			Quality as:	sessment			No of	oatients	Ff	fect		
No of	Design	Risk	Inconsistancy		Imprecision	Other	CR	Control	Relative	Absolute	Quality	Importance
studies		of bias	inconsistency	muneciness	imprecision	considerations	OI.	Control	(95% CI)	Absolute		
New Ou 31	no tcome					none	271/965	217/944	OR 1.33	54 more		
	methodology					lione			(1.08 to	per 1000		
	chosen						(28.1%)	(23%)	1.63)	(from 14 more to		
										97 more)		
										50 more		
								20.1%		per 1000 (from 13		
										more to		
Now O	taama TAC	VC CT	((fallow up ma	n 11 E month) 					90 more)		
6		no	((follow-up mea	no serious	serious ³	reporting bias ⁴	84/210	87/207	OR 0.93	18 fewer	⊕000	
	trials	serious	Serious	indirectness	Serious	reporting bias	(40%)	(42%)	(0.64 to	per 1000	VERY LOW	
		risk of bias ¹							1.37)	(from 103 fewer to		
		bias.								78 more)		
										16 fewer per 1000		
								35.7%		(from 95		
										fewer to		
New Ou	tcome - TAC	VS CO	 N (follow-up me	an 30 months	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		75 more)	1	
1	randomised	no	no serious	no serious	serious ⁵	reporting bias ⁶	3/25	5/23	OR 0.49	98 fewer	⊕⊕00	
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness	551.545	l speriing zine	(12%)	(21.7%)	(0.1 to	per 1000	LOW	
		risk of bias							2.34)	(from 190 fewer to		
										177		
										more) 97 fewer		
										per 1000		
								21.7%		(from 190		
										fewer to 176		
				10 11	,					more)		
1	randomised	no	N (follow-up me no serious	no serious	serious ⁷	reporting bias ⁸	1/19	2/17	OR 0.42	65 fewer	0000	
1	trials	serious	inconsistency	indirectness	serious	reporting bias	(5.3%)	1	(0.03 to	per 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
		risk of bias							5.06)	(from 114		
		Dias								fewer to 285		
										more)		
										65 fewer per 1000		
								11.8%		(from 114		
										fewer to 286		
										more)		
			X (follow-up me no serious	no serious			18/71	19/66	OR 0.87			
4		no serious	inconsistency ⁹	indirectness	serious ¹⁰	none ¹¹		(28.8%)	(0.4 to	28 fewer per 1000	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
		risk of	linoonololololoy				(,	1.9)	(from 149	MODERVITE	
		bias								fewer to 147		
										more)		
										27 fewer per 1000		
								28.3%		(from 147		
								20.070		fewer to 146		
										more)		
			(follow-up mea			I	0/44	2/0	OB 0 44	450.5		I
1	randomised trials	no serious	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹²	reporting bias ¹³	2/11 (18.2%)	3/9 (33.3%)	OR 0.44 (0.06 to	153 fewer per 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
		risk of	,				j '	'	3.51)	(from 304		
		bias								fewer to 304		
										more)		
										153 fewer		
								22 20/		per 1000 (from 304		
								33.3%		fewer to 304		
										more)		
New Ou			A (follow-up me		ns)					,		
1	randomised	no	no serious	no serious	serious ¹⁴	reporting bias ¹⁵	4/21	3/18	OR 1.18 (0.23 to		⊕⊕00	
	trials	risk of	inconsistency	indirectness			(19%)	(16.7%)	6.13)	per 1000 (from 123	LOW	
1	I		I	I	I	I	I	I	-,	,20		I

		bias								fewer to		
										384 more)		
										24 more		
										per 1000		
								16.7%		(from 123		
										fewer to 384		
										more)		
New Ou	tcome - CSA	VS STE	(follow-up mea	an 18 months)	•						
1		no	no serious	no serious	serious ¹⁶	reporting bias ¹⁷	2/28	1/23	OR 1.69	28 more	⊕⊕00	
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			(7.1%)	(4.3%)	(0.14 to 19.94)	per 1000 (from 37	LOW	
		risk of bias							19.94)	fewer to		
										432		
										more)		
										28 more		
										per 1000 (from 38		
								4.4%		fewer to		
										435		
Now Ou	toomo CTV	VS CO	 N (follow-up me	on F2 months						more)		
3	randomised	no	no serious	no serious	serious ¹⁹	reporting bias ²⁰	6/38	1/42	OR 6.26	109 more	ΦΦ00	
		serious	inconsistency ¹⁸		serious	reporting bias20	(15.8%)		(1.02 to	per 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
		risk of							38.45)	(from 0		
		bias								more to 460		
										more)		
								0%		-		
New Ou	tcome - CTX	VS CH	(follow-up mear	1 22 75 month								
3		no	no serious	no serious	serious ²²	none ²³	23/69	13/68	OR 2.14	145 more	⊕⊕⊕О	
	trials	serious risk of	inconsistency ²¹	indirectness			(33.3%)	(19.1%)		per 1000	MODERATE	
		bias							4.7)	(from 3 fewer to		
		Dias								335		
										more)		
										100 more		
										per 1000 (from 2		
								11.1%		fewer to		
										259		
INC. O.	4 OTE	001		05 5 41-						more)		
			l (follow-up mea			26	20/115	23/115	OR 0.82	-		
2	tcome - STE randomised trials	no	no serious	no serious	serious ²⁵	reporting bias ²⁶	20/115	23/115 (20%)	OR 0.82 (0.42 to	30 fewer	⊕⊕OO LOW	
2	randomised	no		no serious		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	23/115 (20%)		-	⊕⊕OO LOW	
2	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	23/115 (20%)	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to		
2	randomised	no serious risk of	no serious	no serious		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	23/115 (20%)	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more)		
2	randomised	no serious risk of	no serious	no serious		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	23/115 (20%)	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer		
2	randomised	no serious risk of	no serious	no serious		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	(20%)	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000		
2	randomised	no serious risk of	no serious	no serious		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	23/115 (20%) 17.6%	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to		
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴	no serious indirectness		reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	(20%)	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94		
2 New Ou	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴	no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵		(17.4%)	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more)	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴	no serious indirectness		reporting bias ²⁶	14/45	(20%)	(0.42 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6%	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 300	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%)	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised	no serious risk of bias /s STE (no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious	no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious	serious ²⁵		14/45	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%)	(0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 36 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to	LOW	
New Ou	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency	48 months) no serious indirectness indirectness	serious ²⁵	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%)	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more)	LOW	
