Captions and Descriptions of Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Forest plots of risk ratios and mean differences of oncological outcomes of the included studies in fixed-effect model, (A) Quirke quality of mesorectum to be complete, (B) circumferential resection margin, (C) positive circumferential resection margin, (D) positive distal resection margin, and (E) harvested lymph nodes. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; SD: standard deviation; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; IV: inverse variance; CI: confidence interval.

Figure S2. Forest plots of risk ratios of Quirke quality of mesorectum, (A) nearly complete in random-effects model, (B) nearly complete in fixed-effect model, (C) incomplete in random-effects model, and (D) incomplete in fixed-effect model. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; CI: confidence interval.

Figure S3. Forest plots of risk ratios of positive circumferential resection margin defined as within 1 mm, (A) random-effects model, and (B) fixed-effect model. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; CI: confidence interval.

Figure S4. Forest plots of risk ratios and mean differences of subgroup analyses, (A) operative time by one team in TaTME, (B) intraoperative bleeding in random-effects model, (C) intraoperative bleeding in fixed-effect model, (D) intraoperative adjacent organ injury in random-effects model, (E) intraoperative adjacent organ injury in fixed-effect model, and (F) hospital stay without ERAS. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; SD: standard deviation; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; IV: inverse variance; CI: confidence interval.

Figure S5. Forest plots of risk ratios of perioperative outcomes of the included studies in fixed-effect model, (A) conversion, (B) diverting ostomy, (C) splenic flexure mobilization, and (D) overall intraoperative complications. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; CI: confidence interval.

Figure S6. Forest plots of risk ratios of short-term postoperative outcomes of the included studies in fixed-effect model, (A) overall postoperative complications, (B) anastomotic leakage, (C) prolonged postoperative ileus, (D) wound infection, (E) urinary retention, and (F) readmission. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; CI: confidence interval.

Figure S7. Forest plots of risk ratios of short-term postoperative complications classified according to the Dindo-Clavien classification, (A) grade I in random-effects model, (B) grade I in fixed-effect model, (C) grade II in random-effects model, (D) grade II in fixed-effect model, (E) grade III in random-effects model, (F) grade III in fixed-effect model, (G) grade IV in random-effects model, and (H) grade IV in fixed-effect model. TaTME: transanal total mesorectal excision; LaTME: laparoscopic total mesorectal excision; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; CI: confidence interval.

٨		TaTM	IE	LaTM	E			Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
A_{-}	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total I	Events	Total	Weight	M-	H. Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
	de'Angelis 2015	27	32	24	32	12.2%		1.13 [0.88, 1.44]			
	Lelong 2017	34 10	3/	30 20	38	9.6%		1 06 [0 69 1 62]		-	
	Perdawood 2015	20	25	17	25	8.6%		1.18 [0.84, 1.64]			
	Perdawood 2017	58	100	68	100	34.4%		0.85 [0.69, 1.06]		+	
	Rasulov 2016	15	22	17	23	8.4%		0.92 [0.63, 1.34]		-	
	Velthuis 2014	24	25	18	25	9.1%		1.33 [1.03, 1.72]		T	
			275		200	100.0%		1 00 10 01 1 111		4	
	Total events	197	215	199	200	100.076		1.00 [0.91, 1.11]		I	
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.	10, df = 6 (P = 0.17)	; l ² = 34	%						
