Table S1

Search strategy on PubMed

#1 Search (((macular edema) AND intravitreal dexamethasone implant) AND anti-VEGF) AND diabetes

#2 Search (((macular edema) AND diabetes) AND dexamethasone) AND anti-VEGF

#3 Search (((macular edema) AND diabetes) AND anti-VEGF) AND Ozurdex

Table S2 GRADE of the evidence

Quality assessment							No of patients		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	OUTCOME	Control		
Mean BCVA at 6 months (follow-up mean 6 months; measured with: ETDRS; Better indicated by lower values)										
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	82	75	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Mean change in BCVA at 6 months and 12 months - at 6 months (follow-up mean 6 months; measured with: ETDRS; Better indicated by lower values)										
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	82	75	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

Mean change in BCVA at 6 months and 12 months - at 12 months (follow-up 12 months; measured with: ETDRS; Better indicated by lower values)										
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[2]	reporting bias[3]	227	224	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Mean CST at 6 months (follow-up 6 months; measured with: OCT; Better indicated by lower values)										
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	82	75	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Mean change in CST at 6 months and 12 months - at 6 months (follow-up 6 months; measured with: OCT; Better indicated by lower values)										
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	82	75	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Mean change in CST at 6 months and 12 months - at 12 months (follow-up 12 months; measured with: OCT; Better indicated by lower values)										
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[3]	209	208	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Total serious adverse events (follow-up 12 months)										
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[3]	47/218 (21.6%)	55/224 (24.6%)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
								30.4%		
Elevation of IOP (follow-up 12 months)										
4	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[3]	101/264 (38.3%)	20/257 (7.8%)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
								3.3%		
Adverse events: Cataract (follow-up 12 months)										
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[3]	44/254 (17.3%)	15/247 (6.1%)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
								7.1%		

[1] In one of the studies, the outcome assessors were not blinded for any outcomes

[2] Precision would be rated down by one level due to the small sample size (n<400)

[3] Study size (small studies) or industry sponsorship or other conflicts of interest

[4] Consider the forest plot with included studies where the confidence intervals do not overlap. The p value for heterogeneity is less than 0.05, and I^2 is more that 50%.