.0%	0.00[0.07,-0.04]	-	ă ă ă ă ă ă
B0010W 2010 -2.9:	007 24.417	2 000	1.1	24.07.57	390	10.0%	-0.08 [-0.20, 0.04]		
Buis 2017 -1	12.6 2	4 57	-11.3	25.5	53	12.1%	-0.05 [-0.43, 0.32]		
Kes 2022 -20	0.12 8.472	8 38	-6.08	10.1528	38	9.9%	-1.49 [-2.00, -0.98]		
Mehta 2019 -	-4.6 19.	8 48	-4.7	23.4	32	10.9%	0.00 [-0.44, 0.45]	<del></del>	
Movahedi 2019 -14	4.53 21.343	2 97	-0.5	19.0939	91	13.5%	-0.69 (-0.98, -0.39)		• •
Pour 2020 -11	1 17 20 144	5 41	-447	26 1088	21	9.6%	-0.30 (-0.83, 0.23)		
Zhai 2020 1	11 5 00 764	1 101	2 0.43	26 4004	100	16.00	-0.13[0.33,0.23]	_ <b>_</b>	ě ě ě ě ě ě
Subtotal (95% Cl)	11.0 20.704	135/	0.3 I	20.4090	800	100.0%	-0.35[-0.60]-0.401	▲	
Subtotal (35% Cl)		1554			030	100.070	-0.55 [-0.00, -0.10]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.10;	; Chi*= 42.38	ν, ατ = 7	(P < 0.0	0001); I* =	83%				
Test for overall effect. $Z = Z$ .	es: Not appl:	o) icable					F	avours [evnerimental] Eavours [control]	
Risk of bias legend		10.00						avours (experimental) in avours (control)	
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen	neration (sel	ection bi	as)					avoirs (experimental) in avoirs (control)	
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment	neration (sele t (selection b	action bi as)	as)						
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants :	neration (sele t (selection b and personr	ection bi ias) iel (perfi	as) ormanc	e bias)				aroura (experimental) in aroura (control)	
(A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome ass	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d	ection bi ias) iel (perfi etection	as) ormanci bias)	e bias)					
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dai	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ita (attrition b	ection bi ias) iel (perfi etection ias)	as) ormanci bias)	e bias)				area's (experimental) i area's (evine)	
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome asis (E) Incomplete outcome dai (F) Selective reporting (repo	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ita (attrition b orting bias)	ection bi ias) iel (perfi etection ias)	as) ormanci bias)	e bias)				area (oxpermentar) i area (omror)	
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants. (D) Blinding of participants (E) Incomplete outcome dat (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ata (attrition b orting bias)	ection bi ias) iel (perfi etection ias)	as) ormanci bias)	e bias)				area's (experimental) i area's (esnirol)	
Ites in the subgroup dimeteric Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dai (F) Selective reporting (reporting (G) Other bias	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ita (attrition b orting bias) Experimenta an So	ection bi ias) iel (perfi etection ias) il Total	as) ormanci bias) Mean	e bias) Control	Total	Wejaht	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bia
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of participants (C) Blinding of participants (C) Blinding of participants (C) Other blas Study or Subgroup Mea	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ta (attrition b orting bias) Experiment an SD	ection bi ias) nel (perf etection ias) 11 Total	as) ormanci bias) Mean	e bias) Control SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia ABCDEF
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of participants (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other blas	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ita (attrition b orting bias) Experiment: an SD	ection bi ias) nel (perf. etection ias) al <u>Total</u>	as) ormanci bias) <u>Mean</u>	e bias) Control SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia ABCDEF
Risk of bias legend     (A) Random sequence gen     (B) Allocation concealment     (C) Blinding of participants     (D) Blinding of participants     (D) Blinding of participants     (D) Blinding of participants     (G) Cher blas     (G) Other blas     (G) Other blas     (D) Subgroup     [     Study or Subgroup     [     Meet     Data 12.22     C)	heration (sele (selection b and personr sessment (d ta (attrition b orting bias) Experiment: an SD 5.8 15.075	ection bi ias) hel (perf etection ias) al Total 79	as) ormanco bias) <u>Mean</u> -1.35	Control	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [c.0.6, -0.02]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bla A B C D E F
Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants. (D) Blinding of participants. (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other blas Study or Subgroup Mease 1.32 OBP Assessed Bhandari 2022 - 55 Buis 2017 - 4	neration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d tta (attrition b orting bias) Experiment: an SD 5.8 15.075 9 13.1	ection bi ias) hel (perf etection ias) al <u>Total</u> 79 57	as) ormanc bias) <u>Mean</u> -1.35 -3.3	e bias) Control SD 10.7429 14.3	<u>Total</u> 75 53	Weight 15.4% 14.3%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F
Test for subgroup uninerine       Tisks of bias legend       (A) Random sequence gen       (B) Allocation concealment       (C) Blinding of participants       (D) Blinding of participants       (G) Other blas       (G) Other blas <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Meet       1.3.2 DBP Assessed       Blandari 2022     -5       Buis 2017     -4       Kes 2022     -65	eration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d tta (attrition b borting bias) Experiment: an SD 5.8 15.075 5.9 13.1 52 6.3175	ection bi ias) hel (perf etection ias) al Total 79 57 39	as) ormanco bias) <u>Mean</u> -1.35 -3.3 0.55	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882	Total 76 53 38	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.65]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for subgroup animeteric Risk of bias legend           (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants.           (D) Blinding of participants.           (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (report (G) Other blas           Study or Subgroup         Meat 1.32 DBP Assessed           Bhandari 2022         -5 Buis 2017           Lisz 2022         -6 Meat 2022           Mehta 2019         7	eration (seli t (selection b and personr sessment (d ta (attrition b orting bias) Experiment: an SD 5.8 15.075 5.9 13.1 52 6.3175 5.3 14.4	ection bi ias) hel (perf letection ias) al Total 79 57 39 48	as) prmance bias) <u>Mean</u> -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6	Total 75 53 38 32	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.66] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F
Test for subgroup unierenc Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Bilnding of participants (D) Bilnding of outcome asis (E) Incomplete outcome dai (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias 1.32 DBP Assessed Bhandari 2022 - 5 Buis 2017 - 4 Kes 2022 - 85 Mehta 2019 - 7 Movahedi 2019 - 0	eration (seli t (selection b and personr sessment (d ta (attrition b orting bias) Experimenta an SD 5.8 15.075 5.9 13.1 52 6.3175 7.3 14.4 6 10.8601	ection bi ias) hel (perf letection ias) al Total 79 57 39 48 97	as) ormanc (bias) -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199	Total 75 53 38 32 91	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.66] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.68] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia
Risk of bias legend     (A) Random sequence gen     (B) Allocation concealment     (C) Binding of participants     (D) Binding of participants     (D) Binding of outcome ass     (E) Incomplete outcome dat     (F) Selective reporting (repc     (G) Other bias	eration (sele t (selection b and personr sessment (d ita (attrition b orting bias) Experiment: an SD 5.8 15.075 1.9 13.1 52 6.3175 7.3 14.4 36 10.8601 9 15 13.21	action bi ias) hel (perf letectior ias) al Total 79 57 39 48 97 48 97 42	as) brmance bias) -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0%	Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.49]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia
