

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

### Table of Content

#### Supplementary Method

**Supplementary Table 1.** PRISMA checklist for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

**Supplementary Table 2.** Search strategy

**Supplementary Table 3.** Quality assessment of observational studies using Newcastle–Ottawa Scale

**Supplementary Table 4.** Summary of included studies on chronic hepatitis B with or without fatty liver

**Supplementary Table 5.** Aggregated study-level data meta-analysis: Subgroup analysis for (A) Hepatocellular carcinoma, (B) cirrhosis, (C) mortality, and (D) HBsAg seroclearance in CHB patients with and without concomitant FLD

**Supplementary Figure 1.** Funnel plot of conventional meta-analysis of 19 studies evaluating the risk of hepatocellular carcinoma between chronic hepatitis B patients with and without fatty liver.

**Supplementary Figure 2.** Individual patient-level data meta-analysis: Subgroup analysis of cumulative incidence of clinical outcomes in the total cohort of patients with chronic hepatitis B with and without fatty liver based on: Age (A & B), Sex (C & D), Treatment status (E & F), Presence of Diabetes Mellitus (G & H), HBeAg seropositivity (I), Baseline liver cirrhosis (J & K) and Diagnosis method of fatty liver (L).

**Supplementary Figure 3.** Test of positivity assumption for the

IPTW model.

**Supplementary Figure 4.** Factors associated with cirrhosis at baseline among patients with chronic hepatitis B with and without fatty liver, stratified by diagnosis method of fatty liver.

#### Supplementary Method:

We extracted data on baseline patient characteristics (age, sex, cirrhosis and diabetes mellitus, alanine aminotransferase [ALT], HBeAg, HBV DNA, and antiviral treatment status), study characteristics (publication date, study location, primary author, sample size, and study design), follow-up duration (person-years), and relevant clinical outcomes (HCC, cirrhosis, mortality and HBsAg seroclearance). If not reported by the study, we estimated the annual rate of the outcome of interest by dividing the number of patients with the outcome by the product of mean follow-up duration in years times the total number of patients and the person-years of follow-up by dividing the number of patients who developed the event by the annual incidence rate of said event.

Studies with a score 7–9 were considered to be of high quality, 4–6 fair quality, and <4 poor quality. Discrepancies during data collection and study quality assessment were resolved by consensus and with a third author as needed.