

Supplementary Table 9. Details of GRADE assessment for TR

No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Quality assessment				Other considerations	No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
			Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	PR+CR		Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute			
New Outcome													
33	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)			
New Outcome - TAC vs CTX (follow-up mean 14.5 months)													
6	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ¹	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none ³	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)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								74.2%		2 more per 1000 (from 233 fewer to 148 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 ⁴	reporting bias ⁵	10/25 (40%)	7/23 (30.4%)	OR 1.52 (0.46 to 5.04)	95 more per 1000 (from 137 fewer to 384 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								30.4%		95 more per 1000 (from 137 fewer to 384 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 ⁶	reporting bias ⁷	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)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								41.2%		44 fewer per 1000 (from 278 fewer to 279 more)			
New Outcome - MMF vs CTX (follow-up mean 15.75 months)													
4	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ⁸	no serious indirectness	serious ⁹	none ¹⁰	47/71 (66.2%)	52/66 (78.8%)	OR 0.59 (0.19 to 1.83)	101 fewer per 1000 (from 374 fewer to 84 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								76.7%		107 fewer per 1000 (from 382 fewer to 91 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 ¹¹	reporting bias ¹²	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)	⊕⊕○○ LOW		
								55.6%		100 fewer per 1000 (from 435 fewer to 275 more)			

											275 more)		
New Outcome - MMF vs CSA (follow-up mean 11.2 months)													
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹³	reporting bias ¹⁴	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)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW		
								66.7%		95 more per 1000 (from 228 fewer to 262 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 ¹⁵	reporting bias ¹⁶	11/28 (39.3%)	3/23 (13%)	OR 4.31 (1.03 to 18.04)	262 more per 1000 (from 3 more to 600 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW		
								13%		262 more per 1000 (from 3 more to 599 more)			
New Outcome - CTX vs CON (follow-up mean 52 months)													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ¹⁷	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ¹⁸	none ¹⁹	54/85 (63.5%)	32/88 (36.4%)	OR 4.06 (2.01 to 8.19)	335 more per 1000 (from 171 more to 460 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH		
								26.9%		330 more per 1000 (from 156 more to 482 more)			
New Outcome - CTX vs CH (follow-up mean 22.75 months)													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ²⁰	no serious indirectness	serious ²¹	none ²²	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)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW		
								44.4%		254 more per 1000 (from 109 fewer to 470 more)			
New Outcome - STE vs CON (follow-up mean 35.5 months)													
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²³	no serious indirectness	serious ²⁴	none ²⁵	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)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE		
								13.1%		114 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 296 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 ²⁶	reporting bias ²⁷	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)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW		
								38.3%		239 more per 1000 (from 31 more to 410 more)			
New Outcome - CH vs CON (follow-up mean 49.6 months)													
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ²⁸	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ²⁹	none ³⁰	66/95 (69.5%)	31/93 (33.3%)	OR 4.65 (2.49 to 8.68)	366 more per 1000 (from 221 more to 479 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH		
										366 more			

- ¹ The heterogeneity of the 6 studies was high($I^2=79\%$),more important,the results of these papers were different with each other.
- ² The optimal information size(OIS) was 5388 >the total events(417).The outcome is imprecise.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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
- ⁴ The optimal information size(OIS) was 776 > the total events(48).The outcome is imprecise very seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.400; rate of control group=0.304)
- ⁵ 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 total events(36).The outcome is imprecise very seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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
- ⁸ The heterogeneity of the 4 studies was high($I^2=37.4\%$),more important,the results of these papers were different with each other
- ⁹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 392 > the total events(137).The outcome is imprecise very seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.662; rate of control group=0.788)
- ¹⁰ 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 total events(20).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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 total events(39).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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
- ¹⁵ The optimal information size(OIS) was 86 >the total 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)
- ¹⁶ 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($I^2=0\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- ¹⁸ The optimal information size(OIS) was 106 <the total 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
- ²⁰ The heterogeneity of the 3 studies was high($I^2=58.9\%$),more important,the results of these papers were different with each other.
- ²¹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 240>the total 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($I^2=0\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- ²⁴ The optimal information size(OIS) was 474>the total 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 total events(92).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.622; rate of control group=0.383)
- ²⁷ 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($I^2=0\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other
- ²⁹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 58 <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=0.695; 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.
- ³¹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 82 >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=0.645; 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 total events(31).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.875; rate of control group=0.733)
- ³⁴ 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 total events(130),and the 95%CI excluded no effect,The outcome is precise.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.600; rate of control group=0.200)
- ³⁶ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- ³⁷ The optimal information size(OIS) was 316>the total events(60).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.833; rate of control group=0.700)
- ³⁸ There is only one article with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- ³⁹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 4862>the total 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)
- ⁴⁰ There are only two articles with samll sample in this study,so we suspect it's publication bias seriously
- ⁴¹ The optimal information size(OIS) was 30 >the total events(18).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; rate of treatment group=0.600; rate of control group=1.000)
- ⁴² 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($I^2=0\%$),all the outcomes were consistent with each other.
- ⁴⁴ The optimal information size(OIS) was 486 >the total events(160).The outcome is imprecise seriously.($\alpha=0.05$; $\beta=0.2$; 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.