Test in vs sugroup animeteric Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Bilnding of participants (D) Bilnding of participants (D) Bilnding of outcome ass (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias Study or Subgroup Measeseet Bhandan 202 Bhandan 202 -6 Buis 2017 Kes 2022 -8 Meha 2019 7 Movahedi 2019 7 Pour 2020 7 Succession Construction Construction	Terration (selic)           t (selection b           and personr           sessment (dita (attrition b           orting bias)           Experiment:           an         SD           5.8         15.076           5.9         13.1           52         6.3175           7.3         14.4           6         10.8601           09         15.1321           2.12         20.325	action bi ias) hel (perf letectior ias) al Total 79 57 39 48 97 48 97 42	mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7234	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5%	Std. Mean Difference 17. Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] 0.14 [-0.27, 0.66] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.66] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.00 [-0.50, 0.24] -0.00 [-0.51, 0.44]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Risk of bias legend     (A) Random sequence gen     (B) Allocation concealment     (C) Binding of participants     (D) Binding of participants     (D) Binding of outcome ass     (E) Incomplete outcome dat     (F) Selective reporting (repc     (G) Other bias      Study of Subgroup     Mea     1.3.2 DBP Assessed Bnandari 2022     -5     Buis 2017     -4     Kes 2022     -5     Movahedi 2019     7     Movahedi 2019     7     Subdy of Qart     (A)     (	Peration (selic)           (selection b)           and personn           sessment (distribution b)           borting bias)           Experiment:           an         SD           5.8         15.075           5.9         13.1           52         6.3175           7.3         14.4           36         10.8601           0.9         15.1321           0.3         13.9375	action bi ias) hel (perf letectior ias) al Total 79 57 39 48 97 42 97 42	Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21 192	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 17.5%	Std. Mean Difference 17, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, 0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.56, 0.49] -0.03 [-0.56, 0.49] -0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.51 (-0.42)	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ●
Study of Subgroup dimerence           Risk of bias legend           (A) Random sequence gen           (B) Allocation concealment           (C) Binding of participants           (D) Binding of orductome ass.           (C) Solective reporting (reporting)           (G) Other bias           13.2 DBP Assessed           Bhandani 2022         -5           Buis 2017         -4           Kes 2022         -9.6           Movahedi 2019         7.3           Movahedi 2019         -0.3           Zhai 2020         -0.3           Zhai 2020         0	heration (seli- (selection b and person; sessment (d ta (attrition b orting bias)           Experiment: an         SD           5.8         15.075           5.8         15.075           5.8         15.075           5.3         14.4           56         10.805           61.025         6.3175           3.3         14.4           3.6         10.805           3.6         10.805	action bi ias) hel (perf letection ias) al Total 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554	Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21 192 502	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 17.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference 1V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.41, 0.45] -0.31 [-0.41, 0.45]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E f ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■
Status         Interface           Tisks of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen           (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment           (D) Blinding of participants         (D) Blinding of outcome as:           (D) Blinding of outcome as:         (F) Selective reporting (reporting (reporting frequencies)           (G) Other bias         1           Study or Subgroup         Mees           Bhandari 2022         -5           Buis 2017         -4           Kes 2022         -96           Movahedi 2019         -7           Movahedi 2019         -03           Pour 2020         -02           Tast 100% Colores         -03           Pour 2020         -02           Tast 2019         -03           Tast 2019         -04           Tast 2019         -05           Tast 2019         -01 <td< td=""><td>heration (seli- (selection b and person; sessment (d tat (attrition b ortring bias)           Experiment. an         SD           5.8         15.075           9.8         13.075           7.3         14.4           36         10.8075           31         13.9375           3.3         13.9375           9.92 (P = 0.38).92 (P = 0.278)</td><td>action bi ias) hel (perf letaction ias) al <u>Total</u> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 42, df= 6 )</td><td>Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0</td><td>Control SD 10.7429 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); ₽ = 1</td><td>Total 75 53 38 32 91 21 192 502 78%</td><td>Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 16.0% 11.5% 17.5% 100.0%</td><td>Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.56, 0.49] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]</td><td>Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl</td><td>Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●</td></td<>	heration (seli- (selection b and person; sessment (d tat (attrition b ortring bias)           Experiment. an         SD           5.8         15.075           9.8         13.075           7.3         14.4           36         10.8075           31         13.9375           3.3         13.9375           9.92 (P = 0.38).92 (P = 0.278)	action bi ias) hel (perf letaction ias) al <u>Total</u> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 42, df= 6 )	Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); ₽ = 1	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21 192 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 16.0% 11.5% 17.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.56, 0.49] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for subgroup animeteric Risk of bias legend           (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome as (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other blas           Study or Subgroup         Measure (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other blas           Study or Subgroup         Measure (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other blas           Study or Subgroup         Measure (F) Selective reporting (repo (F) Selective reporting (repo (F) Selective reporting (F) (F) Selective reporting (F	neration (self.           (selection b and person)           sessment (d ta (attrition b orting bias)           Experiment.           an         SD           5.8         15.075           19         13.1           52         6.3175           26         6.3175           36         10.8601           9         13.9375           : Ch <sup>2</sup> = 27.8.           : 0.92 (P = 0.36	ection bi las) hel (perf letection las) al <u>Total</u> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 4, df= 6 )	Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>2</sup> =	Total 75 53 32 91 21 192 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 16.0% 11.5% 17.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] 0.03 [-0.56, 0.49] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.45]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C1	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for subgroup animeteric Risk of bias legend       (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Bilnding of participants (D) Bilnding of participants (D) Bilnding of outcome as (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias       Study or Subgroup     Meta 1.32 DBP Assessed       Bhandari 2022     -5.6 Buis 2017       Kes 2022     -8.6 Movahedi 2019       You 2020     -3.0 Subfordal (95% CI)       Test for overall effect Z = 0       To 2020     -3.0 Subfordal (95% CI)	heration (seli- (selection b and person)           and person           sessment (d ta (attrition b ortring bias)           Experiment: an           S0           5.8         15.075, 9, 13.152           6.3175, 3.3         14.44, 36           10.8601           90         15.1321           3.3         13.9375           ; Chi² = 27.8, 92 (P = 0.362	ection bi ias) hel (perf letection ias) <b>al</b> <b>Total</b> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 4, df = 6 ) 5554	Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>≠</sup> =	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21 192 502 78% 502	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference (V, Random, 95% C1 -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.68] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.28] -0.03 [-0.56, 0.48] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia
Test for subgroup uniferenc         Tesk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcome as:         (G) Selective reporting (reporting (reporting frequencies)         (G) Other bias         Study or Subgroup       Meas         1.32 DBP Assessed         Bhandari 2022       -55         Mehta 2019       -4.         Yenta 2019       -0.3         Pour 2020       -3.3         Zhai 2020       -0.3         Subtotal (65% CI)       Heterogeneiky: Tau" = 0.11;         Heterogeneiky: Tau" = 0.11;       Total (65% CI)	neration (self.           (selection b and person)           sessment (d tat (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment.           an         SD           5.8         15.075           1.9         13.1           5.2         6.3175           2.6         6.3175           3.1         14.4           36         10.8601           9         15.1321           3.3         13.9375           (Chi² = 27.8.           9.92 (P = 0.36	action bi ias) hel (perf letection ias) al <u>Total</u> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 4, df = 6 ) 554 4, df = 6	Mean -1.36 -3.3 0.56 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.482 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>₽</sup> =	Total 75 53 32 91 21 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 100.0% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.29] 0.03 [-0.56, 0.49] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for subgroup interenc           Test of bias legend           (A) Random sequence gen           (B) Allocation concealment           (C) Elinding of participants           (D) Elinding of outcome assist           (E) Incomplete outcome da           (F) Selective reporting (repo           (G) Other bias           1.32 DBP Assessed           Bhandan 202         -5           Buis 2017         -4           Kes 2022         -9.6           Movahedi 2019         0           Stubtdard (5% CI)         1           Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>a</sup> = 0.11;         Test for overail effect Z = 0           Test for overail effect Z = 0         1	heration (seli-           (selection b           and person           sessment (d           tal (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment.           an           SD           5.8           15.075           2.6           5.8           5.03           16.08           5.03           14.4           3.3           19.2           (P = 0.36           (P = 0.36           (P = 27.8)           .9.2           (P = 27.8)           .9.2           (P = 0.27.8)	action bi las) hel (perf letection ias) <b>al</b> <b>Total</b> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 4, df = 6 ) 554 4, df = 6 )	Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.27 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4829 18.2017 14.7334 0001); F =	Total 75 53 38 32 91 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 12.9% 15% 11.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% (I</u> -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-152, -0.66] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.66] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.24] -0.03 [-0.28, 0.24] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■
Status         Test         Test           Risk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment           (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants           (D) Binding of participants         (C) Binding of participants         (C) Binding of participants           (D) Binding of participants         (C) Binding of cutcome as         (C) Selective reporting (reporting free of (C) Selective reporting (reporting free of (C) Selective reporting (report of (C) Selective reporting (report of (C) Selective reporting (report of (C) Pour 2020         -33           Subtotal (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11;         Test for overall effect Z = 0.           Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11;         Test for subgroup difference	Paration (seli- (selection b and person)           and person           sessment (d tat (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment:           an           50           51           52           6.3175           3           4.436           10.8601           9           1.3           19.3           19.436           19.92 (P = 0.36           ; Chi <sup>P</sup> = 27.8           .92 (P = 0.32           ; Chi <sup>P</sup> = 27.8           .92 (C = 0.32           : Sen: Not app	action bi ias) hel (perf letection ias) <b>al</b> <b>Total</b> 79 57 39 48 97 42 192 554 4, df = 6 ) 554 4, df = 6 ) icable	as) <b>Mean</b> -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 1001); I <sup>≠</sup> =	Total 75 53 38 32 91 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.4% 16.0% 11.5% 100.0% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference           V, Random, 95% CI           -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02]           -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26]           -1.04 [-1.52, -0.66]           0.24 [-0.21, 0.68]           0.03 [-0.56, 0.49]           0.21 [0.01, 0.41]           -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F C C D C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Test for stugroup dimerenc           Tests of bias legend           (A) Random sequence gen           (B) Allocation concealment           (C) Binding of participants           (D) Binding of participants           (D) Binding of outcome as:           (F) Selective reporting (repc           (G) Other bias           132 DBP Assessed           Bhandani 2022         -5           Buis 2017         -4           Kes 2022         -96           Movahedi 2019         -03           Pour 2020         -03           Pour 2020         -03           Pour 2020         -03           Testfor overall effect 2=         0.11           Testfor overall effect 2=         0.11           Testfor overall effect 2=         0.12	neration (self           (selection b           and person           sessment (d           tal (attrition b)           bording bias)           Experiment.           