**GRADE Profile for comparison of listening to Quran to no intervention**

| **Certainty assessment** | **No of patients** | **Effect** | **Certainty** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participants(studies)** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **Quran** | **controls** | **Relative(95% CI)** | **Absolute(95% CI)** |
| **State anxiety (follow up: range 0 week to 8 weeks; assessed with: Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI).** |
| 293(4 RCTs)  | very serious a | very serious b | not serious  | not serious  | none  | 147  | 146  | -  | MD **14.75 lower**(19.88 lower to 9.63 lower) | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| **Trait anxiety (follow up: range 0 week to 8 weeks; assessed with: Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI).** |
| 293(4 RCTs) | very serious a | very serious b | not serious  | not serious  | none  | 147  | 146  | -  | MD **12.38 lower**(16.64 lower to 8.11 lower)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |
| **Anxiety (follow up: range 0 week to 4 weeks; assessed with: Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale (HARS), and Marten's competitive anxiety questionnaires.** |
| 232(4 RCTs) | very serious a | not serious  | not serious  | not serious  | none  | 116  | 116  | -  | SMD **2.06 lower**(2.57 lower to 1.54 lower)  | ⨁⨁◯◯LOW  |
| **Depression (follow up: range 4 week to 8 weeks; assessed with: Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI-II) and Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale.** |
| 167(2 RCTs) | very serious c | very serious d | not serious  | serious e | none  | 84  | 83  | -  | SMD **3.77 lower**(6.68 lower to 0.87 lower)  | ⨁◯◯◯VERY LOW  |

**CI:** Confidence interval; **MD:** Mean difference; **SMD:** Standardised mean difference

#### Explanations

aEvidence downgraded by 2 levels because the overall risk of bias for the 4 studies was judged as high mainly due to issues in randomisation process, deviations from intended interventions, and measurement of the outcome.

bEvidence downgraded by 2 levels as P<0.05 and I square= 96%, indicating high heterogeneity.

cEvidence downgraded by 2 levels because the overall risk of bias for the 2 studies was judged as high mainly due to issues in measurement of the outcome, missing outcome data, and deviations from intended interventions.

dEvidence downgraded by 2 levels as P<0.05 and I square= 97%, indicating high heterogeneity.

eEvidence downgraded by 1 level because 95% CI crosses one MIDs for this outcome.