A priori	Level	Trials	Participants	Mean difference (95% CI) in LDL-C, mmol/L				
subgroup				Within subgroups		Between subgroups	Residual I <sup>2</sup> *	p value†
Total‡		25	984	-0.17 (-0.25 to -0.09)	+		80.0	< 0.001
Baseline <sup>1</sup>	<3.37 mmol/L	6	432	-0.13(-0.46 to 0.20)	<b>—</b>			
	≥3.37 mmol/L	11	536	-0.22 (-0.48 to 0.04)		-0.09 (-0.51 to 0.32)	83.1	0.6
	Beans (1)	15	485	-0.21(-0.39to -0.03)				
Туре	Chickpeas (2)	2	74	-0.19(-0.60 to 0.22)	<b>_</b>			
	Lentils (3)	1	30	0.02 (-0.54 to 0.58)	<b></b>	See caption§	76.5	0.6
	Peas (4)	2	39	0.10 (-0.34 to 0.54)				
	Mixed (5)	6	372	-0.26 (-0.51 to -0.01)				
Dietary fibre intake	<28 g/d	13	381	-0.20 (-0.38 to -0.01)	_			
	≥28 g/d	12	603	-0.16 (-0.34 to 0.01)		0.03 (-0.22 to 0.29)	77.5	0.8
Saturated fat		2	48	-0.59 (-1.03 to -0.14)	▶ <u> </u>			
intake	≥7% E	15	676	-0.14 (-0.29 to 0.02)	<b>-+</b> -+	0.45 (-0.03 to 0.93)	71.5	0.06
Dose	<100 g/d	8	407	-0.08 (-0.22 to 0.05)	+++			
	≥100 g/d	16	569	-0.18(-0.29 to -0.08)	<b>-</b>	-0.10 (-0.27 to 0.07)	60.8	0.2
Design	Crossover	12	386	-0.18(-0.34 to -0.01)				
	Parallel	13	598	-0.19(-0.39 to 0.01)		0.01 (-0.25 to 0.27)	79.4	0.9
								0.0
MQS	<8	19	683	-0.16 (-0.30 to -0.01)	<b></b>			
score	≥8	6	301	-0.25 (-0.49 to 0.00)	<b></b>	-0.09 (-0.38 to 0.19)	80.1	0.5
				· · · ·				
	-1.25 -1 -0.75 -0.5 -0.25 0 0.25 0.5 0.75 1 1.25							
		Favours dietary Favours						
				pulse in	take con	trol		

Appendix 5: A priori subgroup analyses for dichotomous variables investigating the effect of isocaloric exchange of dietary pulse intake for other dietary comparators on low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) in all participants. Point estimates for each subgroup level (diamonds) are the pooled effect estimates. The dashed line represents the pooled effect estimate for the overall (total) analysis. CI = confidence interval.

\*Residual  $l^2$  values reflect the level of inter-study heterogeneity that remains unexplained by the subgroup.  $t_p$  values reflect the level of significance for each of the main subgroup effects assessed by meta-regression analyses at a significance level of p < 0.05.

‡Total represents the pooled effect estimate for the overall primary analysis.

§Pairwise between-subgroup mean differences (95% Cl), mmol/L, for comparator were as follows: (1 vs 2) -0.23 (-0.78, 0.31), (1 vs 3) -0.44 (-1.11, 0.22), (1 vs 4) -0.52 (-1.09, 0.04), (1 vs 5) -0.16 (-0.60, 0.28), (2 vs 1) 0.23 (-0.31, 0.78), (2 vs 3) -0.21 (-0.90, 0.48), (2 vs 4) -0.29 (-0.89, 0.31), (2 vs 5) 0.07 (-0.41, 0.55), (3 vs 1) -0.07 (-0.41, 0.55), (3 vs 2) 0.44 (-0.22, 1.11), (3 vs 4) -0.08(-0.79, 0.63), (3 vs 5) 0.28 (-0.33, 0.89), (4 vs 1) 0.52 (-0.04, 1.09), (4 vs 2) 0.29 (-0.31, 0.89), (4 vs 3) 0.08 (-0.63, 0.79), (4 vs 5) 0.36 (-0.15, 0.87), (5 vs 1) 0.16 (-0.28, 0.60), (5 vs 2) -0.07 (-0.55, 0.41), (5 vs 3) -0.28 (-0.89, 0.33), (5 vs 4) -0.36 (-0.87, 0.15).

## Reference

1. National Cholesterol Education Program Expert Panel on Detection E. Third report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III) final report. *Circulation* 2002;106:3143-421.

Appendix to: Ha V, Sievenpiper JL, de Souza RJ, et al. Effect of dietary pulse intake on established therapeutic lipid targets for cardiovascular risk reduction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *CMAJ* 2014. DOI:10.1503/cmaj.131727. Copyright © 2014 Canadian Medical Association or its licensors