

A

### Bevacizumab for pterygium excision

Patient or population: patients with pterygium excision

Settings:

Intervention: Bevacizumab

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk Control	Corresponding risk Bevacizumab				
Recurrence	Study population		OR 0.45 (0.25 to 0.83)	624 (10 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ low <sup>1,2,3</sup>	
	231 per 1000	119 per 1000 (70 to 199)				
	Moderate					
	133 per 1000	65 per 1000 (37 to 113)				

\*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio.

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>1</sup> Heterogeneity: Tau<sup>2</sup> = 0.31; Chi<sup>2</sup> = 14.58, df = 10 (P = 0.15); I<sup>2</sup> = 31%

<sup>2</sup> Event=108, less than 300

<sup>3</sup> Studies lacked details about allocation concealment and blinding

B

### MMC for pterygium excision

Patient or population: patients with pterygium excision

Settings:

Intervention: MMC

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk Control	Corresponding risk MMC				
Recurrence	Study population		OR 0.15 (0.07 to 0.31)	1127 (15 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ low <sup>1,2,3</sup>	
	396 per 1000	89 per 1000 (44 to 169)				
	Moderate					
	389 per 1000	87 per 1000 (43 to 165)				

\*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio.

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>1</sup> Heterogeneity: Tau<sup>2</sup> = 1.36; Chi<sup>2</sup> = 46.79, df = 14 (P < 0.0001); I<sup>2</sup> = 70%

<sup>2</sup> Studies lacked details about allocation concealment and blinding

<sup>3</sup> Event=230, less than 300

C

### 5-FU for pterygium excision

Patient or population: patients with pterygium excision

Settings:

Intervention: 5-FU

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk Control	Corresponding risk 5-FU				
recurrence	Study population		OR 0.77 (0.07 to 8.7)	280 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ very low <sup>1,2,3,4</sup>	
	229 per 1000	186 per 1000 (20 to 720)				
	Moderate					
	279 per 1000	230 per 1000 (26 to 771)				

\*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio.

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>1</sup> Studies lacked details about allocation concealment and blinding

<sup>2</sup> Event=51, less than 300

<sup>3</sup> Heterogeneity: Tau<sup>2</sup> = 2.74; Chi<sup>2</sup> = 9.69, df = 1 (P = 0.002); I<sup>2</sup> = 90%

<sup>4</sup> OR (95%CI): 0.77 [0.07, 8.70]

D

### β-RT for pterygium excision

Patient or population: patients with pterygium excision

Settings:

Intervention: β-RT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk Control	Corresponding risk β-RT				
recurrence	Study population		OR 8.12 (0.01 to 1.03)	194 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ very low <sup>1,2,3</sup>	
	458 per 1000	92 per 1000 (8 to 486)				
	Moderate					
	492 per 1000	104 per 1000 (10 to 499)				

\*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio.

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>1</sup> Studies lacked details about allocation concealment and blinding

<sup>2</sup> Heterogeneity: Tau<sup>2</sup> = 2.05; Chi<sup>2</sup> = 6.99, df = 1 (P = 0.008); I<sup>2</sup> = 86%

<sup>3</sup> Event=54, less than 300