A

	10D-CT		10D-SQT		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio		Risk of Bias
Study or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Random, 95% C		M-H. Random, 95% Cl		ABCDEFG
Ang (2015)	125	153	130	154	8.7%	0.97 [0.87, 1.07]		•		
Apostolopoulos(2015)	154	182	129	182	7.6%	1.19 [1.07, 1.34]				
Ayse Kefeli(2016)	113	130	113	130	9.4%	1.00 [0.91, 1.10]		- +		
Chung(2016)	137	176	120	170	6.5%	1.10 [0.97, 1.25]		+		
Das(2016)	27	33	25	35	1.9%	1.15 [0.88, 1.49]		+		
Fracesco (2018)	60	63	59	63	10.6%	1.02 [0.93, 1.11]		•		
Georgopoulos(2016)	156	175	140	178	9.6%	1.13 [1.03, 1.24]				
Gungor (2015)	72	100	71	100	3.9%	1.01 [0.85, 1.21]		+		• 7 • • • • • •
Kim(2017)	223	243	216	235	15.5%	1.00 [0.95, 1.05]		•		
McNichol (2014)	146	168	138	170	9.5%	1.07 [0.98, 1.18]		+		
Park(2016)	65	86	66	85	4.3%	0.97 [0.82, 1.15]		+		• ? • • • • ?
Wu (2010)	107	115	108	117	12.4%	1.01 [0.94, 1.08]		•		• 7 • • • • • •
Yasser (2013)	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Total (95% CI)		1624		1619	100.0%	1.04 [1.00, 1.08]				
Total events	1385		1315							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	18.52	df = 11 (
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.07 (P	= 0.04) .				0.02	0.1 1 10 10D-SQT 10D-CT	50	

圆

	10D-CT		10D-SQT		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Ang 2015	125	131	128	136	12.1%	1.01 [0.96, 1.07]	+	
Apostolopoulos 2015	154	171	129	171	6.5%	1.19 [1.08, 1.32]	-	
Ayse Kefeli 2016	113	118	113	119	12.2%	1.01 [0.95, 1.07]	•	
Chung 2016	135	143	119	133	9.8%	1.06 [0.98, 1.13]	+	
Das 2016	27	30	25	29	2.3%	1.04 [0.86, 1.26]	+	
Francesco 2018	60	62	59	62	9.6%	1.02 [0.95, 1.09]	•	
Georgopoulos 2016	156	167	140	169	8.6%	1.13 [1.04, 1.22]	•	
Gungor 2015	72	86	71	88	4.0%	1.04 [0.90, 1.19]	+	**
Kim 2017	213	243	210	235	10.8%	0.98 [0.92, 1.05]	+	
McNichol 2014	125	160	119	162	4.7%	1.06 [0.94, 1.20]	+	
Park 2016	65	68	64	70	7.6%	1.05 [0.96, 1.14]	+	******
Wu 2013	107	115	108	116	9.9%	1.00 [0.93, 1.07]	+	~? ~~~~
Yasser 2013	44	57	39	55	1.8%	1.09 [0.87, 1.36]	+	
Total (95% CI)		1551		1545	100.0%	1.04 [1.01, 1.07]	•	

Supplementary Figure 5. Comparison between 10-day concomitant therapy and 10-day sequential therapy. (A) Intention-to-treat analysis. (B) Per protocol analysis. CT, concomitant therapy; SQT, sequential therapy; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel test.