CrossMark

GOPEN ACCESS

Citation: Cai J, Wang X, Ma A, Wang Q, Han X, Li Y (2015) Factors Associated with Patient and Provider Delays for Tuberculosis Diagnosis and Treatment in Asia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PLoS ONE 10(3): e0120088. doi:10.1371/journal. pone.0120088

Academic Editor: Dongsheng Zhou, Beijing Institute of Microbiology and Epidemiology, CHINA

Received: August 18, 2014

Accepted: January 19, 2015

Published: March 25, 2015

Copyright: © 2015 Cai et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the <u>Creative</u> <u>Commons Attribution License</u>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Funding: The authors thank The National Natural Science Funds (81172662/H2603) (http://159.226. 244.22/portal/Proj_List.asp) and Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education (20123706110004) (http://www.cutech.edu. cn/cn/kyjj/gdxxbsdkyjj/2013/02/1354173488080563. htm) for the grants supporting the study. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Factors Associated with Patient and Provider Delays for Tuberculosis Diagnosis and Treatment in Asia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Jing Cai¹, Xianhua Wang¹, Aiguo Ma¹*, Qiuzhen Wang¹, Xiuxia Han¹, Yong Li²

1 The College of Public Health, Qingdao University, Qingdao, Shandong Province, PR China, 2 The College of Public Health, Beijing University, Beijing, PR China

* aiguom502@hotmail.com

Abstract

Background

Delays in tuberculosis (TB) diagnosis and treatment is a major barrier to effective management of the disease. Determining the factors associated with patient and provider delay of TB diagnosis and treatment in Asia may contribute to TB prevention and control.

Methods

We searched the PubMed, EMBASE and Web of Science for studies that assessed factors associated with delays in care-seeking, diagnosis, or at the beginning of treatment, which were published from January 1992 to September 2014. Two reviewers independently identified studies that were related to our meta-analysis and extracted data from each study. Independent variables were categorized in separate tables for patient and provider delays.

Results

Among 45 eligible studies, 40 studies assessed patient delay whereas 30 assessed provider delay. Cross-sectional surveys were used in all but two articles, which included 17 countries and regions. Socio-demographic characteristics, TB-related symptoms and medical examination, and conditions of seeking medical care in TB patients were frequently reported. Male patients and long travel time/distance to the first healthcare provider led to both shorter patient delays [odds ratio (OR) (95% confidence intervals, CI) = 0.85 (0.78, 0.92); 1.39 (1.08, 1.78)] and shorter provider delays [OR (95%CI) = 0.96 (0.93, 1.00); 1.68 (1.12, 2.51)]. Unemployment, low income, hemoptysis, and positive sputum smears were consistently associated with patient delay [ORs (95%CI) = 1.18 (1.07, 1.30), 1.23 (1.02, 1.49), 0.64 (0.40, 1.00), 1.77 (1.07, 2.94), respectively]. Additionally, consultation at a public hospital was associated with provider delay [OR (95%CI) = 0.43 (0.20, 0.91)].



Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Conclusions

We propose that the major opportunities to reduce delays involve enabling sociodemographic factors and medical conditions. Male, unemployed, rural residence, low income, hemoptysis, positive sputum smear, and long travel time/distance significantly correlated with patient delay. Male, long travel time/distance and consultation at a public hospital were related to provider delay.

Introduction

The severe epidemic situation of tuberculosis (TB) in Asia is well documented, and TB prevention and control is a top priority for public health. TB can cause enormous social and economic disruption, cause a series of serious consequences [1], and hamper a nation's development [2]. In 2012, there were an estimated 8.6 million new TB cases and 1.3 million TB deaths [3]. Of the 22 high-TB burden countries, which account for approximately 80% of the world's TB cases [4], almost all are developing countries where one-quarter of the world's poorest populations lives. Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific region collectively accounted for 58% of the world's TB cases in 2012, and India and China had the largest number of cases (26% and 12% of the global total, respectively). Moreover, as reported by the World Health Organization (WHO) [3], approximately 75% of the estimated 2.9 million cases were either not diagnosed or diagnosed but not reported to national tuberculosis programs in 12 countries, including India (31% of the global total), South Africa, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Indonesia, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mozambique, Nigeria, Ethiopia, the Philippines, and Myanmar.

TB is preventable if people can access health care for prompt diagnosis and treatment. However, diagnosis and treatment delays are inevitable, and can be categorized as patient delays, provider delays (including health system or doctor delays), diagnostic delays (sometimes the sum of patient and provider delays), and treatment delays. Delays are significant regarding disease prognosis and complications at the individual level, as well as for transmission within the community, the reproductive rate of the TB epidemic [5], and the possibility of higher mortality [6, 7]. Delays can affect the rate of infection among close contacts [8], and the emergence of multidrug-resistant TB [9]. Thus, identifying when delays occur and the factors that correlate with different types of delay can aid tuberculosis control programs and help medical providers improve diagnosis and treatment efforts [10]. TB control programs must identify the reasons for delays in order to improve the control strategies.

It has been reported that one-third of the world's TB burden, or approximately 4.9 million prevalent cases, are found in Southeast Asia [11]. Although similar systematic reviews have addressed delays in diagnosis and treatment and have reported the average (median or mean) total diagnosis delay, patient delay, and health system delay as 25–185 days, 4.9–162 days, and 2–87 days, respectively, for both low and high income countries [12], as well as India [13], no study has focused solely on Asia. One meta-analysis [14] described factors associated with patient and diagnostic delays in Chinese TB patients, and another analyzed factors associated with patient and health care system delays for TB in sub-Saharan African countries [15]. Thus, a systematic analysis of factors associated with patient and provider delays for TB that focuses on Asian countries is necessary to help design interventional studies suited to the culture, economic, and co-morbid patterns of this region. We sought studies conducted in adults in Asian countries to identify factors correlated to patient and provider delays in TB diagnosis. Our results may contribute to the practical work of TB prevention and control.

Table 1. PubMed databases search terms and strateg	JY.
----------------------------------------------------	-----

	Search terms
1	provider delay
2	diagnosis late
3	delay treatment
4	patient delay
5	health seeking OR care-seeking
6	treatment seek
7	case detection OR case finding OR case diagnosis
8	delay present OR delay diagnosis OR diagnostic errors OR early diagnosis OR undiagnosed
9	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8
10	Tuberculosis
11	Asia OR China OR Hong Kong OR Macao OR Taiwan OR Japan OR Korea OR Mongolia OR myanmar OR Cambodia OR Indonesia OR Malaysia OR the Philippines OR Singapore OR Thailand OR Vietnam OR Bangladesh OR India OR maldives OR Nepal OR Pakistan OR Afghanistan OR Iran OR Israel OR Saudi Arabia OR Turkey
12	9 AND 10 AND 11
doi:1	0.1371/journal.pone.0120088.t001

Methods

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We used the following inclusion criteria: (1) studies that included TB patients (or suspected TB patients) in Asia; (2) studies that investigated factors that correlated with patient or provider delays in TB diagnosis and treatment; (3) studies designed as observational studies (cross-sectional, case—control, or cohort studies); and (4) studies that provided enough information to calculate the odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). If there was more than one article with the same population or data, the study with the largest population and most complete data was selected.

Our exclusion criteria were: (1) studies that included other diseases; (2) studies that did not investigate the associated factors; (3) duplicate studies; and (4) review articles, case reports, or comments without original data.

Two authors (JC, XW) independently screened the titles and abstracts of the studies that were initially included to assess their eligibility based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. When there was a disagreement regarding the qualifications of the studies, the reviewers discussed whether the studies should be included until a consensus was reached.

Search strategy

Studies published in English from January 1992 to September 2014 that described original research were searched worldwide [16]. Eligible studies involved at least one factor related to delays in care-seeking, diagnosis, or at the beginning of treatment. We searched the PubMed, EMBASE, and Web of Science databases from January 1992 to September 2014. The search was limited to studies in humans. Search terms, including 'tuberculosis', 'patient delay', 'provider delay', 'diagnosis delay', 'treatment delay', 'health system delay', 'Asia' and countries in Asia, were searched in the title and abstract. We reviewed the references of the included studies and reviews. If it was unclear whether studies were eligible, the full texts were reviewed. The PubMed search strategy is shown in <u>Table 1</u>.

Quality assessment

We rated the quality of all included studies using the Newcastle Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) for non-randomized studies in meta-analyses [17] (Table 2).

Data extraction

Two authors (JC, XW) independently extracted the data from the eligible studies. Differences were resolved by discussion between the reviewers to reach a consensus. Available information was extracted from each study including the authors, publication year, location, starting points and endpoints of delays, study design, method of data collection, characteristics of samples, measurements of the dependent variables, data source, and conclusions.

Statistical analyses

We summarized related characteristics and independent variables from the 18 selected studies using separate tables for patient and provider delays. The overall effect of factors related to delays was estimated in more than two studies by conducting a meta-analysis based on ORs and 95% CIs. If ORs and 95% CIs were not reported in the original article but sufficient data were provided, we used the calculator in Review Manager Software 5.2 (Cochrane Collaborative, Oxford, United Kingdom) to calculate ORs and 95% CIs. We used Q tests and the I-squared statistic [I² = 100% × (Q-df)/Q] to quantify heterogeneity. Because of the small number of studies and the small sample size of some of the included studies, we used a P-value of 0.10 and an I² of 50% to determine statistical significance. If the P-value of the Q statistic \geq 0.10, or if P < 0.10 but I² \leq 50%, we used fixed effect models; otherwise, random effect models were used.

Results

Identification of eligible studies

There were 1700 articles regarding factors associated with patient (care-seeking) delays or provider (health-system, doctor, or diagnostic) delays identified from the databases. We excluded 1613 articles after browsing the titles and abstracts, primarily because they did not have a dependent relationship with the topic. In addition, we also excluded reviews, letters, comments, or case reports. After searching 87 full texts, another 34 studies were excluded because although their initial aim focused on delays, correlated factors were not discussed. Eight articles were excluded because the endpoint of patient delay was the start of treatment, which overlaps with the definition of provider delay. Finally, 45 studies were included in this meta-analysis (<u>Table 2</u>). <u>Fig. 1</u> shows a flow chart of the literature search for studies regarding patient and provider delays (<u>Fig. 1</u>).

Study characteristics

The included articles were published between 1997 and 2014 (Table 3). The 45 articles covered 17 countries and regions, including mainland China (k = 14), India (k = 6), Vietnam (k = 3), Nepal (k = 3), Taiwan (k = 3), Indonesia (k = 2), Malaysia (k = 2), Thailand (k = 2), Bangladesh (k = 2), Turkey (k = 1), Mongolia (k = 1), Hong Kong (k = 1), Singapore (k = 1), Tajikistan (k = 1), Jordan (k = 1), Israel (k = 1), and Afghanistan (k = 1). Sample sizes in the studies ranged from 107 to 78,118. All studies except six conducted patient interview surveys (cross-sectional or cohort design), and used a consecutive method of patient sampling. In all the studied samples, the proportion of male patients was greater than 50%. Most studies were conducted in both rural and urban areas (k = 37). Finally, there were 41,185 TB cases on patient delay and 103,427 TB cases on provider delay.

Table 2. Characteristics of the 45 included studies.

Author, year	Location	Study design	Sample	NOS score
Wang W (2007)[<u>18]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 222; newly PTB patients; 76% aged 20–40 years; sex not recorded	4
Leung EC (2007)[<u>19</u>]	Hongkong	Retrospective study	n = 1249; pulmonary TB; 68.4% male; 47.7% were aged ${\geq}60$ years	4
Huong NT (2007) [20]	Vietnam	Cross sectional study	n = 2093; Smear-positive PTB patients; 71% male; 22.6% were ${\geq}65$ years	5
Enkhbat S (1996)[<u>21]</u>	Mongolia	Cross sectional study	n = 107; \geq 16 years TB patients; 54% male; Mean age = 33 years	4
Yamasaki-Nakagawa M (2001) [<u>22]</u>	Nepal	Cross sectional study	n = 390; new TB cases + began to receive Direct Observation Therapy, Short- course; 67.9% male; Median age in men = 37 years, in women = 30 years	5
Chiang CY (2005)[23]	Taiwan	Cross sectional study	n = 206; new sputum-positive PTB patients; 69.4% male, Mean(range) age = 59.2 (17–91) years	5
Rojpibulstit M (2006) [<u>24]</u>	Thailand	Cross sectional study	n = 192; newly diagnosed smear-positive and smear-negative PTB patients; 75% male; Mean (SD, range) = 43.3 (16.2, 15–83) years	5
Li X (2012)[<u>25]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 323; >18 years + migrant + new PTB; 63.8% male; median (inter-quartile range) = 30 (24–38) years	5
Lock WA (2011)[26]	Indonesia	Cross sectional study	n = 194; TB suspects; 54% male; Mean (SD) = 39 (14.1) years	5
Zhou C (2012)[<u>27</u>]	China	Cross sectional study	n = 314; TB patients being treated or had finished standard treatment within 6 months; 63.4% male; age mean (range, median) = 31.8 years (15–70, 28)	5
Chang CT (2007)[28]	Malaysia	Cross sectional study	n = 316; new smear-positive PTB patients + adult; 61.1% male; age mean (range, median) = 44.2 (15–7, 45) years	5
Lin X (2008)[<u>29]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 10356; smear-positive PTB cases; 65.5% male; Median (IQR) = 38 (27– 54) years	5
Basnet R (2009) [<u>30</u>]	Nepal	Cross sectional study	n = 307; new TB patients; 59.0% male; 70.7% 15–54 years	5
Guneylioglu D (2004) [<u>31]</u>	Turkey	Cross sectional study	n = 204; smear-positive PTB + hospitalized patients; 59.8% male; Mean age = 33 years	4
Hoa NB (2011) [<u>32]</u>	Vietnam	Cross sectional study	n = 7040; TB suspects + >15 years; 62.9% male; Mean age (SD) = 48.9 (0.3) years	5
Xu B (2007) [<u>33]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 1204; TB suspects; 61.6% male; 40–59 years 36.0%	4
Ahmad RA (2013) [<u>34]</u>	Indonesia	Cross sectional study	n = 746; TB suspects + \geq 15 years; 38% male; \geq 60 years 45.4%	4
Phoa LL (2005) [<u>35]</u>	Singapore	Cross sectional study	n = 375; adult PTB patients (sputum culture-positive and cough); M/F ratio 3:1, Median (range) = 49 years (15–90 years)	6
Xu X (2013) [<u>36]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 4677; suspected TB cases; 64% male; 15–30 years 60.3%	5
Rundi C (2011) [<u>37]</u>	Malaysia	Cross sectional study	n = 296; smear-positive TB patients + \geq 18 years; age and sex were not presented	6
Zhao X (2014) [<u>38]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 819; TB patients + >15 years; 72.5% male; Median (range) = 53 (15–90) years	5
Cheng G (2005) [<u>39]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 190; smear positive PTB patients; 65.3% male; Mean age (SD) = 48.1 (16.6) years	5
Tobe RG (2013) [<u>40]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 314; smear positive PTB patients; 63.4% male; age was not presented	6
Choudhari M (2012) [41]	Nepal	Cross sectional study	n = 215; PTB patients; 65.6% male; Mean age = 39.6 years	6
Shu W (2014) [<u>42]</u>	China	Cohort study	n = 260; active TB patients; age and sex were not presented	7
Ngamvithayapong J (2001) [<u>43]</u>	Thailand	Cross sectional study	n = 557; smear positive PTB patients + $>\!15$ years; sex was not presented; Median (range) = 37 (29–52) years old	5

(Continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

PLOS ONE

Author, year	Location	Study design	Sample	NOS score
Selvam JM (2003) [<u>44]</u>	India	Cross sectional study	n = 667; new adult TB patients; 73% male; Mean age = 43 years	5
Chen HG (2014) [<u>45]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 1126; PTB patients; age and sex were not presented	6
Kelkar-Khambete A (2008) [<u>46]</u>	India	Cross sectional study	n = 117; new sputum-positive TB patients; 60% male; 15–44 years 82%	5
Ayé R (2010) [<u>47]</u>	Tajikistan	Cross sectional study	n = 168; new PTB patients + \geq 15 years; age and sex were not presented	4
Tobgay KJ (2006) [<u>48]</u>	India	Cross sectional study	n = 323; TB patients cough for \geq 3 weeks; 58.8% male; Median = 30 years	6
Rumman KA (2008) [<u>49</u>]	Jordan	Cross sectional study	n = 1544; TB suspects + >15 years; 57.3% male; >35 years 62.6%	6
Wang Y (2008) [<u>50]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 1005; adult suspected TB cases + >15 years; 54.1% male; $\geq\!\!60$ years 41.4%	6
Mor Z, (2013) [<u>51]</u>	Israel	Cross sectional study	n = 1005; adult suspected TB cases + >15 years; Citizen: 60.8% male; Mean age (SD) = 53.7 (19.7) years; Migrant: 45.5% male; Mean age (SD) = 35.0 (9.8) years	5
Rifat M (2011) [52]	Bangladesh	Cross sectional study	n = 7280; new smear-positive PTB patients; age and sex were not presented	5
Bai LQ (2004) [<u>53]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 318; smear-positive PTB patients + \geq 15 years; 72.0% male; Mean age (SD) = 38.2 (12.0) years	6
Tamhane A (2012) [<u>54]</u>	India	Cross sectional study	n = 150; newly smear-positive PTB patients + \geq 18 years; 50% male; Median = 30 years	5
Sabawoon W (2012) [55]	Afghanistan	Cross sectional study	n = 122; smear-positive PTB patients + \geq 15 years; 45.9% male; Mean age (SD) = 42.2 (17.7) years	4
Karim F (2007) [<u>56]</u>	Bangladesh	Cross sectional study	n = 1000; smear-positive PTB patients; 50% male; Mean age = 37.7 years	5
Thakur R (2010) [<u>57]</u>	India	Cross sectional study	n = 234; smear-positive PTB patients; 66.7% male; $\geq\!\!35$ years 50.9%	5
Lönnroth K (1999) [<u>58]</u>	Vietnam	Cross sectional study	n = 422; new TB patients + \geq 15 years; 70.4% male; 51.1% were aged 15–34	4
Rajeswari R (2002) [<u>59]</u>	India	Cross sectional study	n = 531; new smear- positive TB patients; 72% male; 62%<45 years	5
Lin HP (2009) [<u>60]</u>	Taiwan	Cross sectional study	n = 78118; new PTB patients; 69.4%were male; 42648 (54.6%) patients were aged over 65 years	5
Wang WB (2006) [<u>61]</u>	China	Cross sectional study	n = 493; newly TB patients; 72.4% male; 40–60 years 38.1%	4
Lin CY (2010) [<u>62]</u>	Taiwan	Cross sectional study	n = 193; culture-proven, new hospitalized PTB patients; 67.9% male; Mean age (SD) = 63.47 (18.04) years	5

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.t002

Patient delay studies

Patient delay was measured using patients' recall of first TB symptoms as the starting point, (usually described as the onset of a persistent cough) and the date of the first health facility consultation as the endpoint. All studies measured delay as a dichotomous variable, typically based on a median split from 7 to 60 days. Nearly all studies reported their definition of delay; however, some (k = 9) did not mention the specific interval of delay.

Factors assessed. Forty studies assessed associated factors, including patient sociodemographic characteristics, TB-related symptoms, medical examinations, and conditions of seeking medical care (<u>Table 3</u>). Socio-demographic characteristics included gender, age, education, occupation, rural residence, and income level. Thirty-three studies analyzed the







doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.g001

PLOS ONE

relationship between male sex and delay, and seven showed male sex negatively correlated with delay. Thirty-one studies evaluated the role of age in delay, and 13 studies addressed unemployment and patient delay. Education level was discussed in 14 studies. Fourteen studies reported correlations between rural residence and patient delay. Nineteen studies paid attention to income level. TB symptoms were associated with patient delay in eight studies, in which cough was analyzed as the first symptom (k = 2) and hemoptysis (k = 8) was associated with patient severity. Positive sputum smears and chest radiographs were taken at the first consultation in seven and three studies, respectively. Consulting a public hospital was associated with delay in ten studies. Long travel time or distance to the first healthcare provider was investigated in 11 studies.

Meta-analysis. Male, unemployed, low income level, hemoptysis, positive sputum smears, chest radiographs, and long travel time or distance to the first healthcare provider all significantly correlated with patient delay (Table 4). Male and hemoptysis were negatively associated with patient delay, whereas the other three factors were positively associated (P<0.05). There were no significant relationships between delay and older age, education level, rural residence, chest radiographs, or consultation with a public hospital (Fig. 2). Cough and other factors could not be evaluated due to a lack of data in the studies.

Table 3. Factors as	sessed for as:	sociatio	n with F	oatient delay (k = 40).								
Citation	Delay = 1st sx to (interval)	Male sex	Old age	Education	Unemployed	Rural residence	Income Iow Ievel	Hemoptysis	Cough	Positive sputum smear	Chest radiographs	Consult with a public hospital	Long travel time/ distance
Wang W (2007) [18]	1st consult (21 days)	×	×	×	×	I	←	→		I	×	I	
Leung EC (2007) [19]	1st consult (20days)	I	I	1	←	I	I	\rightarrow	I	I	Ι	I	
Huong NT (2007) [20]	1st consult (6 weeks)	×	×	I	1	←	I	I	I	I	1	×	
Enkhbat S (1996) [21]	1st consult (1 month)	×	×		1	×	×	Ι	I	I	Ι	×	
Yamasaki- Nakagawa M (2001)[22]	1st consult (1 months or 7 months)	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	Ι	I	I	I
Chiang CY (2005) [23]	1st consult (7 days)	×	←	I	1	I	I	×	×	×	×	×	
Rojpibulstit M (2006)[24]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	×	×	I	I	I	I	I	I	×	I	I	I
Li X (2012)[<u>25]</u>	1st consult (10 days)	×	×	1	×	I	I	→	I	I	I	I	
Lock WA (2011) [26]	1st consult (2weeks)	×	×	×	I	×	×	Ι	I	I	Ι	←	←
Zhou C (2012)[27]	1st consult (14 days)	×	×	×	1	×	←	Ι	I	I	Ι	I	←
Chang CT (2007) [28]	1st consult (30days)	\rightarrow	I	I	I	1	×	I	1	1	I	I	I
Lin X (2008)[29]	1st consult (60 days)	I	\rightarrow	I	×	1	\rightarrow	I	1	1	I	I	1
Basnet R (2009) [<u>30]</u>	1st consult (30 days)	×	×	×	I	I	×	I	I	←	I	I	×
Guneylioglu D (2004) [31]	1st consult (30 days)	×	×	×	1	×	←	\rightarrow	\rightarrow	1	I	I	1
Hoa NB (2011) [32]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	\rightarrow	I	I	I	\rightarrow	×	I	I	I	I	I	I
Xu B (2007) [<u>33]</u>	1st consult (interval not recorded)	×	×	×	I	I	×	I	I	I	I	I	I
Ahmad RA (2013) [34]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	\rightarrow	I	I	×	I	I	I	1	I	I	I	I
Phoa LL (2005) [<u>35]</u>	1st consult (4 weeks)	×	\rightarrow		×	1	1	I	1	←	I	I	I
Xu X (2013) [<u>36]</u>	1st consult (3 weeks)	\rightarrow	×	I	I	I	1	I	1	←	I	I	I
												<u>U</u>	ontinued)

