

	10 da	y-CT	10 day	-SQT		Risk ratio	Risk ratio	Risk of bias
Study of subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, random, 95% C	M-H, random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Ang et al. (2015)	125	153	130	154	8.7%	0.97 [0.87, 1.07]	•	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Apostolopoulos et al. (2015) 154	182	129	182	7.6%	1.19 [1.07, 1.34]	-	
Ayse Kefeli et al. (2016)	113	130	113	130	9.4%	1.00 [0.91, 1.10]	-	
Chung et al. (2016)	137	176	120	170	6.5%	1.10 [0.97, 1.25]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Das et al. (2016)	27	33	25	35	1.9%	1.15 [0.88, 1.49]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Fracesco et al. (2018)	60	63	59	63	10.6%	1.02 [0.93, 1.11]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Georgopoulos et al. (2016)	156	175	140	178	9.6%	1.13 [1.03, 1.24]	-	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Gungor et al. (2015)	72	100	71	100	3.9%	1.01 [0.85, 1.21]	+	$\bullet ? \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kim et al. (2017)	223	243	216	235	15.5%	1.00 [0.95, 1.05]	+	
McNichol et al. (2014)	146	168	138	170	9.5%	1.07 [0.98, 1.18]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Park et al. (2016)	65	86	66	85	4.3%	0.97 [0.82, 1.15]	+	$\Theta O \oplus \Theta \oplus \Theta O$
Wu et al. (2010)	107	115	108	117	12.4%	1.01 [0.94, 1.08]	+	$\bullet ? \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Yasser et al. (2013)	0	0	0	0		Not estimable		••••
Total (95% CI)		1,624		1,619	100.0%	1.04 [1.00, 1.08]		
Total events	1,385		1,315					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z=2.0			0.02 0.1 1 10 50 10 day-SQT 10 day-CT					

Α

Study of subgroup	10 day Events	y-CT Total	10 day Events	-SQT Total	Weight	Risk ratio M-H, random, 95% C	Risk ratio M-H, random, 95% CI	Risk of bias
Ang et al. (2015)	125	131	128	136	12.1%	1.01 [0.96, 1.07]	+	$\textcircled{\begin{tabular}{c} \hline \hline$
Apostolopoulos et al. (2015)) 154	171	129	171	6.5%	1.19 [1.08, 1.32]		
Ayse Kefeli et al. (2016)	113	118	113	119	12.2%	1.01 [0.95, 1.07]	+	
Chung et al. (2016)	135	143	119	133	9.8%	1.06 [0.98, 1.13]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Das et al. (2016)	27	30	25	29	2.3%	1.04 [0.86, 1.26]	+	
Fracesco et al. (2018)	60	62	59	62	9.6%	1.02 [0.95, 1.09]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Georgopoulos et al. (2016)	156	167	140	169	8.6%	1.13 [1.04, 1.22]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Gungor et al. (2015)	72	86	71	88	4.0%	1.04 [0.90, 1.19]	+	$\Theta @ \Theta \oplus $
Kim et al. (2017)	213	243	210	235	10.8%	0.98 [0.92, 1.05]	+	
McNichol et al. (2014)	125	160	119	162	4.7%	1.06 [0.94, 1.20]	+	
Park et al. (2016)	65	68	64	70	7.6%	1.05 [0.96, 1.14]	+	
Wu et al. (2013)	107	15	108	116	9.9%	1.00 [0.93, 1.07]	+	
Yasser et al. (2013)	44	57	39	55	1.8%	1.09 [0.87, 1.36]	+	••••
Total (95% CI)		1,551		1,545	100.0%	1.04 [1.01, 1.07]		
Total events	1,396		1,324					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z=2.5			0.01 0.1 1 10 100 10 day-SQT 10 day-CT					

В

Supplementary Figure 7. Comparison between 10-day concomitant therapy and 10-day sequential therapy (A) intention-to-treat analysis (B) per protocol analysis. Risk of bias: A, random sequence generation (selection bias); B, allocation concealment (selection bias); C, blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias); D, blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias); E, incomplete outcome data (attrition bias); F, selective reporting (reporting bias); G, other bias. CT, concomitant therapy; SQT, sequential therapy; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; CI, confidence interval.