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.09 (P =	= 0.93)						0.01	0.1 1 10 Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	100
D		TaTM	AE	L	aTME			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
D _	Study or Subgroup	Mean 3	SD Total	Mean	<u>SD</u>	100	1 70/	IV, Fixed, 95%	<u>CI</u>	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
	de'Angelis 2015	9.68 4	.5 50 57 32	9 19	5 55	32	1.7%	0.49 [-2.00, 2.98	31	+	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	12 ().9 37	11	0.6	37 9	2.3%	1.00 [0.65, 1.3	5]		
	Perdawood 2015	10.25 4.	75 25	13	8	25	0.8%	-2.75 [-6.40, 0.90	0]	-	
	Perdawood 2017	8.99 7.	21 100	9.44	7.86	100	2.6%	-0.45 [-2.54, 1.64	F]	t	
	Velthuis 2014	13 7.1	25 25	12	6.25	25	0.8%	1.00 [-2.72, 4.72	2]	T	
	Total (95% CI)		269			319 10	0.0%	0.92 [0.58. 1.25	1		
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.89	9, df = 5 (P :	= 0.32); l ²	= 15%		2000-0052 5000			-		100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	5.37 (P < 0	.00001)						-100	Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	100
C		TaTM	IE	LaTM	IE			Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
U_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total I	Events	Total	Weight	M-	H. Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	0	23	4	23	12.0%		0.11 [0.01, 1.95]	•		
	do'Angolis 2015	2	30	10	32	8.0%		0.40 [0.09, 1.76]			
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	0	37	0	37	0.0%		Not estimable			
	Lelong 2017	2	34	4	38	10.1%		0.56 [0.11 2.86]			
	Perdawood 2015	1	25	4	25	10.7%		0.25 [0.03, 2.08]			
	Perdawood 2017	7	100	13	100	34.7%		0.54 [0.22, 1.29]			
	Rasulov 2016	1	22	0	23	1.3%	3	8.13 [0.13, 72.99]			
	Velthuis 2014	1	25	2	25	5.3%		0.50 [0.05, 5.17]			
	Total (95% CI)		348		403	100.0%		0.45 [0.26. 0.79]		•	
	Total events	15	0.0	40							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.	00, df = 7 (P = 0.88)	; l² = 0%	6						100
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.79 (P =	= 0.005)						0.01	Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	100
		TaTME		LaTME				Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
D_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total Ev	vents .	Total	Weight	M-H	H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	0	23	1	23	30.5%	(0.33 [0.01, 7.78]			
	de'Angelis 2015	2	32	0	32	10.2%	5.0	0 [0.25, 100.20]			\rightarrow
	Lelong 2017	0	34	1	38	28.8%	(0.37 [0.02, 8.82]			
	Perdawood 2017	0	100	1	100	30.5%	(0.33 [0.01, 8.09]			
	Total (95% CI)		189		193	100.0%	0	0.82 [0.22, 3.02]			
	Total events	2		3							12
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2	.26, df = 3	(P = 0.52	2); I ² = 0)%				0.01	0.1 1 10	100
	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.30 (P	= 0.76)						0.01	Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	100
\mathbf{E}		TaTM	E	La	TME			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Г.	Study or Subgroup	22 9 10	oriotal	10 F	SD	1 otal We	1 20/	IV, Fixed, 95%	11	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
	Chen 2015	16.7 7	s 23 3 50	19.5	8.9	100 17	+.3%	-0 70 [-3 48 2 0	+] 31	+	
	de'Angelis 2015	17.06 7.14	4 32	18.63	10.07	32 7	7.5%	-1.57 [-5.85, 2.7	1]	+	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	14.3	6 37	14.7	6	37 18	3.4%	-0.40 [-3.13, 2.3	3]	+	
	Lelong 2017	14	7 34	12	5.25	38 16	6.5%	2.00 [-0.88, 4.8	3]	1	
	Perdawood 2015	23.25 8.2	5 25	24	9.5	25 5	5.7%	-0.75 [-5.68, 4.1	B]	Ţ	
	Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016	22.32 8.94	+ 100	21.75 '	10.98	100 17	.9%	0.57 [-2.21, 3.3	0] 71	F	
	Velthuis 2014	14 4.2	5 25	13	8.75	25 9	9.5%	1.00 [-2.81, 4.8	1]	+	
	Name of International American										
	Total (95% CI)) $df = 0$ (D	348	- 0%		403 100	0.0%	0.21 [-0.96, 1.38	8] 		
	Test for overall effect: $7 =$	0.35 (P = 0	- 0.70); I ² : .72)	- 0%					-100	-50 0 50	100
			,							Favours TATME Favours LaTME	

