			Quality ass	sessment			No of n	atients	Ef	fect		
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency		Imprecision	Other considerations	PR+CR	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
New Ou	tcome								'			
	no methodology chosen					none	626/1022 (61.3%)	502/1002 (50.1%)	OR 1.66 (1.13 to 2.44)	124 more per 1000 (from 31 more to 209 more)		
								55.6%		119 more per 1000 (from 30 more to 197 more)		
			(follow-up mea						100 101			
1 -	trials	no serious risk of bias	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none <sup>3</sup>	149/210 (71%)	154/207 (74.4%)	OR 1.01 (0.36 to 2.82)	2 more per 1000 (from 233 fewer to 147 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								74.2%		2 more per 1000 (from 233 fewer to 148 more)		
New Ou			no serious	no serious	i e		10/25	7/23	OR 1.52	05		
1	trials	no serious risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness	serious <sup>4</sup>	reporting bias <sup>5</sup>	(40%)	(30.4%)	(0.46 to 5.04)	95 more per 1000 (from 137 fewer to 384 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								30.4%		95 more per 1000 (from 137 fewer to 384 more)		
			N (follow-up me		s)							
1	trials s	no no ser serious incons risk of bias		no serious indirectness	serious <sup>6</sup>	reporting bias <sup>7</sup>	7/19 (36.8%)	7/17 (41.2%)	OR 0.83 (0.22 to 3.19)	44 fewer per 1000 (from 278 fewer to 279 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								41.2%		44 fewer per 1000 (from 278 fewer to 279 more)		
			(follow-up me									1
1 1	trials	no serious risk of bias	serious <sup>8</sup>	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>9</sup>	none <sup>10</sup>	47/71 (66.2%)	52/66 (78.8%)	OR 0.59 (0.19 to 1.83)	fewer per 1000 (from 374 fewer to 84 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								76.7%		107 fewer per 1000 (from 382 fewer to 91 more)		
			(follow-up mea				F 14 1	=16	0000	400		
	trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>11</sup>	reporting bias <sup>12</sup>	5/11 (45.5%)	5/9 (55.6%)	OR 0.67 (0.11 to 3.92)	100 fewer per 1000 (from 435 fewer to 275 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								55.6%		100 fewer per 1000 (from 435 fewer to		

										275		
New O	Itcome - MM	ve Ce	 A (follow-up me	an 11 2 mont	he)					more)		
	randomised trials	no	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>13</sup>	reporting bias <sup>14</sup>	16/21 (76.2%)	12/18 (66.7%)	OR 1.6 (0.39 to 6.51)	95 more per 1000 (from 228 fewer to 262 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Jour Ou	tooms CSA	vo STE	(fallow up mag	n 19 months				66.7%		95 more per 1000 (from 228 fewer to 262 more)		
	i	no	no serious	no serious	serious <sup>15</sup>	reporting bias <sup>16</sup>	11/28	3/23	OR 4.31	262 more	⊕⊕OO	
		serious risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness	SCHOUS	Teporting bias	(39.3%)	(13%)	(1.03 to 18.04)	per 1000 (from 3 more to 600 more)	Low	
								13%		per 1000 (from 3 more to 599 more)		
		vs CON	l (follow-up mea	no serious	no serious	none <sup>19</sup>	54/85	32/88	OR 4 06	335 more	0000	
	trials		inconsistency <sup>17</sup>		imprecision <sup>18</sup>	none '°	(63.5%)	(36.4%)	(2.01 to 8.19)	per 1000 (from 171 more to 460 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
								26.9%		330 more per 1000 (from 156 more to 482 more)		
		vs CH	follow-up mear	22.75 month	is)					,		
3	trials	no serious risk of bias	serious <sup>20</sup>	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>21</sup>	none <sup>22</sup>	54/69 (78.3%)	42/68 (61.8%)	OR 2.89 (0.63 to 13.27)	206 more per 1000 (from 113 fewer to 338 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								44.4%		254 more per 1000 (from 109 fewer to 470 more)		
		vs CON	l (follow-up mea				10/06	11/90	OD 2 45	1.00		
	trials s	serious incorisk of bias	inconsistency <sup>23</sup>	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>24</sup>	none <sup>25</sup>	19/86 (22.1%)	11/89 (12.4%)	OR 2.15 (0.94 to 4.94)	109 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 287 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								13.1%		114 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 296 more)		
			follow-up mean				20/45	40/47	00.00			
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>26</sup>	reporting bias <sup>27</sup>	28/45 (62.2%)	18/47 (38.3%)	OR 2.65 (1.14 to 6.16)	239 more per 1000 (from 31 more to 410 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								38.3%		239 more per 1000 (from 31 more to 410 more)		
			(follow-up mea	n 49.6 months	no serious	20	66/0F	24/02	OP 4 65	366 more		_
		no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency <sup>28</sup>		imprecision <sup>29</sup>	none <sup>30</sup>	66/95 (69.5%)	31/93 (33.3%)	(2.49 to 8.68)	366 more per 1000 (from 221 more to 479 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
										more) 366 more		

										per 1000		
								33.3%		(from 221 more to		
										480 more)		
New O	utcome - RTX	vs CON	l (follow-up mea	n 17 months	3)					more)		
1	randomised	no	no serious	no serious	serious <sup>31</sup>	reporting bias <sup>32</sup>	24/37	13/38	OR 3.55	307 more	⊕⊕OO	
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness		roperting blue	(64.9%)	(34.2%)	(1.37 to	per 1000	LOW	
		risk of bias							9.19)	(from 74 more to		
										485		
									-	more) 307 more		
										per 1000		
								34.2%		(from 74		
										more to 485		
										more)		
New O	utcome - TAC randomised	vs CSA	no serious	no serious	. 22	34	14/16	11/15	OR 2.55	110		
'	trials	1	inconsistency	indirectness	serious <sup>33</sup>	reporting bias <sup>34</sup>	(87.5%)	(73.3%)	(0.39 to	142 more per 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
		risk of	_						16.55)	(from 216		
		bias								fewer to 245		
										more)		
										142 more		
								70.00/		per 1000 (from 216		
								73.3%		fewer to		
