

Supplementary Table 6. Details of GRADE assessment for CR

No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Quality assessment				No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
			Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CR	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
New Outcome												
31	no methodology chosen					none	271/965 (28.1%)	217/944 (23%)	OR 1.33 (1.08 to 1.63)	54 more per 1000 (from 14 more to 97 more)		
								20.1%		50 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 90 more)		
New Outcome - TAC VS CTX (follow-up mean 14.5 months)												
6	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias ¹	serious ²	no serious indirectness	serious ³	reporting bias ⁴	84/210 (40%)	87/207 (42%)	OR 0.93 (0.64 to 1.37)	18 fewer per 1000 (from 103 fewer to 78 more)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	
								35.7%		16 fewer per 1000 (from 95 fewer to 75 more)		
New Outcome - TAC VS CON (follow-up mean 30 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁵	reporting bias ⁶	3/25 (12%)	5/23 (21.7%)	OR 0.49 (0.1 to 2.34)	98 fewer per 1000 (from 190 fewer to 177 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	
								21.7%		97 fewer per 1000 (from 190 fewer to 176 more)		
New Outcome - MMF VS CON (follow-up mean 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁷	reporting bias ⁸	1/19 (5.3%)	2/17 (11.8%)	OR 0.42 (0.03 to 5.06)	65 fewer per 1000 (from 114 fewer to 285 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	
								11.8%		65 fewer per 1000 (from 114 fewer to 286 more)		
New Outcome - MMF VS CTX (follow-up mean 15 75 months)												
4	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ⁹	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁰	none ¹¹	18/71 (25.4%)	19/66 (28.8%)	OR 0.87 (0.4 to 1.9)	28 fewer per 1000 (from 149 fewer to 147 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE	
								28.3%		27 fewer per 1000 (from 147 fewer to 146 more)		
New Outcome - MMF VS CH (follow-up mean 15 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	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 3.51)	153 fewer per 1000 (from 304 fewer to 304 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	
								33.3%		153 fewer per 1000 (from 304 fewer to 304 more)		
New Outcome - MMF vs CSA (follow-up mean 11 2 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁴	reporting bias ¹⁵	4/21 (19%)	3/18 (16.7%)	OR 1.18 (0.23 to 6.13)	24 more per 1000 (from 123	⊕⊕○○ LOW	

		bias									fewer to 384 more)		
								16.7%			24 more per 1000 (from 123 fewer to 384 more)		
New Outcome - CSA VS STE (follow-up mean 18 months)													
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁶	reporting bias ¹⁷	2/28 (7.1%)	1/23 (4.3%)	OR 1.69 (0.14 to 19.94)	28 more per 1000 (from 37 fewer to 432 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								4.4%		28 more per 1000 (from 38 fewer to 435 more)			
New Outcome - CTX VS CON (follow-up mean 52 months)													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ¹⁸	no serious indirectness	serious ¹⁹	reporting bias ²⁰	6/38 (15.8%)	1/42 (2.4%)	OR 6.26 (1.02 to 38.45)	109 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 460 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								0%		-			
New Outcome - CTX VS CH (follow-up mean 22.75 months)													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²¹	no serious indirectness	serious ²²	none ²³	23/69 (33.3%)	13/68 (19.1%)	OR 2.14 (0.98 to 4.7)	145 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 335 more)	⊕⊕○○ MODERATE		
								11.1%		100 more per 1000 (from 2 fewer to 259 more)			
New Outcome - STE vs CON (follow-up mean 35.5 months)													
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁴	no serious indirectness	serious ²⁵	reporting bias ²⁶	20/115 (17.4%)	23/115 (20%)	OR 0.82 (0.42 to 1.6)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 86 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								17.6%		27 fewer per 1000 (from 94 fewer to 79 more)			
New Outcome - CH vs STE (follow-up mean 48 months)													
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²⁷	reporting bias ²⁸	14/45 (31.1%)	10/47 (21.3%)	OR 1.67 (0.65 to 4.28)	98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								21.3%		98 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 324 more)			
New Outcome - CH vs CON (follow-up mean 49.6 months)													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁹	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ³⁰	none ³¹	38/95 (40%)	7/93 (7.5%)	OR 8.43 (3.49 to 20.38)	332 more per 1000 (from 146 more to 549 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH		
								6.7%		310 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 527 more)			
New Outcome - RTX vs CON (follow-up mean 17 months)													
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³²	reporting bias ³³	7/37 (18.9%)	1/38 (2.6%)	OR 8.63 (1.01 to 74.11)	163 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 641 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		

