Author(s)	Effect Size [95% CI]
Bae (2013)	0.30 [0.16, 0.44]
Bello (2012, study 1); Mutz (2002); Smith (2015, United States study 1)	-0.14 [-0.20, -0.08]
Bello (2012, study 2); Mutz (2002)	-0.34 [-0.44, -0.24]
Bello (2012, study 3); McClurg (2006a)	-0.16 [-0.22, -0.10]
Brundidge et al. (2014, study 1)	-0.07 [-0.15, 0.02]
Brundidge et al. (2014, study 2)	-0.01 [-0.07, 0.06]
De Zuniga et al. (2013)	0.12 [-0.01, 0.25]
Eveland & Hively (2009)	0.13 [0.05, 0.21]
Eveland et al. (2009)	0.04 [-0.06, 0.14]
Feezell (2016)	-0.05 [-0.11, 0.01]
Foos & de Rooij (2016)	0.03 [-0.02, 0.08]
Guidetti et al. (2016. study 1)	-0.07 [-0.11, -0.03]
Guidetti et al. (2016. study 2)	-0.15 [-0.20, -0.10]
Harell et al. (2016)	0.09 [0.05, 0.13]
Hasell & Weeks (2016)	-0.08 [-0.19, 0.03]
Hopmann (2012, study 1)	0.06 [0.03, 0.09]
Hopmann (2012, study 2)	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]
Ikeda & Boase (2011)	0.09 [0.04, 0.14]
Kim (2015)	0.26 [0.15, 0.37]
Kim (2016)	0.06 [-0.06, 0.18]
Kim & Chen (2016)	0.13 [0.07, 0.19]
Kim et al. (2011); Scheufele et al. (2006)	0.12 [0.05, 0.19]
Klofstad et al. (2013)	0.02 [-0.04, 0.08]
Kwak (2005)	0.30 [0.20, 0.40]
Lee (2012)	-0.08 [-0.15, -0.01]
Lee et al. (2015)	0.17 [0.11, 0.24]
Liu & Chiu (2011)	0.12 [0.06, 0.19]
Liu et al. (2013; study 1)	-0.22 [-0.29, -0.15]
Liu et al. (2013; study 2)	-0.08 [-0.15, -0.01]
Liu et al. (2013; study 3)	-0.14 [-0.21, -0.07]
Lu & Myrick (2016)	0.17 [0.03, 0.31]
Lu et al. (2016)	-0.21 [-0.27, -0.15]
Lupton & Thornton (2016)	-0.14 [-0.19, -0.09]
Matthes (2012, study 1)	0.18 [0.11, 0.25]
Matthes (2012, study 2)	-0.03 [-0.12, 0.07]
Matthes (2013, study 1)	0.04 [0.02, 0.10]
Matthes (2013, study 2)	0.11 [-0.01, 0.24]
Matthes & Marquart (2015)	-0.03 [-0.08, 0.02]
McClurg (2006b)	-0.16 [-0.22, -0.10]
McLeod et al. (1999)	0.15 [0.05, 0.25]
Moehler & Conroy-Krutz (2016)	-0.16 [-0.27, -0.05]
Nir (2011)	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]
Park & Karan (2014)	0.25 [0.16, 0.34]
Quintelier et al. (2012)	0.10 [0.07, 0.14]
Rojas (2008)	0.09 [0.02, 0.16]
Scheufele et al. (2004)	0.14 [0.07, 0.21]
Shi (2016)	-0.02 [-0.04, 0.00]
Smith (2015, Bulgaria)	-0.17 [-0.25, -0.09]
Smith (2015, Chile)	-0.10 [-0.17, -0.03]
Smith (2015, Greece)	-0.06 [-0.15, 0.02]
Smith (2015, Hong Kong)	0.04 [-0.09, 0.16]
Smith (2015, Hungary study 1)	-0.01 [-0.09, 0.07]
Smith (2015, Hungary study 2)	-0.09 [-0.18, -0.00]
Smith (2015, Mexico)	0.03 [-0.03, 0.09]
Smith (2015, Mozambique)	0.05 [-0.02, 0.12]
Smith (2015, Portugal)	-0.04 [-0.09, 0.00]
Smith (2015, South Africa)	-0.03 [-0.12, 0.06]
Smith (2015, Spain study 1)	0.01 [-0.06, 0.07]
Smith (2015, Spain study 2)	-0.01 [-0.07, 0.05]
Smith (2015, Taiwan)	0.07 [-0.01, 0.14]
Smith (2015, United Kingdom)	0.16 [0.11, 0.20]
Smith (2015, United States study 2)	-0.13 [-0.19, -0.07]
Smith (2015, Uruguay study 1)	-0.00 [-0.10, 0.09]
Smith (2015, Uruguay study 2)	-0.08 [-0.17, 0.01]
Valenzuela et al. (2012)	-0.10 [-0.16, -0.04]
Van Kempen (2005)	-0.17 [-0.27, -0.06]
Vraga et al. (2015)	0.13 [0.00, 0.26]
Wojcieszak (2009)	-0.10 [-0.23, 0.04]
Wojcieszak (2011)	0.07 [-0.08, 0.21]
Wojcieszak et al. (2016)	0.06 [0.01, 0.11]
Overall Effect	0.00 [-0.04, 0.05]

Figure 2. Forest plot of the studies in the meta-analysis according to authors.