Stroke – Women

Outcome	Hazard Ratio	HR	95%–CI	Weight
def_priority = 3				
16		0.90	[0.43; 1.89]	2.2%
1		1.21	[0.56; 2.60]	2.1%
25		1.29	[1.22; 1.37]	30.0%
21		1.66	[0.98; 2.82]	4.1%
Random effects model		**1.29**	**[1.22; 1.37]**	**38.5%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.6142$				
def_priority = 2				
9		1.30	[0.69; 2.44]	3.0%
2		1.36	[0.84; 2.20]	4.9%
Random effects model		**1.34**	**[0.91; 1.96]**	**7.9%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.9112$				
def_priority = 6				
18		1.14	[0.99; 1.32]	21.5%
def_priority = 1				
32		1.03	[0.94; 1.13]	26.4%
23		1.27	[0.82; 1.96]	5.7%
Random effects model		**1.04**	**[0.95; 1.14]**	**32.2%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.3576$				
Random effects model		**1.19**	**[1.06; 1.33]**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 56.4\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0106$, $p = 0.0187$
Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2_3 = 15.70$, df = 3 ($p = 0.0013$)

0.5 1 2

Stroke – Men

Outcome	Hazard Ratio	HR	95%–CI	Weight
def_priority = 3				
25		1.17	[1.11; 1.23]	31.7%
1		1.25	[0.84; 1.87]	3.9%
16		1.43	[0.97; 2.11]	4.2%
21		1.90	[1.24; 2.91]	3.6%
Random effects model		**1.33**	**[1.08; 1.63]**	**43.3%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 49.5\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0216$, $p = 0.1144$				
def_priority = 2				
2		0.97	[0.64; 1.47]	3.7%
9		1.36	[0.78; 2.37]	2.2%
Random effects model		**1.09**	**[0.79; 1.52]**	**5.9%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.3385$				
def_priority = 6				
18		1.04	[0.91; 1.18]	19.6%
def_priority = 1				
32		1.05	[0.97; 1.14]	27.0%
23		1.22	[0.83; 1.80]	4.1%
Random effects model		**1.06**	**[0.98; 1.14]**	**31.2%**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.4600$				
Random effects model		**1.14**	**[1.05; 1.24]**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 46.7\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0052$, $p = 0.0589$
Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2_3 = 4.46$, df = 3 ($p = 0.2162$)

0.5 1 2