		TaTM	E	LaTM	E		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Α.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C		M-H, Random, 95% CI	
	de'Angelis 2015	3	32	4	32	6.1%	0.75 [0.18, 3.09]	Ľ		
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	2	37	2	37	3.4%	1.00 [0.15, 6.73]			
	Lelong 2017	15	34	16	38	43.3%	1.05 [0.62, 1.78]			
	Perdawood 2015	5	25	4	25	8.6%	1.25 [0.38, 4.12]			
	Perdawood 2017	28	100	12	100	32.1%	2.33 [1.26, 4.32]			
	Rasulov 2016	3	22	2	23	4.3%	1.57 [0.29, 8.51]			
	Velthuis 2014	1	25	2	25	2.2%	0.50 [0.05, 5.17]			
							1999 CARLENDER CONTRACTOR AND A CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR			
	Total (95% CI)		275		280	100.0%	1.35 [0.95, 1.91]		•	
	Total events	57		42						
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	0; Chi ² = {	5.46, df	= 6 (P =	0.49); l ^a	² = 0%				
	Test for overall effect: Z =	1.67 (P =	0.10)					0.01		100
			,						Favours Talme Favours Lalme	
		TaTM	1E	LaTM	/IE		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Β.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Ú.	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	
	de'Angelis 2015	3	32	4	32	9.7%	0.75 [0.18, 3.09]			
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	2	37	2	37	4.9%	1.00 [0.15, 6.73]			
	Lelong 2017	15	34	16	38	36.8%	1.05 [0.62, 1.78]			
	Perdawood 2015	.0	25	.0	25	9.7%	1.25 [0.38, 4.12]			
	Perdawood 2017	28	100	12	100	29.2%	2 33 [1 26 4 32]			
	Rasulov 2016	20	22	2	23	4.8%	1 57 [0 29 8 51]			
	Velthuis 2014	1	25	2	25	4.0%				
			20	2	20	4.370	0.00 [0.00, 0.17]			
	Total (95% CI)		275		280	100.0%	1 41 [0 99 2 00]		•	
	Total events	57		42	200	1001070				
	Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 5.4$	6 df = 6	$\mathbf{P} = 0$	 ۱۹)∙ ا² = ∩	0/2			F	I I I I	
	Test for overall effect: 7 =	= 1 93 (P :	= 0.05)	(3), I = U	/0			0.01	0.1 1 10	100
		- 1.85 (F ·	- 0.03)						Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	
		TaTM	F	LaTM	F		Risk Ratio		Risk Batio	
-		i a i wi		Earm	_		I NON I NULIO		Risk Rulio	
C	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H Random 95% (1	M-H Random 95% Cl	
С.	Study or Subgroup	Events 2	Total 32	Events	Total 32	Weight 9.4%	M-H, Random, 95% C		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
С.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014	Events 2	Total 32 37	Events 4	<u>Total</u> 32 37	<u>Weight</u> 9.4%	<u>M-H, Random, 95% (</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3 00 [0 13, 71 34]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017	Events 2 1	Total 32 37 34	Events 4 0 2	Total 32 37 38	<u>Weight</u> 9.4% 2.5% 2.8%	<u>M-H, Random, 95% (</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01 4.48]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
C -	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015	Events 2 1 0	Total 32 37 34 25	Events 4 0 2 4	Total 32 37 38 25	<u>Weight</u> 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96]			
С.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Pardawood 2017	Events 2 1 0 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100	Events 4 0 2 4 20	Total 32 37 38 25 100	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31]			
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016	Events 2 1 0 0 14	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014	Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56]			
C -	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014	Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56]			
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI)	Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 280	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events	Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 200 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0: Cbi ² = 4	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1)	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 280	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% 2 = 0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	1
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: 7 =	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1 73 (P =	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08)	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1)	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% 2 = 0%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P =	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08)	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 f = 6 (P = 1)	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% 2 = 0%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P =	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08)	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) LaTM	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% 2 0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	 100
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 f = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	 100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 f = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events 4	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C</u>		M-H, Random, 95% Cl M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.1 1 10 Favours TaTME Favours LaTME Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	 100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernándoz Hevia 2014	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 f = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events 4 0	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 32	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] <u>Risk Ratio</u> <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl 	 100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events 4 0 2 2 2 39 = 6 (P = 1)	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2%	<u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] <u>Risk Ratio</u> <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	 100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Pardawood 2015	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 37 34 32 37 34 32 37 34 32 37 34 34 35 34 34 35 34 34 35 34 34 35 34 35 34 34 35 34 35 34 35 34 35 34 35 34 35 34 35 34 35 34 35 36 36 36 37 36 36 37 36 36 37 36 36 37 36 37 36 36 37 36 37 36 37 36 37 36 37 36 37 36 37 36 37 37 36 37 36 37 36 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 5 4 0 2 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 6 6 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 37 38	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 4.61]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	 100
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Pardawood 2015	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 37 34 25 100 22 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) Events 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 20 20 4 5 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 40.02*/	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.27, 4.21]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0 0 14	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 25 5.64, df 32 37 34 25 100 25	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 37 38 25 100 0.47); F	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 9.6%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.20, 2.67]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	 100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2021	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = 7 1.73 (P = 7 1.74 (P = 7))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 25 100 25 100 22 23	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 20 4 5 2 4 20 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% ² = 0% ² = 0% ² = 0% ² = 0% ² = 0% ³ + 0% 5.8% 11.0% 49.0% 9.6%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.00 [0.14 57]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 25 100 25 100 22 25	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 2 4 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 7 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 100 23 25	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 9.6% 13.5%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI)	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 7 8 6 7 8 9 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 25 280 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 9.6% 13.5%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.57 [0.25, 0.041]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI)	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 5 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 25 100 22 25 100 22 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 2 4 5 5 2 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 280 280 280 280 280 280 280 280	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 9.6% 13.5% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.57 [0.35, 0.91]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = 9 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 0 14 4 0 21	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 25 275 26 100 22 25 200 25 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) 5 2 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) 5 39 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F 280 0.47); F 280 (1.47); F 280 (1.	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 9.6% 13.5% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.57 [0.35, 0.91]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
C .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Lelong 2017 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2015 Perdawood 2017 Rasulov 2016 Velthuis 2014 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.6	Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 0; Chi ² = $\frac{1}{2}$ 1.73 (P = TaTM Events 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 14 4 0 21 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 1.4 4 0 21 1.73 (P = 2 1 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 1.4 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 1.4 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 1.4 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 1.4 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 1.4 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 0 1.4 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 0 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 0 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 0 1.4 0 0 1.73 (P = 2 1 0 0 0 1.4 0 0 0 1.4 0 0 0 1.4 0 0 0 1.4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 275 5.64, df 0.08) IE Total 32 37 34 25 100 22 25 100 22 25 275 275 275 275	Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) LaTM Events 4 0 2 4 20 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) 100 2 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) 100 2 4 5 39 = 6 (P = 1) 100 2 4 20 4 5 39 100 2 4 5 39 100 2 4 20 4 20 4 20 4 20 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 200 4 5 399 100 200 4 200 4 200 4 5 399 100 200 4 5 399 100 100 200 4 5 399 1000 100 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100	Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 280 0.47); F ME Total 32 37 38 25 100 23 25 100 23 25 280 %	Weight 9.4% 2.5% 2.8% 3.0% 63.6% 15.7% 3.1% 100.0% ² = 0% Weight 9.8% 1.2% 5.8% 11.0% 9.6% 13.5% 100.0%	M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.64 [0.39, 1.06] M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.54] 3.00 [0.13, 71.34] 0.22 [0.01, 4.48] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96] 0.70 [0.37, 1.31] 1.05 [0.30, 3.67] 0.09 [0.01, 1.56] 0.57 [0.35, 0.91]		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100

