Supplementary material for

"Quantifying and presenting overall evidence in network meta-analysis"

by

Lifeng Lin

Department of Statistics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306

Email: linl@stat.fsu.edu

Table S1. The number of studies of direct evidence (upper triangular) and the effective number of studies of overall evidence (lower triangular) for all treatment comparisons in the network meta-analysis by Welton et al.[1] The diagonal numbers are treatment IDs, which are detailed in the legend of Figure 2 in the main text. Blank elements are zeros.

1	3	6	7	1	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	2
3.9	2		1												
6.9	2.5	3	1												
8.6	3.2	4.4	4												
1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9	5											
4.0	2.0	2.5	2.7	0.8	6										
3.8	1.9	2.4	2.6	0.8	1.9	7							1		
2.7	1.6	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.6	1.6	8							1	
2.0	1.3	1.5	1.6	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.1	9							
1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	10						
1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.5	11					
1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	12				
1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	13			
3.8	1.9	2.4	2.6	0.8	1.9	2.5	1.6	1.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	14		
2.7	1.6	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.6	1.6	2.0	1.1	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.6	15	
2.0	1.3	1.5	1.6	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.1	16

Table S2. The sample size of direct evidence (upper triangular) and the effective sample size of overall evidence (lower triangular) for all treatment comparisons in the network meta-analysis by Welton et al.[1] The diagonal numbers are treatment IDs, which are detailed in the legend of Figure 2 in the main text. Blank elements are zeros.

1	1797	2200	5490	792	1158	443	144	400	156	2328	44	93	392	163	273
1862	2		66												
2276	1025	3	77												
5628	1424	1653	4												
792	556	588	694	5											
1158	714	767	960	470	6										
535	416	433	489	319	366	7							121		
171	156	159	166	140	149	129	8							32	
400	329	340	373	266	297	229	120	9							
156	144	146	152	130	137	121	82	112	10						
2328	1035	1151	1647	591	773	435	159	341	146	11					
44	43	43	44	42	42	41	35	40	34	43	12				
93	89	89	91	83	86	79	60	75	58	89	30	13			
487	386	401	448	302	343	329	126	220	118	403	40	78	14		
189	172	175	183	153	163	140	108	128	85	175	36	62	136	15	
273	238	244	260	203	221	181	105	162	99	244	38	69	175	112	16

Table S3. The precision of direct evidence (upper triangular) and the effective precision of overall evidence (lower triangular) for all treatment comparisons in the network meta-analysis by Welton et al.[1] The diagonal numbers are treatment IDs, which are detailed in the legend of Figure 2 in the main text. Blank elements are zeros.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	17.4	21.0	118.3	2.2	23.9	4.3	1.8	2.6	4.0	35.5	0.4	1.2	1.8	2.7	3.5
18.3	2		0.9												
21.2	9.8	3	0.2												
119.3	16.0	18.1	4												
2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2	5											
23.9	10.4	11.2	19.9	2.0	6										
4.6	3.7	3.8	4.4	1.5	3.9	7							0.5		
2.6	2.3	2.3	2.6	1.2	2.4	1.7	8							1.2	
2.6	2.3	2.3	2.6	1.2	2.4	1.7	1.3	9							
4.0	3.3	3.4	3.9	1.4	3.4	2.1	1.6	1.6	10						
35.5	12.1	13.3	27.4	2.1	14.3	4.1	2.4	2.5	3.6	11					
0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	12				
1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.8	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.1	0.3	13			
2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2	1.1	2.1	1.7	1.2	1.2	1.4	2.1	0.4	0.8	14		
3.4	2.9	2.9	3.3	1.3	3.0	2.0	2.3	1.5	1.8	3.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	15	
3.5	2.9	3.0	3.4	1.4	3.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.9	3.2	0.4	0.9	1.4	1.7	16

Table S4. The (effective) number of studies, sample size, and precision of direct evidence (upper triangular) and overall evidence (lower triangular) for all treatment comparisons in the network meta-analysis by Elliott and Meyer.[2] The diagonal numbers are treatment IDs, which are detailed in the legend of Figure 3 in the main text. Blank elements are zeros.

The (effective) number of studies:

1	3	3	1	2	1
6.4	2	2	2	1	2
6.4	6.2	3	3		3
5.6	6.2	7.0	4	1	5
4.1	3.7	3.4	3.7	5	1
5.6	6.2	7.0	8.5	3.7	6

The (effective) sample size:

1	7343	17,893	9711	9778	3315
26,976	2	16,488	15,739	392	8752
34,413	35,049	3	12,597		15,158
33,363	36,917	40,725	4	10,161	44,974
21,255	17,424	18,923	24,153	5	7999
29,905	33,069	38,825	65,078	22,823	6

The (effective) precision:

1	89	414	80	133	17
320	2	159	170	1	58
597	375	3	126		235
431	381	520	4	323	759
333	252	329	522	5	128
397	345	516	1014	437	6

Table S5. The (effective) number of studies, sample size, and precision of direct evidence (upper triangular) and overall evidence (lower triangular) for all treatment comparisons in the network meta-analysis by Picard and Tramèr.[3] The diagonal numbers are treatment IDs, which are detailed in the legend of Figure 4 in the main text. Blank elements are zeros.

The (effective) number of studies:

1	2	9	15	4	9	4	5
14.0	2	3	4	2	4		4
16.5	10.2	3	2	2	1	2	
22.7	12.2	11.6	4	1	2		2
11.3	8.5	8.6	8.9	5	2	1	1
16.3	11.1	9.8	11.9	8.6	6		1
6.6	4.8	5.8	5.4	4.9	5.0	7	
11.1	9.5	7.5	9.4	6.8	8.1	4.3	8

The (effective) sample size:

1	133	849	1707	224	629	420	312
907	2	152	244	69	280		302
1348	664	3	111	71	103	200	
2198	823	940	4	30	139		169
646	457	510	541	5	149	140	40
1177	743	740	909	524	6		67
697	423	579	547	430	469	7	
754	646	528	681	398	562	378	8

The (effective) precision:

1	5.1	42.5	70.5	9.0	29.2	18.9	10.6
41.3	2	8.0	11.6	3.5	13.2		15.2
64.7	31.6	3	3.4	3.5	6.2	7.8	
91.2	37.4	42.3	4	1.4	7.3		6.0
24.9	19.0	20.8	21.2	5	4.8	3.4	1.5
54.6	34.8	35.7	41.5	20.7	6		3.2
28.5	17.9	24.0	22.3	15.6	19.7	7	
29.9	29.0	22.6	27.2	15.7	24.1	15.1	8

References:

1. Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Adamopoulos E, Vedhara K. Mixed treatment comparison meta-analysis of complex interventions: psychological interventions in coronary heart disease. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2009; **169**: 1158-65.

2. Elliott WJ, Meyer PM. Incident diabetes in clinical trials of antihypertensive drugs: a network meta-analysis. *The Lancet* 2007; **369**: 201-7.

3. Picard P, Tramèr MR. Prevention of pain on injection with propofol: a quantitative systematic review. *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 2000; **90**: 963-9.