Online Supplementary File 3

Supplementary Table 1A: Assessment of risk of bias of RCT included studies through the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool.

First Author	Selection bias		Reporting Bias	Performance bias	Detection bias	Attrition bias	Other	Total score
	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Selective reporting	Blinding - participants & personnel	Blinding - outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Other source of bias	
Non-Pharmacological Management								
Exercise								
Barger, et al.	Unclear	Low	Low	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	High 2, Low 2, Unclear 3
Yamanaka, et al.	Unclear	Low	Low	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	High 2, Low 2, Unclear 3
Sleep								
Petit, et al.2014	Unclear	High	High	High	High	Low	Unclear	High 4, Low 1, Unclear 2
Petit, et al.2018	Unclear	High	Low	High	High	Low	Unclear	High 3, Low 2, Unclear 2
Straub, et al.	High	High	High	High	High	High	Unclear	High 6, Low 0, Unclear 1
Light								
Thompson, et al.	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High 0, Low 5, Unclear 2
Nutrition (meal timing / composition)								
Ruscitto & Ogden.	Low	Low	Unclear	High	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	High 1, Low 2, Unclear 4
Pharmacological Management								
Stimulants								
Rosenberg, et al.	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	High 0, Low 6, Unclear 1
Lagarde, et al.	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High	Unclear	Unclear	High 1, Low 1, Unclear 5
Piérard, et al.	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High	Unclear	Unclear	High 1, Low 1, Unclear 5
Beaumont, et al.	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	High 0, Low 1, Unclear 6
Melatonin Analogues								
Rajaratnam, et al.	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High 0, Low 5, Unclear 2
Richardson, et al.	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High 0, Low 4, Unclear 3
Zee, et al.	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Unclear	High 0, Low 3, Unclear 4

Supplementary Table 1B: Assessment of methodological quality of non-RCT included studies through the Downs and Black Quality of Reporting Scale.

First Author	Reporting	External validity	Internal validity bias	Internal validity confounding/ selection bias	Power	Total score	Interpretation: QI scores: >20 = good, 11 - 20 = moderate, <11 = poor
Exercise							
Montaruli, et al.	6	0	4	0	0	10/28	Poor
Cardinali, et al.	5	1	3	1	0	10/28	Poor
Light							
Cardinali, et al.	5	1	3	1	0	10/28	Poor
Nutrition (meal timing / composition)							
Reynolds & Montgomery.	4	1	2	3	0	10/28	Poor
Pharmacological Management							
Melatonin							
Cardinali, et al.	5	1	3	1	0	10/28	Poor
Manfredini, et al.	5	1	2	1	0	9/28	Poor
Sedatives							
Reilly, et al.	3	1	4	1	0	9/28	Poor
Melatonin Analogues							
Nickelsen, et al.	9	1	5	4	0	19/28	Moderate

Note: Studies were assessed for quality by means of the Downs and Black checklist. This scoring system is based on a checklist of 27 questions (total score of 28, Q5 = 2 points), comprising of four categories of evaluation: quality reporting (10 questions), external validity (3 questions), internal validity - bias and confounding (13 questions) and statistical power (1 question). Quality Index (QI) score used: >20 good, 11 - 20 moderate, and <11 poor.