0.1 1 10 Favours TaTME Favours LaTME

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 5.64, df = 6 (P = 0.47); $I^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 2.33 (P = 0.02)

		TaTM	E	LaTM	Е		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
Α.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C		M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	0	23	4	23	4.7%	0.11 [0.01, 1.95]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•		
	Chen 2015	2	50	10	100	17.7%	0.40 [0.09, 1.76]	i i			
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	0	37	0	37		Not estimable	1			
	Lelong 2017	2	34	4	38	14.5%	0.56 [0.11, 2.86]	1			
	Perdawood 2015	1	25	4	25	8.6%	0.25 [0.03, 2.08]	1	•		
	Perdawood 2017	7	100	13	100	50.5%	0.54 [0.22, 1.29]	1		_	
	Rasulov 2016	1	22	0	23	3.9%	3.13 [0.13, 72.99]			•	
	Total (95% CI)		291		346	100.0%	0.48 [0.26, 0.89]		•		
	Total events	13		35							
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	0; Chi ² = :	2.91, df	= 5 (P =	0.71); I	² = 0%				10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	2.32 (P =	0.02)					0.01	0.1 Eavours TaTME	TU Favours LaTME	100
D		TaTM	/IE	LaTI	ME		Risk Ratio		Risk F	Ratio	
Β.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	0	23	4	23	13.9%	0.11 [0.01, 1.95]	•	•		
	Chen 2015	2	50	10	100	20.6%	0.40 [0.09, 1.76]			_	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	0	37	0	37		Not estimable				
	Lelong 2017	2	34	4	38	11.6%	0.56 [0.11, 2.86]				
	Perdawood 2015	1	25	4	25	12.3%	0.25 [0.03, 2.08]	-	-		
	Perdawood 2017	7	100	13	100	40.1%	0.54 [0.22, 1.29]		-	-	
	Rasulov 2016	1	22	0	23	1.5%	3.13 [0.13, 72.99]				
	Total (95% CI)		291		346	100.0%	0.46 [0.25, 0.83]		•		
							100 V V V V				
	Total events	13		35							
	Total events Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 2.9$	13 1, df = 5	(P = 0.7	35 71); l² = 0	%			—			

Test for overall effect: Z = 2.55 (P = 0.01)

Favours TaTME Favours LaTME

٨		Ta	ТМЕ	L	aTME			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Α_	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD Tot	al Mean	SD	Total We	eight	IV, Random, 95%	6 CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	200	57.4 2	3 191.8	64.8	23 1	6.3%	8.20 [-27.18, 43.	58]		
	de Angelis 2015	195 4	13.62 3	2 225	51.74	32 2	4.9%	-30.00 [-53.45, -6.	55J		
	Perdawood 2015	313 75 4	97.5 3 16.25 2	5 350 5	65	25 1	8.8%	-36 75 [-68 02 -54	481		
	Perdawood 2017	284.99	67.25 10	0 334.3	84.31	100 2	6.9%	-49.31 [-70.45, -28.	17]		
			24	4		210 10	0.09/	22.06 [60.22 42.9	201		
	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2$	206.27: Ch	$i^2 = 7.84$, d	⊶ f=4 (P=)	0.10): l²	= 49%	0.070	-52.00 [-50.55, -15.0	, L		
	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.44 (P	= 0.0006)			1070			-1	00 -50 0 50	100
					_						
D	Chudu an Cubanaun	Tal		LaTM	E	Mainht		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
D -	Study or Subgroup	Even	<u>is iotai</u>	Events	Total	weight	IVI-H	, Random, 95% C		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
	Chen 2015		2 50	3	100	34.0%		1.33 [0.23, 7.72]			
	Perdawood 2015		2 20	1	25	19.0%		2.00 [0.19, 20.07]			
	Perdawood 2017		8 100	2	100	45.9%		4.00 [0.87, 18.37]			
	Total (95% CI)		175		225	100.0%		2.39 [0.85, 6.71]			
	Total events	1	2	6							
	Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; C	hi² = 0.90,	df = 2 (P	= 0.64); I² = 0%			0.01		100
	Test for overall effect	t: Z = 1.65	5 (P = 0.10	D)					0.01	Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	100
		-	THE	1				Diek D-ti-			
\mathbf{C}	Study or Subara	Ia Even		Evente	Total	Woigh	+ M	RISK RATIO		KISK KATIO	
U -	Chan 2015	Even	2 50	Evenus	100	40.0%	<u>, ivi-</u>	1 22 10 22 7 721			
	Chen 2015		2 50	3	100	40.0%	0	1.33 [0.23, 7.72]			
	Perdawood 2015		2 20	1	25	20.0%	o Z	.00 [0.19, 20.67]			
	Perdawood 2017		8 100	2	100	40.0%	0 4	.00 [0.87, 18.37]			
	Total (95% CI)		175		225	100.0%	6	2.53 [0.92, 6.95]			
	Total events	2	12	6				• • •			
	Heterogeneity: Chi ²	= 0.90, df	f = 2 (P =	0.64); l ² =	= 0%				H		
	Test for overall effect	t: Z = 1.8	0 (P = 0.0)7)					0.01	0.1 1 10	100
										Favours farme Favours Larme	
D		Tal	ГМЕ	LaTM	E			Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
υ.	Study or Subgroup	Event	ts Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H	. Random, 95% C		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
	Chen 2015		1 50	2	100	29.6%		1.00 [0.09, 10.77]			
	Perdawood 2017		3 100	2	100	53.5%		1.50 [0.26, 8.79]			
	Rasulov 2016		1 22	0	23	10.9%		3.13 [0.13, 72.99]			
	Total (95% CI)		172		223	100.0%		1.51 [0.41, 5.49]			
	Total events		5	4							
	Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; C	hi² = 0.32,	df = 2 (P	= 0.85); I² = 0%					100
	Test for overall effect	t: Z = 0.62	2 (P = 0.53	3)					0.01	Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	100
		-									
F	Study or Subgroup	Ta Evon	IME te Total	Lain	/IE Total	Woigh	+ M_	RISK RATIO		RISK RATIO	
L -	Chen 2015	LVCI	1 50	2	100	3/ 0%	<u> </u>				
	Perdawood 2017		3 100	2	100	52.3%		1 50 [0.03, 10.77]		_	
	Rasulov 2016		1 22	0	23	12.8%	° 63	.13 [0.13, 72,99]			
	Total (95% CI)		172		223	100.0%	6	1.53 [0.43, 5.47]			
	Total events		5	4							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ²	= 0.32, df	f = 2 (P =	0.85); l² =	= 0%				0.01	0.1 1 10	100
	Test for overall effect	t: Z = 0.6	6 (P = 0.5	51)					0.01	Favours TaTME Favours LaTME	
			TATME		LaTME			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
F	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD To	otal Mean	SD	Total V	Neight	IV, Random, 95%	% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	6.8	3	37 9	7.6	37	46.1%	-2.20 [-4.83, 0.	43]		
	Perdawood 2015	13.75	10.25	25 20.5	5 11.5	25	16.7%	-6.75 [-12.79, -0.	71]	-	
	Perdawood 2017	8.63	6.2	100 14.23	15.67	100	37.2%	-5.60 [-8.90, -2.	30]	•	
	Total (95% CI)			62		162 1	00 0%	-4 23 [-7 01 -1	451		
	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2$	2.56: Chi ² :	= 3.47. df =	= 2 (P = 0 1	18); l ² =	42%	/0			' ·	
	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.98 (P	P = 0.003)		- // .				-1	100 -50 0 50 Eavours TaTME Eavours LaTME	100

