

Appendix 8: A priori subgroup analyses for dichotomous variables investigating the effect of isocaloric exchange of dietary pulse intake for other dietary comparators on non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (non-HDL-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.

Reference

 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.

^{*}Residual I^2 values reflect the level of inter-study heterogeneity that remains unexplained by the subgroup.

tp 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% CI), mmol/L, for comparator were as follows: (1 vs 2) -0.21 (-1.06, 0.64), (1 vs 3) -0.09 (-1.12, 0.96), (1 vs 4) -0.27 (-1.04, 0.50), (1 vs 5) -0.52 (-1.20, 0.17), (2 vs 1) 0.21 (-0.64, 1.06), (2 vs 3) 0.12 (-0.93, 1.18), (2 vs 4) -0.06 (-0.85, 0.73), (2 vs 5) -0.30 (-1.01, 0.40), (3 vs 1) 0.09 (-0.96, 1.13), (3 vs 2) -0.12 (-1.18, 0.93), (3 vs 4) -0.18 (-1.18, 0.81), (3 vs 5) -0.43 (-1.36, 0.50), (4 vs 1) 0.27 (-0.50, 1.04), (4 vs 2) 0.06 (-0.73, 0.85), (4 vs 3) 0.18 (-0.81, 1.18), (4 vs 5) -0.25 (-0.86, 0.37), (5 vs 1) 0.52 (-0.17, 1.20), (5 vs 2) 0.30 (-0.40, 1.01), (5 vs 3) 0.43 (-0.50, 1.36), (5 vs 4) 0.25 (-0.37, 0.86).