												161 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 638 more)		
												2.6%		
New Outcome - TAC VS CSA (follow-up mean 6 months)														
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³⁴	reporting bias ³⁵	7/16 (43.8%)	5/15 (33.3%)	OR 1.56 (0.36 to 6.69)			105 more per 1000 (from 181 fewer to 437 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW	
											33.3%	105 more per 1000 (from 181 fewer to 437 more)		
New Outcome - RTX VS CSA (follow-up mean 24 months)														
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ³⁶	reporting bias ³⁷	23/65 (35.4%)	0/65 (0%)	OR 72.44 (4.28 to 1224.53)	-			⊕⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE	
											0%	-		
New Outcome - TAC VS MMF (follow-up mean 9 months)														
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ³⁸	reporting bias ³⁹	16/30 (53.3%)	6/30 (20%)	not pooled	not pooled			⊕⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE	
										0%	not pooled			
New Outcome - CSA VS CON (follow-up mean 12 months)														
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁴⁰	reporting bias ⁴¹	1/10 (10%)	0/10 (0%)	OR 3.32 (0.12 to 91.6)	-			⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW	
											0%	-		
New Outcome - CSA VS CTX (follow-up mean 9 months)														
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁴²	reporting bias ⁴³	1/10 (10%)	4/8 (50%)	OR 0.11 (0.01 to 1.34)			401 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 73 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW	
											50%	401 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 73 more)		
New Outcome - RTX VS CTX (follow-up mean 24 months)														
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)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ 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.

² 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 total 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 total 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 small sample in this study, so we suspect its publication bias seriously.

⁷ The optimal information size(OIS) was 580 > the total 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 small sample in this study, so we suspect its 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 total 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 total 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 small sample in this study, so we suspect its publication bias seriously

¹⁴ The optimal information size(OIS) was 8702 > the total 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 small sample in this study, so we suspect its publication bias seriously.

¹⁶ The optimal information size(OIS) was 2152 > the total 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 small sample in this study, so we suspect its publication bias seriously

¹⁸ 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 total events(80).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.158; rate of control group=0.024)
- 20 There are only two articles with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- 21 The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was low($I^2=23.3\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- 22 The optimal information size(OIS) was 300 >the total events(137).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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($I^2=0\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- 25 The optimal information size(OIS) was 7060 >the total events(230).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.174; rate of control group=0.200)
- 26 There are only two articles with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- 27 The optimal information size(OIS) was 466 >the total events(48).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.120; rate of control group=0.217)
- 28 There are only two articles with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- 29 The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was low($I^2=0\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- 30 The optimal information size(OIS) was 52 <the total events(188).and the 95%CI excluded no effect,The outcome is precise.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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 total events(75).and the 95%CI excluded no effect,The outcome is precise.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.189; rate of control group=0.026)
- 33 There is only one article with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 34 The optimal information size(OIS) was 674 >the total events(31).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.438; rate of control group=0.333)
- 35 There is only one article with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 36 The optimal information size(OIS) was 5<the total events(130).and the 95%CI excluded no effect,The outcome is precise.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.354; rate of control group=0.00)
- 37 There is only one article with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 38 The optimal information size(OIS) was 60=the total events(60).The outcome is imprecise very seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.533; rate of control group=0.200)
- 39 There is only one article with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 40 The optimal information size(OIS) was 5382>the total events(277).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.254; rate of control group=0.288)
- 41 There are only two articles with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 42 The optimal information size(OIS) was 40 >the total events(18).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.10; rate of control group=0.50)
- 43 There is only one article with small sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously.
- 44 The heterogeneity of the 2 studies was high ($I^2=65\%$), the outcomes were not consistent with each other.
- 45 The optimal information size(OIS) was 158 <the total events(160).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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.