Favours TaTME Favours LaTME

		TaTM	E	LaTM	IE		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
Α.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	0	23	0	23		Not estimable				
	Chen 2015	1	50	5	100	11.2%	0.40 [0.05, 3.33]		•		
	de'Angelis 2015	1	32	1	32	3.4%	1.00 [0.07, 15.30]			1	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	0	37	0	37		Not estimable				
	Lelong 2017	1	34	9	38	28.5%	0.12 [0.02, 0.93]				
	Perdawood 2015	0	25	4	25	15.1%	0.11 [0.01, 1.96]	-		<u> </u>	
	Perdawood 2017	0	100	11	100	38.6%	0.04 [0.00, 0.73]	•			
	Rasulov 2016	1	22	1	23	3.3%	1.05 [0.07, 15.70]				
	Total (95% CI)		323		378	100.0%	0.18 [0.07, 0.45]				
	Total events	4		31						(ST)	
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.8	8, df = 5 (I	P = 0.4	3); l² = 0%	6			0.01	01	1 10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.65 (P =	0.000	3)				0.01	Favours TaTME	Favours LaTME	100
р		TaTM	E	LaTM	IE		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
В.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
	Chang 2017	21	23	23	23	11.5%	0.91 [0.79, 1.06]		-		
	Chen 2015	46	50	91	100	29.7%	1.01 [0.91, 1.12]		1	•	
	de'Angelis 2015	32	32	32	32	15.9%	1.00 [0.94, 1.06]			•	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	32	37	30	37	14.7%	1.07 [0.87, 1.30]			•	
	Lelong 2017	34	34	38	38	17.8%	1.00 [0.95, 1.06]			t	
	Rasulov 2016	22	22	21	23	10.3%	1.09 [0.94, 1.27]			T	
	Total (95% CI)		198		253	100.0%	1.01 [0.96, 1.07]			•	
	Total events	187		235							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.4	2, df = 5 (F	P = 0.6	4); l ² = 0%	6				01	1 10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.49 (P =	0.62)					0.01	Favours TaTME	Favours LaTME	100
C		TaTM	E	LaTM	IE		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
C.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
	Chen 2015	14	50	25	100	35.0%	1.12 [0.64, 1.96]			-	
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	14	37	5	37	10.5%	2.80 [1.12, 6.98]				
	Perdawood 2015	17	25	9	25	18.9%	1.89 [1.05, 3.40]				
	Perdawood 2017	29	100	17	100	35.7%	1.71 [1.00, 2.90]				
	Total (95% CI)		212		262	100.0%	1.65 [1.22, 2.24]			•	
	Total events	74		56							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.3	5, df = 3 (I	P = 0.3	4); l ² = 10)%				01	1 10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.23 (P =	0.001)				0.01	Favours TaTME	Favours LaTME	100
D		TaTM	E	LaTM	IE		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
D.	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
	Chen 2015	3	50	5	100	18.2%	1.20 [0.30, 4.82]			•	
	de'Angelis 2015	0	32	0	32		Not estimable				
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	0	37	0	37		Not estimable				
	Perdawood 2015	2	25	3	25	16.4%	0.67 [0.12, 3.65]				
	Perdawood 2017	13	100	12	100	65.5%	1.08 [0.52, 2.26]		-		
	Total (95% CI)		244		294	100.0%	1.04 [0.57, 1.90]				
	Total events	18		20							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.3	2, df = 2 (F	P = 0.8	5); l ² = 0%	6						400
	Test for overall effect: 7 =	0.12 (P =	0.91)	45				0.01	0.1	1 10	100

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.12 (P = 0.91)