										245 more)		
New O	utcome - RTX	vs CSA	(follow-up mea	an 24 months	)	1	·	·	1	-/	1	
1	randomised	no	no serious	no serious	no serious	reporting bias <sup>36</sup>	39/65	13/65	OR 6	400 more	⊕⊕⊕О	
	trials	serious risk of	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision <sup>35</sup>		(60%)	(20%)	(2.74 to 13.15)	per 1000 (from 207	MODERATE	
		bias							,	more to		
										567 more)		
										400 more		
										per 1000		
								20%		(from 207 more to		
										567		
										more)		
New O		no	no serious	no serious	serious <sup>37</sup>		25/30	21/30	OR 2.14	133 more	0000	
	trials	serious	inconsistency	indirectness	serious	reporting bias <sup>38</sup>	(83.3%)	(70%)	(0.62 to	per 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
		risk of bias							7.39)	(from 109 fewer to		
		Dias								245		
										more)		
										133 more per 1000		
										(from 109		
								70%		(IIIOIII)		
								70%		fewer to		
								70%		fewer to 245 more)		
			N (follow-up me		1					fewer to 245 more)		
New O	randomised	no	N (follow-up me serious	no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>	10/19	10/18	OR 0.97	fewer to 245 more)	⊕000	
					1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>	10/19 (52.6%)		OR 0.97 (0.01 to 177.01)	fewer to 245 more) 8 fewer per 1000	#000 VERY LOW	
	randomised	no serious		no serious	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18	(0.01 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to		
	randomised	no serious risk of		no serious	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18	(0.01 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440		
	randomised	no serious risk of		no serious	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18	(0.01 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to		
	randomised	no serious risk of		no serious	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18 (55.6%)	(0.01 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000		
	randomised	no serious risk of		no serious	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18	(0.01 to	8 fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 490		
	randomised	no serious risk of		no serious	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18 (55.6%)	(0.01 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 494		
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious	no serious indirectness	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>		10/18 (55.6%)	(0.01 to	8 fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 490		
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias		no serious indirectness	serious <sup>39</sup>			10/18 (55.6%)	(0.01 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 494	VERY LOW	
1 New Ou	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious	no serious indirectness	1	reporting bias <sup>40</sup>	(52.6%)	10/18 (55.6%)	(0.01 to 177.01) OR 0.08 (0 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 494		
1 New Ou	randomised trials utcome - CSA randomised	no serious risk of bias	serious  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>		6/10	10/18 (55.6%) 50%	(0.01 to 177.01)	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 494	VERY LOW	
New Or	randomised trials utcome - CSA randomised trials	no serious risk of bias vs CTX no serious risk of bias	serious  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness	serious <sup>39</sup>		6/10	10/18 (55.6%) 50%	(0.01 to 177.01) OR 0.08 (0 to	8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more) 8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 from 490 fewer to 494 more)	VERY LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  vs CTX no serious risk of bias vs CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>		(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	8 fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX	no serious risk of bias vs CTX no serious risk of bias vs CTX no serious risk of bias vs CTX no serious	serious  (follow-up meano serious inconsistency  (follow-up meano)	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	8 fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  vs CTX no serious risk of bias vs CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)  - 140 fewer per 1000 (from 440 fewer per 1000 (from 444 fewer per 1000 (from 444 fewer per 1000 (from 444	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	8 fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)  - 140 fewer per 1000 (from 444 fewer to 1000 from 444 fewer to 1000	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)  - 140 fewer per 1000 (from 440 fewer per 1000 (from 444 fewer per 1000 (from 444 fewer per 1000 (from 444	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)  - 140 fewer per 1000 (from 444 fewer to 156 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100% 52/80 (65%)	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100%	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 444 to more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
New Or	randomised trials  utcome - CSA randomised trials  utcome - RTX randomised	no serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX  NO Serious risk of bias  VS CTX	serious  (follow-up mea no serious inconsistency  (follow-up mea	no serious indirectness an 9 months) no serious indirectness no serious	serious <sup>39</sup>	reporting bias <sup>42</sup>	(52.6%) 6/10 (60%)	10/18 (55.6%) 50% 8/8 (100%) 100% 52/80 (65%)	OR 0.08 (0 to 1.88)	fewer to 245 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 543 fewer to 440 more)  8 fewer per 1000 (from 490 fewer to 494 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	

I					101	
I					161	
I					more)	
I					more	

- <sup>1</sup> The heterogeneity of the 6 studies was high(I2=79%),more important,the results of these papers were different with each other.
