



Fig. S1. Forest plot about the relationship between SNHG15 expression and the


lymph node metastasis.




**Fig. S2**. Forest plot about the relationship between SNHG15 expression and distant metastasis (A) and histologic grade (B).



**Fig. S3**. Forest plot about the relationship between SNHG15 expression and depth of invasion (A), tumor size (B) and smoking (C).



**Fig. S4**. Forest plot about the relationship between SNHG15 expression and age (older vs. young) (A) and gender (female vs. male) (B).



**Fig. S5**. Funnel plot for the correlation between SNHG15 expression level and different prognosis indicators.DFS (A) .TNM stage (B) .Lymph node metastasis (C) . Distant metastasis (D). Histologic grade (E). depth of invasion (F). Tumor size (G). age (H). Gender (I).

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI
1.2.1 Lung cancer					
Cui HX 2018	0.8038	0.3933	8.8%	2.23 [1.03, 4.83]	<b>_</b>
Dong YZ 2018	0.6152	0.34	10.0%	1.85 [0.95, 3.60]	
Jin B 2018	0.4886		6.1%	1.63 [0.56, 4.74]	
Ma XR 2019	1.1933		7.7%	3.30 [1.36, 7.98]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			32.6%	2.16 [1.44, 3.24]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0					
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>'</u> = 3.73 (P = 0.0002)	)			
1.2.2 Hepatocellular c	arcinoma				
Zhang JH 2016	0.8096	0.2672	11.8%	2.25 [1.33, 3.79]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			11.8%	2.25 [1.33, 3.79]	-
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2					
1.2.3 Thyroid cancer					
Wu DM 2018	0.6366	0.4516	7.7%	1.89 [0.78, 4.58]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			7.7%	1.89 [0.78, 4.58]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable				
Test for overall effect: 2					
1.2.4 Colorectal cance	)r				
Huang L 2018	1.0047	0.5101	6.7%	2.73 [1.00, 7.42]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			6.7%	2.73 [1.00, 7.42]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable				
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>′</u> = 1.97 (P = 0.05)				
1.2.5 Epithelial ovaria	n cancer				
Qu C 2019	0.1275	0.031	16.6%	1.14 [1.07, 1.21]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			16.6%	1.14 [1.07, 1.21]	•
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2		)			
1.2.6 Breast cancer					
Kong QL 2017	0.6206	0.4305	8.1%	1.86 [0.80, 4.32]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			8.1%	1.86 [0.80, 4.32]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable				
Test for overall effect: 2	<u>′</u> = 1.44 (P = 0.15)				
1.2.7 Glioma					
Ma YW 2017	1.3376	1.2329	1.7%	3.81 [0.34, 42.69]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			1.7%	3.81 [0.34, 42.69]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable				
Test for overall effect: 2	2 = 1.08 (P = 0.28)				
1.2.9 Gastric cancer					
Chen SX 2015	1.0743	0.4127	8.4%	2.93 [1.30, 6.57]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			8.4%	2.93 [1.30, 6.57]	
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2					
1.2.10 Pancreatic can	cer				
Guo XB 2018		0.5184	6.5%	3.25 [1.18, 8.98]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2.0101	6.5%	3.25 [1.18, 8.98]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable			,	
Test for overall effect: 2					
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	2.07 [1.48, 2.88]	•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$	).17: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 31.73 df	= 11 (P			
Test for overall effect: 2			2.2000)	,	0.01 0.1 1 10 1
Test for overall effect: 2 Test for subaroup differ	( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		P = 0.0002	2). I <sup>2</sup> = 73.7%	High expression Low expression

**Fig. S6**. Forest plot about the relationship between SNHG15 expression and OS in different cancer types.