0.1 1 10 Favours TaTME Favours LaTME



τ.		TaTME	L	aTME			Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
Α.	Study or Subgroup	Events Te	otal Eve	ents T	otal	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	:	M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
	de'Angelis 2015	3	32	2	32	15.3%	1.50 [0.27, 8.38]				
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	8	37	10	37	68.9%	0.80 [0.36, 1.80]		_		
	Rasulov 2016	3	22	2	23	15.8%	1.57 [0.29, 8.51]				
	Total (95% CI)		91		92	100.0%	0.98 [0.50, 1.92]				
	Total events	14		14					r		Ŧ
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0)0; Chi ² = 0.7	'8, df = 2	(P = 0.0)	68); l²	² = 0%		0.01	0.1	1 10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.06 (P = 0.	.95)					0.01	Favours TaTME	Favours LaTME	100
D		TaTME		LaTME		1000 10 1010	Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
В.	Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal Ev	/ents	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
	de'Angelis 2015	3	32	2	32	14.3%	1.50 [0.27, 8.38]				
	Fernandez-Hevia 2014	8	37	10	37	71.7%	0.80 [0.36, 1.80]			<u>.</u>	
	Rasulov 2016	3	22	2	23	14.0%	1.57 [0.29, 8.51]				
			04		00	400.09/	4 04 10 50 4 061				
	Total (95% CI)		91		92	100.0%	1.01 [0.52, 1.96]				
	Total events	14 70 4f = 0 /D	- 0 60), 1	14				—			
	Test for everall effect: 7	$r_{0}, ar = 2 (P)$	= 0.00); I	- = 0%				0.01	0.1	10	100
	Test for overall effect. Z	= 0.02 (P = 0	1.96)						Favours TaTME	Favours LaTME	
		TaTME	T	aTME			Risk Ratio		Rick	Ratio	
C	Study or Subgroup	Events To	otal Eve	ents T	otal	Weight	M-H. Random, 95% C	1	M-H. Rand	om, 95% Cl	
U .	de'Angelis 2015	3	32	5	32	49.4%	0.60 [0.16, 2.30]				
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	1	37	4	37	19.4%	0.25 [0.03, 2.13]				
	Rasulov 2016	3	22	2	23	31.2%	1.57 [0.29, 8.51]		-		
		5		-	20	J /0					
	Total (95% CI)		91		92	100.0%	0.68 [0.27, 1.76]		-		
	Total events	7		11					1000 - 10		
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	00; Chi² = 1.8	2, df = 2	(P = 0.4	40); l²	= 0%		-			400
	Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.79 (P = 0.	.43)			042003700		0.01	0.1		100
			51						ravours faimE	r avours La I ME	
D		TaTME		LaTME			Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
D.	Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal Ev	vents	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
	de'Angelis 2015	3	32	5	32	45.6%	0.60 [0.16, 2.30]				
	Fernández-Hevia 2014	1	37	4	37	36.5%	0.25 [0.03, 2.13]			10	
	Rasulov 2016	3	22	2	23	17.8%	1.57 [0.29, 8.51]				
	Total (95% CI)		91		92	100.0%	0.65 [0.26, 1.59]				
	Total events	7		11							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.8	32, df = 2 (P	= 0.40); I	$l^2 = 0\%$				0.01	0.1 1	10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.96 (P = 0).34)						Favours TaTME	Favours LaTME	
		TATME		TME			Diak Datia		Diak	Datia	
F	Study or Subgroup	Events T	otal Eve	ante T	otal	Weight	M-H Random 95% C	4	M-H Rand	om 95% CI	
г.	do'Apgolic 2015	1	22	2	22	25 7%	0 22 10 04 2 041	1			
	Gernándoz Hovia 2014	3	37	1	37	61 7%	0.35 [0.04, 3.04]				
	Rasulov 2016	0	22	1	23	12.6%	0.35 [0.10, 3.12]	_			
	Rasulov 2010	0	22		23	12.0%	0.35 [0.01, 6.11]				
	Total (95% CI)		91		92	100.0%	0.55 [0.18, 1.69]		-	-	
	Total events			8							
	Hotorogonoity: $T_{0}u^{2} = 0.0$	4		-							
	neterodeneity. rau ⁻ – 0.t	4)0: Chi² = 0.4	6. df = 2	(P = 0.7)	79): l²	= 0%		H			
	Test for overall effect: Z =	4)0; Chi² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0.	6, df = 2 .30)	(P = 0.7	79); I²	= 0%		0.01	0.1	1 10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0.	l6, df = 2 .30)	(P = 0.7	79); l²	= 0%		0.01	l 0.1 Favours TaTME	I 10 Favours LaTME	100
Б	Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME	46, df = 2 .30)	(P = 0.7	79); I²	= 0%	Risk Ratio	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio	100
F.	Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u>	6, df = 2 .30) <u>otal Ev</u>	(P = 0.7 LaTME	79); I² : : <u>:</u>	= 0% Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	0.01	I 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F .	Test for overall effect: Z = <u>Study or Subgroup</u> de'Angelis 2015	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1	6, df = 2 .30) <u>fotal Ev</u> 32	(P = 0.7 LaTME vents 3	79); I² : : <u>Fotal</u> 32	= 0% <u>Weight</u> 35.4%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F.	Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3	6, df = 2 .30) <u>fotal Ev</u> 32 37	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4	79); I ² : <u>Fotal</u> 32 37	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016	4 20; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. <u>TaTME</u> <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0	6, df = 2 .30) <u>Fotal Ev</u> 32 37 22	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1	79); I ² : <u>Fotal</u> 32 37 23	E = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016	4 D0; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. <u>TaTME</u> <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0	6, df = 2 .30) <u>Fotal Ev</u> 32 37 22	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1	79); I ² : Total 32 37 23	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI)	4 D0; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0	16, df = 2 .30) <u>Total Ev</u> 32 37 22 91	(P = 0.1 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1	79); I ² : Total 32 37 23 92	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events	4 D0; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0	46, df = 2 .30) <u>Total Ev</u> 32 37 22 91	(P = 0.1 LaTME <u>vents 1</u> 3 4 1	79); I ² : Total 32 37 23 92	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P	i6, df = 2 .30) <u>Fotal Ev</u> 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I	(P = 0.1 LaTME <u>vents</u>	79); I ²	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0)	i6, df = 2 .30) <u>Fotal Ev</u> 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I).26)	(P = 0.1 LaTME 2 3 4 1 1 8 1 ² = 0%	79); I ²	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 16, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME	i6, df = 2 .30) <u>fotal Ev</u> 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I).26)	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents</u>	79); I ²	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 16, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events T	i6, df = 2 .30) <u>Total Ev</u> 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I).26) L	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents 7</u> 3 4 1 8 I ² = 0%	79); I ² Fotal 32 37 23 92	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk	A 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P + C TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0	<pre>16, df = 2 .30)</pre>	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents 7</u> 3 4 1 1 8 ² = 0%	79); I ² : Total 32 37 23 92 92	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% C</u>	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand	A 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% Cl	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Eemández-Hevia 2015 Eemández-Hevia 2014	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 TaTME <u>Events Ta</u> 0	i6, df = 2 .30) <u>fotal Ev</u> 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I).26) L <u>ptal Eve</u> 32 37	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents 7</u> 3 4 1 1 8 1 ² = 0% LaTME ents 7 2	79); I ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0tal 32 37	 Weight. 