an           SD           5.8           15.075           3           14.4           36           108           1.92           (CH <sup>2</sup> = 27.8)           1.92 (P = 0.36)           chi <sup>2</sup> = 27.8.           1.92 (P = 0.32 (P = 0.36)	action bi las) el (perf letectior ias) al <u>Total</u> 79 57 39 48 97 42 554 4, df = 6 ) 554 4, df = 6 ) icable	as) ormanccibias) -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0	e bias) Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>≠</sup> = 1 0001); I <sup>≠</sup> = 1	Total 75 53 38 32 91 21 192 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.9% 16.0% 17.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference <u>1V</u> , Random, 95% (1 -0.34 [0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [0.21, 0.69] 0.01 [0.28, 0.49] -0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■
Test for subgroup dimerenc         Tesk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcome as:         (F) Selective reporting (repc         (G) Other bias         Study or Subgroup         Meat         1.3.2 DBP Assessed         Bhandari 2022       -5         Buis 2017       -4         Kes 2022       -5.         Mehta 2019       7.         Your 2020       -3.3         Zhal 2020       0.3         Subtotal (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>a</sup> = 0.11;         Test for subgroup difference         Test for subgroup difference         Risk Driblas Legend	Paration (seli- (selection b and person)           and person           sessment (d tal (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment:           an         SD           52         6.3175           53         14.5075           54         15.075           53         14.436           10.8601         09           93         14.435           10.8601         09           93         14.435           10.8601         09           93         14.435           10.8601         09           93         14.93           13         13.9375           (Chi² = 27.8, 92 (P = 0.36)           ; Chi² = 27.8, 92 (P = 0.37)           ; ese: Nota (pa)	ection bi las) ====( perf letectior ias) <b>1</b> <b>Total</b> 79 57 79 48 97 72 48 97 72 48 97 72 48 97 72 48 97 72 48 97 72 554 4, df=6 ( perf control contro	as) ormance bias) -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>≠</sup> =	Total 75 53 38 91 21 12 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 11.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference           V, Random, 95% CI           -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02]           -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26]           -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56]           0.24 [-0.21, 0.68]           0.03 [-0.28, 0.28]           0.03 [-0.56, 0.49]           0.21 [0.01, 0.41]           -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Test for stugroup unierenc Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Binding of participants (D) Binding of participants (D) Binding of outcome as (F) selective reporting (repc (G) Other bias <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Meese <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Meese <b>St</b>	heration (self           (selection b           and personn           sessment (d           tat (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment.           an           SD           5.8         15.075           3         13.1           5.2         6.3175           6.3         10.8001           06         16.3221           0.3         13.9375           ; Chi² = 27.8.           0.92 (P = 0.32           cols?         ; Chi² = 27.8.           ces: Not app           nearation (self	ection bi ias) el (perf letectior ias) al Total 79 57 48 97 48 97 48 97 48 97 48 97 554 4, df = 6 ) icable 554 4, df = 6 ) coble 554 4, df = 7 ) coble 554 4, df = 7 ) coble 554 554 554 554 554 554 554 574 574 574 574 574 574 574 574 574	as) ormanc. blas) -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0	e bias) Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4882 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 1001); F = 1 0001); F = 1	Total 75 53 38 32 91 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference 1V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.68] 0.03 [-0.26, 0.48] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for subgroup dimeteric         Risk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcome as         (F) Selective reporting (repc         (G) Other bias         Study of Subgroup         Meat         1.3.2 DBP Assessed         Bhandari 2022       -5         Subia 2017       -4         Kes 2022       -8.5         Mehta 2019       7         Movahedi 2019       -0.3         Pour 2020       -3.2         Subtotal (95% C)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11;         Test for subgroup different         Test for subgroup different         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment	heration (seli- (selection b and person)           and person           sessment (d tal (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment:           an         SD           52         6.3175           53         15.075           54.3175         3.14.436           10.8601         10.8601           02         15.1321           3.13.9375         ; Chi² = 27.8.           :92 (P = 0.36         ; chi² = 27.8.           :92 (P = 0.37         ; chi² = 27.8.           :92 (P = 0.37         ; chi² = 27.8.           :92 (P = 0.37         ; chi² = 27.8.           :93 (P = 0.37         ; chi² = 27.8.           :94 (ei-clon t)         ; chi² = 27.8.	ection bi las) = el (perf letectior ias) <b>al</b> <u>Total</u> 79 57 79 67 79 79 87 79 48 87 79 554 48 47 42 192 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 7, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 7, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 4, df = 6 9) 554 7, df = 6 9) 554 8, df = 6 9 554 8, df = 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 554 7 5557 5557 7 5557 55	as) ormance bias) Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.56 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0)	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4822 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>a</sup> = 1	Total 75 53 38 32 91 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.4% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 1100.0%	Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.03 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.28, 0.24] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] F;	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Test for subgroup dimerenc         Tesk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Bilnding of participants         (D) Bilnding of participants         (G) Other bias         Study of Subgroup         Measa         Study of Subgroup         Measa         Bhandan 2022         6 Buis 2017         -4         Kes 2022       -8!         Movahedi 2019       7         Movahedi 2019       7         Subtoral (95% CI)       0         Heterogeneiky: Tau" = 0.11;         Test for overall effect Z = 0         Tostifor subgroup differenc         Elsk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence ger         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Blinding of participants	heration (seli           (selection b           and person           sessment (d           ta (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment.           an           SD           5.8           15.075           3           13.1           5.2           6.315.2           6.315.2           6.316.10.800           16.10.801           (Chi² = 27.8.           (2 Ch² = 27.8.           ces: Not app           neration (sell           ( celection k)           ( celection k)	ection bi las) el (perf <b>Total</b> <b>Total</b> <b>Total</b> 79 97 77 39 48 97 42 554 4, df = 6 ) icable ection b ection b	as) ormanc. blas) -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0)	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4822 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 0001); I <sup>≠</sup> = 0001); I <sup>≠</sup> =	Total 75 53 38 32 91 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 17.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference 1V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.68] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.24] 0.03 [-0.56, 0.48] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] F;	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for subgroup uniferenc         Tesk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcome as         (F) Selective reporting (repc         (G) Other bias         Study of Subgroup         Meat         1.3.2 DBP Assessed         Bhandari 2022       -5         Mehta 2019       -3         Pour 2020       -3.2         Subtotal (55% C)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>a</sup> = 0.11;         Test for subgroup difference         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Blanding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcome as	heration (seli- (selection b and person)           sand person           sessment (d tal (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment.           an         SD           50         5.8           15.075         3.17.57           3.8         15.075           3.8         15.075           3.14.4         36           3.0         3.83.07           3.13.9375         3.13.9375           ; Chi² = 27.8.         9.92 (P = 0.36           ; Chi² = 27.8.         9.92 (P = 0.37           ; chi² = 27.8.         9.92 (P = 0.37           ; chi² = 27.8.         9.92 (P = 0.37           ; chi² = and person         sessment (C	ection bi las) el (perf letectior ias) al <u>Total</u> 79 57 47 9 77 39 48 97 73 9 48 97 42 192 554 4, df = 6 ) icable ection bi icable ection bi ection	as) ormance blas) Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -0.44 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 ias)) formance blas)	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4829 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 10001); I <sup>a</sup> = 10001); I <sup>a</sup> =	Total 76 53 38 32 91 21 192 502 78% 502 78%	Weight 15.4% 14.3% 12.9% 16.0% 11.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference 1, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, 0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.03 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.28, 0.24] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] F:	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F C D C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Test for subgroup dimerenc         Tesk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Bilnding of participants         (D) Bilnding of participants         (D) Bilnding of participants         (D) Bilnding of participants         (D) Bilnding of outcome as         (F) Selective reporting (repc         (G) Other bias         Study of Subgroup       Mees         Bhandan 2022       -5         Buis 2017       -4         Kes 2022       -8.5         Meha 2019       7         Your 2020       -0.3         Zhai 2020       0         Subtoral (95% CI)       1         Heterogeneiky: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11;         Test for overall effect. Z = 0         Tost of subgroup differenc         Risk of bias legand         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation conceasilment         (C) Bilnding of oparticipants         (D) Bilnding of participants	heration (seli           (selection b           and person           sessment (d           tal (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment.           an           SD           5.8           15.075           3           13.1           5.2           6.315.075           3           14.4           36           0.8           (Chi² = 27.8,           (2Chi² = 27.8,           (2C) P = 0.32 (P = 0.32)           (chi² = 27.8,           (2) CP = 0.32 (P = 0.32)           (chi² = 27.8, 0.22 (P = 0.32)           (chi² = 27.8, 0.22 (P = 0.32)           (chi² = 10.10 (sel           (tolection b)           and person           (sel ection b)           and person           (sel activiton b)           at (attrition b)           sel (selection b)           (at (attrition b)	ection bi las) el (perf <b>Total</b> <b>Total</b> 79 57 49 79 79 48 97 42 554 4, df = 6 ) icable ection b las) 19 554 4, df = 6 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	as) ormanc: -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 ias) formance bias)	Control SD 10.7429 14.3 10.4822 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 0001); I <sup>≠</sup> = 0001); I <sup>≠</sup> =	Total 75 53 38 32 91 192 502 78% 502 78%		Std. Mean Difference W, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.68] 0.01 [-0.28, 0.24] 0.03 [-0.56, 0.48] 0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] F;	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bia A B C D E F ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
Test for Subgroup uniferenc         Tesk of bias legend         (A) Random sequence gen         (B) Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcome as         (F) Selective reporting (repc         (G) Other bias         Study or Subgroup         Meat         1.3.2 DBP Assessed         Binadraf 2022       -5         Mehta 2019       -4         Kes 2022       -8.5         Mehta 2019       7         Movahedi 2019       -0.3         Pour 2020       -3.3         Stubtotal (95% C)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>a</sup> = 0.11;         Test for overall effect Z = 0         Test for subgroup difference         (A) Random sequence ger         Allocation concealment         (C) Binding of participants         (D) Binding of outcom as         (F) Selective reporting (reprover)	Paration (seli- (selection b and personn)           sand personnent           sessment (d tai (attrition b)           borting bias)           Experiment:           an         SD           52         6.3175           53         14.4           36         10.8601           31.3         3.9375           ; Chi² = 27.8         .92 (P = 0.36           ; Chi² = 27.8         .92 (P = 0.37           ; chi² = 27.8         .92 (P = 0.36           ; chi² = son and person seessment (usal (selection t; seessment (usal (tat (attrition t) oring bias))	ection bil las) al <b>Total</b> <b>79</b> 57 39 57 48 97 42 192 554 4, df = 6 io) 554 4, df = 6 io) 554 4, df = 6	as) ormancc bias) Mean -1.35 -3.3 0.55 4 -2.52 -2.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 ias) formanc bias)	e bias) Control SD 10.7429 12.6 9.8199 18.2017 14.7334 0001); F = 1001); F =	Total 75 53 38 291 21 11 11 502 78% <b>502</b> 78%	Weight 14.3% 12.4% 16.0% 16.0% 17.5% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI -0.34 [-0.66, -0.02] -0.12 [-0.49, 0.26] -1.04 [-1.52, -0.56] 0.24 [-0.21, 0.69] 0.03 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.03 [-0.28, 0.29] -0.21 [0.01, 0.41] -0.13 [-0.41, 0.15] Fi	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bia A B C D E F C D E

