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**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 | 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 |
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