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight. 47.5% 26.1% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7, 93]	0.01 0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Ranc	A 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% Cl	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME <u>Events Ta</u> 1 0	 i6, df = 2 i30) i32 i37 i22 91 = 0.79); I i.26) L ptal Eve 32 37 22 	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1 1 k l ² = 0% LaTME ents T 2 1	79); 1 ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 92	 Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Rand	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% CI	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events Tc 1 0 0	<pre>16, df = 2 .30) Fotal Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I ptal Eve 32 37 22</pre>	(P = 0.7 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1 8 1 ² = 0% LaTME ents Tr 2 1 1	79); 1 ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 92 0tal 32 37 23	 Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Ranc	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI I Favours LaTME Ratio om, 95% CI	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI)	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events To 1 0 0	 i6, df = 2 i30) i32 i37 i22 91 = 0.79); l i26) L 121 122 32 37 22 91 	(P = 0.1 LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1 8 1 ² = 0% .aTME ents T- 2 1 1	79); 1 ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0 0 1 37 32 37 23 92 92	 Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.4% 100.0% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Ranc	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% Cl	100 I I
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total (95% Cl) Total (95% Cl) Total (95% Cl) Total events	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events To 1 0 0 1	 i6, df = 2 .30) Fotal Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I 0.26) L otal Eve 32 37 22 91 	(P = 0.1 LaTME <u>vents 7</u> 3 4 1 8 I ² = 0% LaTME 2 1 1 1	79); 1 ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 92 92 92	 Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06]	0.01 0.01 : 	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% Cl	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events 1 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME Events 1 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Fotal Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L otal Eve 32 37 22 91 i5, df = 2</pre>	(P = 0. LaTME 3 4 1 8 8 1 ² = 0% 2 1 1 4 (P = 0.	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0tal 32 37 23 92 92 97); ²	 = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% 	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand	A to the second	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 TaTME Events To 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0.	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L total Eve 32 37 22 91 15, df = 2 .28)</pre>	(P = 0 LaTME rents - 3 4 1 8 k ² = 0% aTME ents Tr 2 1 1 1 (P = 0	79); 1 ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0tal 32 37 23 92 92 97); 1 ²	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% <u>Weight</u> 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random. 95% C 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio lom. 95% CI 1 10 Eaucurs LaTME	100
F . G .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total overts Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events Ta 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0.	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L total Eve 32 37 22 91 I5, df = 2 .28)</pre>	(P = 0 LaTME rents - 3 4 1 8 8 1 2 0% - aTME 2 1 1 1 4 (P = 0	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0tal 32 37 23 92 92 97); ²	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 100.0% 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random, 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Ranc 0.1 0.1 Favours TaTME	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME	100
F.	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Test for overall effect: Z =	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events Ta 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L total Eve 32 37 22 91 H5, df = 2 .28)</pre>	(P = 0 LaTME rents - 3 4 1 8 8 1 ² = 0% aTME 2 1 1 (P = 0 2 1 1 1	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0tal 32 37 23 92 92 97); ²	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% *= 0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Ranc 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk Risk	A 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% Cl 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio Favours LaTME Ratio	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events T 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T	<pre>16, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I Dtal Eve 32 37 22 91 15, df = 2 .28) Total Eve Cotal Eve </pre>	(P = 0 LaTME rents - 3 4 1 8 8 1 2 0% 4 1 1 1 4 (P = 0.1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 92 92 97); ² Fotal	 Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% C</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% CI</u>	0.01 0.01 0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Rand 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe	I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI I0 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% CI I 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME <u>Events T</u> 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME <u>Events T</u> 1	<pre>16, df = 2 30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); l D.26) L otal Eve 32 37 22 91 15, df = 2 .28) Total Eve 32</pre>	(P = 0. LaTME <u>eents</u> 3 4 1 8 1 ² = 0% <u>aTME</u> 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. <u>U</u> 4 (P = 0. <u>U</u> 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 92 92 92 97); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 93 92 93 92 93 92 93 93 93 93 93 93 93 93 93 93	 = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% Cl</u> 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om, 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events T 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0	<pre>I6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L otal Eve 32 37 22 91 I5, df = 2 .28) Total Ev 32 37 </pre>	(P = 0. LaTME <u>rents</u> 3 4 1 8 1 ² = 0% . aTME 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. 4 (P = 0. 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 0tal 32 37 23 92 97); ² : Fotal 32 37 23 92 37 37 23 92 37 37 37 37 32 37 37 32 37 37 37 37 37 37 32 37 37 32 37 32 37 37 32 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	 = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Rand	A tio Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om, 95% Cl 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total (95% Cl) </td <td>4 00; Chi² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME Events T 0 0 1 0; Chi² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 0 1 0; Chi² = 1.0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td> <td>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L otal Eve 32 37 22 91 N5, df = 2 .28) Total Ev .28) Total Ev .28)</td> <td>(P = 0.1 LaTME rents - 3 4 1 1 8 8 1² = 0% - aTME 1 1 4 (P = 0.1 1 1 4 (P = 0.1) 1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td> <td>79); 12 Total 32 37 23 92 0 132 37 23 92 92 97); 12 132 137 23 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92</td> <td>Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% *= 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 29.6%</td> <td>Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]</td> <td>0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01</td> <td>0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe</td> <td>A 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om, 95% Cl 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl</td> <td>100</td>	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME Events T 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 1.0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L otal Eve 32 37 22 91 N5, df = 2 .28) Total Ev .28) Total Ev .28)	(P = 0.1 LaTME rents - 3 4 1 1 8 8 1 ² = 0% - aTME 1 1 4 (P = 0.1 1 1 4 (P = 0.1) 1 1 2 1 1 1 1	79); 12 Total 32 37 23 92 0 132 37 23 92 92 97); 12 132 137 23 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92	Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% *= 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 29.6%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]	0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Rand 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	A 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om, 95% Cl 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 0 1 0 0 1 00; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L total Eve 32 37 22 91 15, df = 2 .28) Total Ev 32 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 22 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37</pre>	(P = 0.1 LaTME <u>ents</u> 3 4 1 8 <u>a</u> TME <u>ents</u> 1 1 4 (P = 0.1 1 1 LaTME <u>2</u> 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	79); 12 Fotal 32 37 23 92 0 0 132 37 23 92 0 0 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11]	0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Ranc 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H, Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl 10 Favours LaTME Ratio lom, 95% Cl 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl LaTME Ratio d, 95% Cl	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI)	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = 0 TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 00; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L .26 L .28 91 15, df = 2 .28 .37 22 91 .5, df = 2 .32 37 22 91 .5, df = 2 .32 37 22 91 .5, df = 2 .32 .37 .22 .37 .22 .37 .32 .37 .32 .37 .32 .37 .32 .37 .32 .37 .32 .37 .33 .37 .37</pre>	(P = 0. LaTME rents - 3 4 1 8 8 1 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. - 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. - 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	79); 12 Total 32 37 23 92 0 0 0 12 37 23 92 97); 12 12 37 23 92 97 12 37 23 92 97 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 29.6% 100.0% 	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H. Random, 95% C 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.40 [0.08, 2.03]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Ranc 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME Events T 0 0 1 00; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); I .26) L total Eve 32 37 22 91 15, df = 2 .28) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 5, df = 2 .28) Total Ev 32 37 22 91</pre>	(P = 0. LaTME rents - 3 4 1 8 8 1 8 1 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. 3 4 1 1 4 4 (P = 0. 3 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	79); 12 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	 = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 29.6% 100.0% 	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.40 [0.08, 2.03]	0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Ranc 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d. 95% CI	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.6 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.1 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.0	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 00; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 00; Chi ² = 0.2 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME D0; Chi ² = 0.2 = 1.08 (P = 0. 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<pre>i6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); 1 D.26) L Dtal Eve 32 37 22 91 15, df = 2 .28) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.97); 1 = 0.97); 1</pre>	(P = 0. LaTME <u>rents</u> 3 4 1 8 8 1 ² = 0% 4 (P = 0. 4 (P = 0. LaTME <u>rents</u> 2 1 1 4 (P = 0. 4 (P = 0.)	79); ² Fotal 32 37 23 92 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	 = 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 29.6% 100.0% 	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.40 [0.08, 2.03]	0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Ranc 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio om. 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio	100
F . G . H .	Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.4 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup de'Angelis 2015 Fernández-Hevia 2014 Rasulov 2016 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.0 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.0 Total for overall effect: Z	4 00; Chi ² = 0.4 = 1.04 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 3 0 4 46, df = 2 (P = 1.12 (P = C TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 0; Chi ² = 0.0 = 1.08 (P = 0. TaTME Events T 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<pre>H6, df = 2 .30) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.79); l .26) L ptal Eve 32 37 22 91 I5, df = 2 .28) Total Ev 32 37 22 91 = 0.97); l .27)</pre>	(P = 0. LaTME <u>vents</u> 3 4 1 8 1 ² = 0% 4 (P = 0. 4 (P = 0. 1 1 4 (P = 0. 1 1 1 4 (P = 0. 1 1 1 4 (P = 0. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	79); 12 Total 32 37 23 92 0 0 132 37 23 92 0 0 12 37 23 92 0 12 37 23 92 0 12 37 23 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92	= 0% Weight 35.4% 47.2% 17.3% 100.0% Weight 47.5% 26.1% 26.4% 100.0% = 0% Weight 40.3% 30.2% 29.6% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> 0.33 [0.04, 3.04] 0.75 [0.18, 3.12] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.53 [0.18, 1.61] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Random. 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.41 [0.08, 2.06] Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.05, 5.24] 0.33 [0.01, 7.93] 0.35 [0.01, 8.11] 0.40 [0.08, 2.03]	0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01	0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Rand 0.1 Favours TaTME Risk M-H. Fixe	1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio lom. 95% CI 1 10 Favours LaTME Ratio d, 95% CI 10 Favours LaTME Ratio	100