New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias vs STE (no serious risk of bias vs CON no	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 324 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias rs STE (no serious risk of bias rs CON no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%)	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias vs STE (no serious risk of bias vs CON no	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias s CON (serious risk of bias)	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3%	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias s CON (serious risk of bias)	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3%	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias s CON (serious risk of bias)	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3%	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias s CON (serious risk of bias)	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%)	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias s CON (serious risk of bias)	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3%	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 322 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 133 more to 133 more to 145 more to 1549 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou 3	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias s CON (serious risk of bias)	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%)	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou 1	tcome - CH vrandomised trials tcome - CH vrandomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency ²⁹	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness 49.6 months no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%)	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 322 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 133 more to 133 more to 145 more to 1549 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou 1	tcome - CH vrandomised trials tcome - CH vrandomised trials	no serious risk of bias s STE (no serious risk of bias serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness 49.6 months no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%)	OR 1.67 (0.42 to 1.6) OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou New Ou 1	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials ttcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias **s STE (no serious risk of bias **s CON no serious risk of bias vs CON no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴ (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency ²⁹	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness 49.6 months no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%) 6.7%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28) OR 8.43 (3.49 to 20.38)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou New Ou 1	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias vs STE (no serious risk of bias vs CON no serious risk of bias vs CON po serious risk of bias	follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency ²⁹	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness no serious indirectness an 17 months no serious	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%) 38/95 (40%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%) 6.7%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28) OR 8.43 (3.49 to 20.38)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more) 163 more per 1000 (from 0	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou New Ou 1	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias **s STE (no serious risk of bias **s CON no serious risk of bias vs CON no serious risk of bias	follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency ²⁹	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness no serious indirectness an 17 months no serious	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%) 38/95 (40%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%) 6.7%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28) OR 8.43 (3.49 to 20.38)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more) 163 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 0 more 1000 (from 0 more to 0 more to 0 more to 0 more 1000 (from 0 more to 0 more to 0 more 1000 (from 0 more to 0 more to 0 more 1000 (from 0 more to 0 more to 0 more 1000 (from	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou New Ou 1	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias vs STE (no serious risk of bias vs CON no serious risk of bias vs CON po serious risk of bias	follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency ²⁹	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness no serious indirectness an 17 months no serious	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%) 38/95 (40%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%) 6.7%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28) OR 8.43 (3.49 to 20.38)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more) 163 more per 1000 (from 0	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou New Ou New Ou 1	randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials tcome - CH v randomised trials	no serious risk of bias vs STE (no serious risk of bias vs CON no serious risk of bias vs CON po serious risk of bias	follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency (follow-up mean no serious inconsistency ²⁹	48 months) no serious indirectness 48 months) no serious indirectness no serious indirectness an 17 months no serious	serious ²⁵ serious ²⁷ serious ²⁷ no serious imprecision ³⁰	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%) 38/95 (40%)	17.6% 10/47 (21.3%) 21.3% 7/93 (7.5%) 6.7%	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28) OR 8.43 (3.49 to 20.38)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more) 27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more) 332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more) 310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more) 163 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 641	⊕⊕OO LOW	

1	randomised trials	no	(follow-up me: no serious inconsistency	an 6 months) no serious indirectness	serious ³⁴	reporting bias ²	7/16 (43.8%)	2.6% 5/15 (33.3%)	OR 1.56 (0.36 to 6.69)	161 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 638 more) 105 more per 1000 (from 181 fewer to 437 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								33.3%		per 1000 (from 181 fewer to 437 more)		
			(follow-up me		<u> </u>		- 00/05		OD			
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ³⁶	reporting bias	23/65 (35.4%)	0/65 (0%)	OR 72.44 (4.28 to	-	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
		bias						0%	1224.53)	-		
New Ou			F (follow-up me									