Figure 3: Sensitivity analysis on the effect of SMS interventions on medication adherence, systolic, and diastolic blood pressure.

used. Multiple studies have found that adding educational content can improve medication adherence among hypertensive individuals [15,16,19,20]. Therefore, educational content in SMS-based interventions is recommended to improve medication adherence for hypertensive individuals.

After assessing the quality of studies, it was found that 54% (n=6) had a high or unclear risk for selection bias, performance bias, detection bias, attrition bias, and reporting bias. Evidence-based medicine aims to find the best treatment for patients, so clinical trials need to minimize the risk of treatment effects being altered by confounding variables. The Cochrane Collaboration has defined six critical appraisal domains to ensure trial validity. Blinding and randomization help maintain adherence to these domains, preventing unconscious and intentional manipulation and the perception of treatment effect [21]. This study also tested if the intervention influenced blood pressure. Results of the meta-analysis on systolic and diastolic blood pressure suggest that there is also a statistically significant reduction in the systolic blood pressure SMD -0.11 (Z = 2.38, p = 0.02), but not in diastolic blood pressure SMD 0.00 (Z = 0.49, p = 0.62). The results provide validation for the observed effect on blood pressure outcome. These findings are consistent with a recent review in which there had been a reduction in systolic blood pressure of SMD = -0.13 (95% CI, -0.23 to -0.03, p = 0.01). In comparison, the reduction in diastolic blood pressure is SMD -0.06 (95% CI, -0.25 to 0.13, p = 0.56), indicating that text messaging interventions can reduce systolic blood pressure but not diastolic blood pressure [22].

