Abstract Outcome = cons_soc

Study	Effect size with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Huda (2012) 1 2	-0.03 [-0.10, 0.04]	5.17
Cahyadi (2018) 1 11	0.01 [-0.02, 0.04]	5.19
Guiteras (2015) 1 4	0.01 [-0.07, 0.09]	5.16
Guiteras (2015) 2 4	0.02 [-0.03, 0.07]	5.18
Tutor (2014) 1 8	0.03 [-0.02, 0.08]	5.18
Brugh (2018) 1 7	0.04 [-0.05, 0.14]	5.14
Cameron (2013) 1 4	0.11 [0.02, 0.20]	5.15
Briceno (2017) 1 1	0.11 [-0.01, 0.24]	5.09
Briceno (2017) 3 5	0.12 [-0.01, 0.24]	5.10
Guiteras (2015) 3 4	0.12 [0.07, 0.17]	5.18
Guiteras (2015) 4 1	0.15 [0.05, 0.25]	5.14
Patil (2013) 1 1	0.19 [0.11, 0.26]	5.16
Filmer (2018) 1 1	0.19 [0.05, 0.32]	5.08
Miller (2011) 1 1	0.20 [0.10, 0.30]	5.13
Crocker (2016) 1 6	0.21 [0.09, 0.33]	5.10
Luby (2009) 1 2	0.39 [-0.58, 1.36]	2.35
Luby (2009) 2 1	0.51 [-0.13, 1.15]	3.39
Stoller (2011) 1 7	1.12 [0.81, 1.44]	4.60
Parvez (2018) 2 1	1.23 [0.81, 1.65]	4.22
Parvez (2018) 6 1	1.50 [1.06, 1.94]	4.16
Parvez (2018) 5 1	1.52 [1.07, 1.96]	4.14
Overall	0.33 [0.13, 0.53]	

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.20$, $I^2 = 99.12\%$, $H^2 = 113.25$

Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(20) = 216.06, p = 0.00

Test of $\theta = 0$: z = 3.24, p = 0.00



Random-effects REML model