

Table S3. Summary of findings.

Outcome indicators	Study design	Studies (n)	Participants (n)	Absolute (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Evidence confidence	Importance
Effect of doll therapy on behaviour	Randomised trials	7	338	SMD -0.95 (-1.38 to 0.53)	Serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	Not serious	Low ^{ab}	Critical
Effect of doll therapy on agitated behaviour	Randomised trials	9	770	SMD -0.59 (-0.91 to -0.28)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	High	Critical
Effect of doll therapy on cognitive function	Randomised trials	5	541	SMD 0.70 (-0.05 to 1.45)	Serious ^a	Serious ^c	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Low ^{ac}	Critical
Effect of doll therapy on quality of life	Randomised trials	4	512	SMD 1.00 (0.81 to 1.18)	Serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Moderate ^a	Important

CI: confidence interval; SMD: standardised mean difference

^a More than 25% of the studies showed risk of bias in allocation concealment and blinding of participants and personnel.

^b The total sample size of both subjects was below 400 patients.

^c Heterogeneity ($I^2 > 50\%$)