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Supplementary Information

Supplementary Figure 1. PRISMA diagram.

### Supplementary Table 1. Grading of recommendations according to Guyatt et al (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade of recommendation/Description</th>
<th>Benefit vs risk and burdens</th>
<th>Methodological quality of supporting evidence</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A Strong recommendation, high-quality evidence</td>
<td>Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens, or vice versa</td>
<td>RCTs without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies</td>
<td>Strong recommendation, can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence</td>
<td>Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens, or vice versa</td>
<td>RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodological flaws, indirect, or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies</td>
<td>Strong recommendation, can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C Strong recommendation, low-quality or very low-quality evidence</td>
<td>Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens, or vice versa</td>
<td>Observational studies or case series</td>
<td>Strong recommendation but may change when higher quality evidence becomes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Weak recommendation, high-quality evidence</td>
<td>Benefits closely balanced with risks and burden</td>
<td>RCTs without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies</td>
<td>Weak recommendation, best action may differ depending on circumstances or patients’ or societal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence</td>
<td>Benefits closely balanced with risks and burden</td>
<td>RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodological flaws, indirect, or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies</td>
<td>Weak recommendation, best action may differ depending on circumstances or patients’ or societal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C Weak recommendation, low-quality or very low-quality evidence</td>
<td>Uncertainty in the estimates of benefits, risks, and burden; benefits, risk, and burden may be closely balanced</td>
<td>Observational studies or case series</td>
<td>Very weak recommendations; other alternatives may be equally reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RCTs, randomized clinical trials.
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