The results of the sensitivity analysis demonstrated that the inclusion of studies that were judged with high or unclear risk of bias for selection bias, performance bias, and detection bias caused an increase in the estimated effect size in terms of the outcomes such as on medication adherence

and systolic blood pressure, however, retained the inconclusive effect of SMS intervention on diastolic blood pressure. The results yielded also showed a drastic increase in between-study heterogeneity for medication adherence, systolic blood pressure, and diastolic blood pressure, reaching 70-100%, which is translated to considerable heterogeneity, thereby demonstrating the effect of including studies judged with high/unclear risk on certain domains to overall heterogeneity.

With this study's findings, using SMS-based interventions is a viable option for improving medication adherence and blood pressure outcomes among hypertensive individuals. Physicians may utilize this form of health care delivery when handling patients that are nonadherent to their maintenance medications. Furthermore, government health agencies may incorporate SMS-based intervention, an affordable and accessible mode of healthcare delivery, into existing health programs and campaigns. Health agencies can assign healthcare professionals to create a standard text message with education material. The message can be saved in databases and automatically sent to registered numbers who agreed to receive the texts, ensuring consistent intervention.

Limitations were found due to varying outcome measures and a high risk of bias in many studies. A random effects model was used to generate pooled effect estimates, considering the random variability of outcome effects across the population. However, most of the included studies were judged to have a high risk of bias in multiple domains, and only studies in English were included. Despite this limitation, the studies were conducted in different countries, accounting for population variability. Lastly, the demographic profile of the study participants needed to be more welldefined in this review.

### Conclusion

This review provides information on the effect of SMS-based interventions on medication adherence and blood pressure. The researcher concludes that SMS-based interventions effectively improve antihypertensive drug compliance and reduce systolic blood pressure but not diastolic blood pressure. The findings of this study could provide a practical basis for developing health programs and modes of healthcare delivery that are effective and cost-efficient and addresses nonadherence to maintenance medications and blood pressure control among hypertensive individuals.

The review has laid out a framework and background for future studies related to the present one. The researcher has also identified the current study's limitations and provided recommendations for improving the methodology. These recommendations are: 1) future researchers should conduct a quantitative assessment of the effects of different frequencies, duration, conditions, and content of SMS-based interventions on medication adherence and blood pressure, preferably through a subgroup analysis of studies to address incomplete or limited assessment, and 2) future researchers should perform a meta-regression analysis following the quantitative analysis to address the potential effect of demographic variance on the overall estimates of effects. These improvements will provide important information for future studies.

# References

- 1. Lehane E, McCarthy G. An examination of the intentional and unintentional aspects of medication non-adherence in patients diagnosed with hypertension. J Clin Nurs. 2007; 16: 698-706.
- Arceo LP, Buan E, Neri R, Torres DJ, Trinidad E, Chua P, et al. Philippine Heart Association-Council on Hypertension Report on Survey of Hypertension and Target Organ Damage (PRESYON 2-TOD\*)A report on prevalence of hypertension, awareness, treatment profile and control rate. 2007.

- Egan BM, Lackland DT, Cutler NE. Awareness, Knowledge, and Attitudes of Older Americans about High Blood Pressure: Implications for Health Care Policy, Education, and Research. Arch
- Anglada-Martinez H, Riu-Viladoms G, Martin-Conde M, Rovira-Illamola M, Sotoca-Momblona JM, Codina-Jane C. Does mHealth increase adherence to medication? Results of a systematic review. Int J Clin Pract. 2015; 69: 9-32.

