**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.