	Exergame			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean [points]	SD [points]	Total	Mean [points]	SD [points]	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI [points]] IV, Random	, 95% CI [points]
1.7.1 Active control g	group (other exe	rcise program)							
Daniel 2012	81.4	24	4	86.2	11	8	6.2%	-4.80 [-29.52, 19.92]	•	
Laver 2012	47.2	18.6	22	46.3	18.95	22	30.9%	0.90 [-10.20, 12.00]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			26			30	37.2%	-0.06 [-10.18, 10.07]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² = 0.17	df = 1 (P = 0.6)	8); I ² =	= 0%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.01 (P = 0.99)	9)								
1.7.2 Passive control	group (no exerc	cise program)								
Daniel 2012	81.4	24	4	63.4	31	7	3.5%	18.00 [-14.87, 50.87]		+
Whyatt 2015	75.3	15.1	40	67.9	21.5	42	59.3%	7.40 [-0.61, 15.41]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			44			49	62.8%	7.99 [0.21, 15.78]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² = 0.38	df = 1 (P = 0.5)	(4); I ² =	= 0%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.01 (P = 0.04)	4)								
Total (95% CI)			70			79	100.0%	5.00 [-1.17, 11.17]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² = 2.07	df = 3 (P = 0.5)	66); I ² =	= 0%					10	10 10
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.59 (P = 0.11)									-20 -10 Favours control:	0 10 2 s Favours Exergames
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Chi² = 1.	53, df = 1 (P = 0	0.22), I	² = 34.5%					ravours control	s ravours Exerganies

Figure A5. Forest plot for the ABC score.