

**Supplementary table 1.** Studies included in the meta-regression investigating the effect of baseline HAM-D scores on effect size with the stimulation area included.

<b>STUDIES</b>	<b>HAM-D SCORE</b>	<b>AREA STIMULATED</b>
Arumugham et al. 2018	8,11	SMA
Carmi et al. 2019	10	Dorsal mPFC and ACC bilaterally
Gomes et al. 2012	20,7	SMA
Hawken et al. 2015	12	SMA
Seo et al.2015	19,9	DLPFC
Xiaoyan et al. 2014	12,8	DLPFC
Zhang et al. 2019	16,16	SMA

HAM-D: Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; SMA: supplementary motor area; ACC: Anterior Cingulate Cortex; DLPFC: Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex.

**Supplementary table 2.** Results of other meta-regressions (non-significant results found)

<b>Variable analyzed in meta-regression</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>p value</b>	<b>N Studies included in the analysis</b>
Age	0.12	0.34	24
% Females	0.02	0.88	24
CGI-baseline	1.13	0.30	11
MADRS-baseline	0.72	0.43	7
Y-BOCS-baseline	0.04	0.85	22
Duration of illness	0.23	0.21	11

CGI: Clinical Global Impression; MADRS: Montgomery–Åsberg Depression Rating Scale; Y-BOCS: Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale.

**Supplementary table 3.** Researcher allegiance scores across all studies included in the meta-analysis

<b>Study</b>	<b>Criterion 1</b>	<b>Criterion 2</b>	<b>Criterion 3</b>	<b>Criterion 4</b>
Alonso et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Arumugham et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Badawy et al	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Carmi et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Elbeh et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Gomes et al	Yes	Yes	No	No

Haghighi et al	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Harika et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hawken et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Jahangard et al	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kang et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mansur et al	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mantovani et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Naro et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nauczyciel	Yes	Yes	No	No
Pelissolo et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Prasko et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Sachdev et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Ruffini et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Seo et al	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shayganfard et al	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Max X et al	No	Yes	Yes	No
Zhang et al	Yes	Yes	No	No

**Researcher allegiance criteria - researcher allegiance tool from Cujipers et al., 2012.**

1. Is only one of the interventions mentioned in the title?
2. In the introduction, is one of the interventions explicitly described as being the main experimental intervention?
3. Was one intervention specifically described as a control condition?
4. Is there an explicit hypothesis that one treatment is expected to be more effective than the other?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, the study is deemed at risk of researcher allegiance.