- <sup>2</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 5388 >the toal events(417). The outcome is imprecise. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.710; rate of control group=0.744)
- 3 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.13>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant
- <sup>4</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 776 > the toal events(48). The outcome is imprecise very seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.400; rate of control group=0.304)
- <sup>5</sup> There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- $^{6}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 3856 > the toal events(36). The outcome is imprecise very seriously (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.368; rate of control group=0.412)
- $^{7}$  There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- The heterogeneity of the 4 studies was high(I2=37.4%),more important,the results of these papers were different with each other
- 9 The optimal information size(OIS) was 392 > the toal events(137). The outcome is imprecise very seriously.  $(\alpha=0.05; \beta=0.2; \text{ rate of treatment group}=0.662; \text{ rate of control group}=0.788)$
- Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.265>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant
- 11 The optimal information size(OIS) was 768>the toal events(20). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.455; rate of control group=0.556)
- 12 There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- $^{13}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 708>the toal events(39). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.762; rate of control group=0.667)
- 14 There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- <sup>15</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 86 > the toal events(51). The outcome is imprecise very seriously. ( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.393; rate of control group=0.130)
- <sup>16</sup> There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- 17 The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was low(I2=0%), all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- <sup>18</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 106 < the toal events(173).and the 95%CI excluded no effect, The outcome is precise. ( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.635; rate of control group=0.364)
- 19 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.187>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant
- <sup>20</sup> The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was high(I2=58.9%),more important,the results of these papers were different with each other.
- <sup>21</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 240>the toal events(137). The outcome is imprecise seriously. ( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.783; rate of control group=0.618)
- 22 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.880>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant
- $^{23}$  The heterogeneity of the 2 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- $^{24}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 474>the toal events(175). The outcome is imprecise seriously.( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.221; rate of control group=0.124)
- 25 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
- $^{26}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 132>the toal events(92). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.622; rate of control group=0.383)
- <sup>27</sup> There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- $^{28}$  The heterogeneity of the 4 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- $^{29}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 58 <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=0.695; rate of control group=0.333)
- 30 Egger's test was used to detect the publication bias,the P value=0.257>0.1,therefore,the publication bias of these studies was not significant.
- <sup>31</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 82 > the toal events(75) and the 95%Cl excluded no effect, The outcome is precise. ( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.645; rate of control group=0.349)
- 32 There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- $^{33}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 244 > the toal events(31). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.875; rate of control group=0.733)
- There is only one article with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- $^{35}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 46<the toal events(130).and the 95%CI excluded no effect, The outcome is precise.( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.600; rate of control group=0.200)
- <sup>36</sup> There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- <sup>37</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 316>the toal events(60). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.833; rate of control group=0.700)
- <sup>38</sup> There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- <sup>39</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 4862>the toal events(37). The outcome is imprecise seriously. ( $\alpha$ =0.05;  $\beta$ =0.2; rate of treatment group=0.526; rate of control group=0.556)
- There are only two articles with samll sample in this study, so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- <sup>41</sup> The optimal information size(OIS) was 30 >the toal events(18). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.600; rate of control group=1.000)
- <sup>42</sup> There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- $^{43}$  The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was low(I2=0%),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- $^{44}$  The optimal information size(OIS) was 486 >the toal events(160). The outcome is imprecise seriously. (α=0.05; β=0.2; rate of treatment group=0.525; rate of control group=0.650)
- 45 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.