

Supplemental Material S4. List of differences between the study protocol as registered in Open Science Framework in June 2021 and the completed study.

Planned methods registered in protocol	Study as executed
Searches of conference proceedings were planned.	Conference proceedings were not included. The scope of the search and number of references returned (14, 416), combined with the difficulty of searching relevant conference procedures, made this plan infeasible.
At least 20% of screened studies were planned to be screened by a second reviewer.	All studies (100%) were screened by two independent reviewers, and disagreements were resolved by a third reviewer.
Application of the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for assessing quality of cohort studies was planned.	Formal analysis of risk of bias was not conducted due to the heterogeneity in approaches to examining the predictors of treatment response across studies and to the Newcastle-Ottawa scale's design for cohort studies rather than for predictors of treatment response. Instead, a broad critical analysis of the literature is included in the published study.
Meta-analysis of results was considered.	Meta-analysis was deemed inappropriate due to the heterogeneity of studies in the results.
No articles authored by members of the review team were anticipated to be included.	Ebert & Pham (2023) was published during the review's search and extraction phase and was included in the review