Intern Med. 2003;163: 681.

3.

- Ershad Sarabi R, Sadoughi F, Jamshidi Orak R, Bahaadinbeigy K. The Effectiveness of Mobile Phone Text Messaging in Improving Medication Adherence for Patients with Chronic Diseases: A Systematic Review. Iran Red Crescent Med J. 2016; 18.
- Sua YS, Jiang Y, Thompson DR, Wang W. Effectiveness of mobile phone-based self-management interventions for medication adherence and change in blood pressure in patients with coronary heart disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs. 2020; 19: 192-200.
- 7. Faraone SV. Interpreting estimates of treatment effects: implications for managed care. P T Peer-Rev J Formul Manag. 2008; 33: 700-711.
- Akhu-Zaheya LM, Shiyab WY. The effect of short message system (SMS) reminder on adherence to a healthy diet, medication, and cessation of smoking among adult patients with cardiovascular diseases. Int J Med Inf. 2017; 98: 65-75.
- Bhandari B, Narasimhan P, Jayasuriya R, Vaidya A, Schutte AE. Effectiveness and Acceptability of a Mobile Phone Text Messaging Intervention to Improve Blood Pressure Control (TEXT4BP) among Patients with Hypertension in Nepal: A Feasibility Randomised Controlled Trial. Glob Heart. 2022; 17: 13.
- Bobrow K, Farmer AJ, Springer D, Shanyinde M, Yu LM, Brennan T, et al. Mobile Phone Text Messages to Support Treatment Adherence in Adults With High Blood Pressure (SMS-Text Adherence Support [StAR]): A Single-Blind, Randomized Trial. Circulation. 2016; 133: 592-600.
- 11. Maslakpak MH, Safaie M. A Comparison between the Effectiveness of Short Message Service and Reminder Cards Regarding Medication Adherence in Patients with Hypertension: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. Int J Community Based Nurs Midwifery. 2016; 4: 209-218.
- Movahedi M, Khadivi R, Rouzbahani R, Tavakoli-Fard N. Effect of training through short message service on compliance and mean blood pressure of hypertensive patients. Int J Prev Med. 2019; 10: 200.
- 13. Pour E, Aliyari S, Farsi Z, Ghelich Y. Comparing the effects of interactive and noninteractive education using short message service on treatment adherence and blood pressure among patients with hypertension. Nurs Midwifery Stud. 2020; 9: 68.
- 14. Varleta P, Acevedo M, Akel C, Salinas C, Navarrete C, Garcia A, et al. Mobile phone text messaging improves antihypertensive drug adherence in the community. J Clin Hypertens. 2017; 19: 1276-1284.
- Zhai P, Hayat K, Ji W, Li Q, Shi L, Atif A, et al. Efficacy of Text Messaging and Personal Consultation by Pharmacy Students Among Adults With Hypertension: Randomized Controlled Trial. J Med Internet Res. 2020; 22: e16019.
- 16. Kes D, Polat U. The effect of nurse-led telephone support on adherence to blood pressure control and drug treatment in individuals with primary hypertension: A randomized controlled study. Int J Nurs Pract. 2022; 28.

# 

3

- 17. Buis L, Hirzel L, Dawood RM, Dawood KL, Nichols LP, Artinian NT, et al. Text Messaging to Improve Hypertension Medication Adherence in African Americans From Primary Care and Emergency Department Settings: Results From Two Randomized Feasibility Studies. JMIR MHealth UHealth. 2017; 5: e9.
- Mehta SJ, Volpp KG, Troxel AB, Day SC, Lim R, Marcus N, et al. Electronic Pill Bottles or Bidirectional Text Messaging to Improve Hypertension Medication Adherence (Way 2 Text): a Randomized Clinical Trial. J Gen Intern Med. 2019; 34: 2397-2404.
- Gutierrez M, Sakulbumrungsil R. Effect of Patient Education Intervention on Medication Adherence and Blood Pressure of Hypertensive Filipino Patients: Systematic Review and Metaanalysis. Philipp J Sci. 2021; 150: 625-633.
- Ayodapo Ao, Elegbede Ot, Omosanya Oe, Monsudi Kf. Patient Education and Medication Adherence among Hypertensives in a Tertiary Hospital, South Western Nigeria. Ethiop J Health Sci. 2020; 30.
- 21. Probst P, Grummich K, Heger P, Zaschke S, Knebel P, Ulrich A, et al. Blinding in randomized controlled trials in general and abdominal surgery: protocol for a systematic review and empirical study. Syst Rev. 2016; 5: 48.
- 22. Tam HL, Leung LYL, Wong EML, Cheung K, Chan ASW. Integration of text messaging interventions into hypertension management among older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Worldviews Evid Based Nurs. 2022; 19: 16-27.