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ³⁸	reporting bias	16/30 (53.3%)	6/30 (20%)	not pooled	not pooled not	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
										pooled		
-			N (follow-up me		ı´		4/40		00.00			
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁴⁰	reporting bias ²	1/10 (10%)	0/10 (0%)	OR 3.32 (0.12 to 91.6)	-	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Ou	tcome - CSA		(follow-up mea	an 9 months)		1						
1	randomised trials	no	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁴²	reporting bias ⁴	1/10 (10%)	4/8 (50%)	OR 0.11 (0.01 to 1.34)	401 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 73 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								50%		401 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 73 more)		
			(follow-up mea									
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ⁴⁴	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ⁴⁵	none ⁴⁶	17/80 (21.3%)	33/80 (41.3%)	OR 0.37 (0.18 to 0.75)	206 fewer per 1000 (from 68 fewer to 300 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								39.7%		201 fewer per 1000 (from 66 fewer to 291 fewer)		

- ¹ The study of Liang was not RCT, However the other 5 papers were all RCTs with high quality.
- The heterogeneity of the 6 studies was high(I2=79%), more important, the results of these papers were different with each other.
- 3 The optimal information size(OIS) was 18986 > the toal events(417). The outcome is imprecise. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.40; rate of control group=0.42)
- ⁴ Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.002<0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was significant.
- 5 The optimal information size(OIS) was 466 > the toal events(48). The outcome is imprecise very seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.120; rate of control group=0.217)
- ⁶ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 7 The optimal information size(OIS) was 580 > the toal events(36). The outcome is imprecise very seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.053; rate of control group=0.118)
- ⁸ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- ⁹ The heterogeneity of the 4 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- ¹⁰ The optimal information size(OIS) was 18986>the toal events(277). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.400; rate of control group=0.420)
- 11 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.92>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant
- 12 The optimal information size(OIS) was 262>the toal events(20). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.182; rate of control group=0.333)
- 13 There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- 14 The optimal information size(OIS) was 8702>the toal events(39). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.093; rate of control group=0.209)
- ¹⁵ There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- ¹⁶ The optimal information size(OIS) was 2152>the toal events(51). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.071; rate of control group=0.043)
- 17 There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- The heterogeneity of the 2 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.

- ¹⁹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 144>the toal events(80). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.158; rate of control group=0.024)
- 20 There are only two articles with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- ²¹ he heterogeneity of the 3 studies was low(I2=23.3%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- ²² The optimal information size(OIS) was 300 > the toal events(137). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.333; rate of control group=0.191)
- 23 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.644>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant
- ²⁴ The heterogeneity of the 2 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- 25 The optimal information size(OIS) was 7060 >the toal events(230). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.174; rate of control group=0.200)
- ²⁶ There are only two articles with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- 27 The optimal information size(OIS) was 466 > the toal events(48). The outcome is imprecise seriously (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.120; rate of control group=0.217)
- ²⁸ There are only two articles with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- ²⁹ The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- 30 The optimal information size(OIS) was 52 <the toal events(188).and the 95%CI excluded no effect, The outcome is precise.(α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.400; rate of control group=0.075)
- 31 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.548>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant.
- 32 The optimal information size(OIS) was 112 >the toal events(75) and the 95%CI excluded no effect, The outcome is precise. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.189; rate of control group=0.026)
- 33 There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 34 The optimal information size(OIS) was 674 >the toal events(31). The outcome is imprecise seriously.(α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.438; rate of control group=0.333)
- ³⁵ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 36 The optimal information size(OIS) was 5<the toal events(130) and the 95%CI excluded no effect, The outcome is precise.(α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.354; rate of control group=0.00)
- ³⁷ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- ³⁸ The optimal information size(OIS) was 60=the toal events(60). The outcome is imprecise very seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.533; rate of control group=0.200)
- 39 There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 40 The optimal information size(OIS) was 5382>the toal events(277). The outcome is imprecise seriously.(α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.254; rate of control group=0.288)
- ⁴¹ There are only two articles with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- ⁴² The optimal information size(OIS) was 40 > the toal events(18). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α =0.05; β =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.10; rate of control group=0.50)
- ⁴³ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- ⁴⁴ The heterogeneity of the 2 studies was high (I2=65%), the outcomes were not consistent with each other.
- 45 The optimal information size(OIS) was 158 <the toal events(160). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.213; rate of control group=0.413)
- 46 Begg's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.317>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant.