	P	rogrip	Suture fixation					Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Bruna Estaban 2010	1.17	1.305	45	1.33	1.822	45	8.1%	-0.16 [-0.81, 0.49]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Nikkolo 2015	3.59	2.73	70	3.78	3.25	75	3.6%	-0.19 [-1.16, 0.78]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Pierides 2012	1.42	1.52	174	1.61	1.76	172	28.8%	-0.19 [-0.54, 0.16]	— ∎ ∔−
Ronka 2015	2.7	1.9	189	2.7	1.8	197	25.3%	0.00 [-0.37, 0.37]	│
Sanders 2014	1.71	1.61	243	1.98	1.98	250	34.2%	-0.27 [-0.59, 0.05]	
Total (95% CI)			721			739	100.0%	-0.17 [-0.35, 0.02]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.00$; $Chi^2 = 1.21$, $df = 4$ (P = 0.88); $I^2 = 0\%$									
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.76$ (P = 0.08)								-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [Progrip] Favours [Suture fixation]	

Supporting information: figure 4 Forest plot comparing mean VAS-score of ProGrip[™] and suture fixation at 1 week postoperatively.