Table 3. (Continued	¢.												
Citation	Delay = 1st sx to (interval)	Male sex	Old age	Education	Unemployed	Rural residence	Income Iow Ievel	Hemoptysis	Cough	Positive sputum smear	Chest radiographs	Consult with a public hospital	Long trravel time/ distance
Rundi C (2011) [37]	1st consult (30 days)	×	×	I	1	×	×	1		I	1	×	×
Zhao X (2014) [<u>38]</u>	1st consult (30 days)	\rightarrow	×	×	×	I	×	1	1	1	I	I	×
Cheng G (2005) [39]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	×	×	\rightarrow	I	I	×	I	I	I	I	×	×
Tobe RG (2013) [40]	1st consult (2 weeks)	×	I	×	I	×	←		I	I	I	I	←
Choudhari M (2012) [41]	1st consult (30 days)	×	\leftarrow	1	×	×	×		I	I		I	←
Shu W (2014) [42]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	I	×	I	I	l	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Ngamvithayapong J (2001) [43]	1st consult (21 days)	×	×	×		I	I			I	I	I	I
Selvam JM (2003) [44]	1st consult (28 days)	×	×	×	×		I			I	I	×	×
Chen HG (2014) [45]	1st consult (30 days)	×	\leftarrow	I		I	I		I	←	Cavity:↑	I	I
Kelkar-Khambete A (2008) [46]	1st consult (21 days)	×	×	×	Ι	×	×	I		I	Ι	I	
Ayé R (2010) [47]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	×	×	I	I	×	I		I	I	I	I	I
Tobgay KJ (2006) [48]	1st consult (30 days)	×	×	I	I	I	I			I	I	←	I
Rumman KA (2008) [49]	1st consult (3 weeks)	\rightarrow	\leftarrow	←	×	←	←		I	I	I	I	×
Wang Y (2008) [50]	1st consult (2 weeks)	\rightarrow	\rightarrow	\rightarrow	×	I	→	1	I	1	I	I	I
Mor Z (2013) [51]	1st consult (25 days)	×	×		×		I	1	I	←	Ι	I	I
Rifat M (2011) [52]	1st consult (4 weeks)	×	×	I	Ι	←	I	I		I	Ι	I	
Bai LQ (2004) [<u>53</u>]	1st consult (14 days)	I	I	I		I	I			I	I	I	I
Tamhane A (2012) [54]	1st consult (20 days)	I	I	I	×	I	1	×	1	1	I	I	I
Sabawoon W (2012) [55]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	\rightarrow	←
												Q	ontinued)

(Continued)	
Table 3.	

Citation	Delay = 1st sx to (interval)	Male sex	Old age	Education	Unemployed	Rural residence	Income Iow Ievel	Hemoptysis	Cough	Positive sputum smear	Chest radiographs	Consult with a public hospital	Long travel time/ distance
Karim F (2007) [56]	1st consult (interval not recorded)	×	×	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1
Thakur R (2010) [57]	1st consult (33.5 days)	×	×	×	1	×	<i>←</i>	I	I	I	I	←	I
x. Assessed but P ≥	0.05												
 ↓. Ivegauvery correlat ↑. Positively correlat 	ad with delay, F	r < 0.05 ^ < 0.05	-										
 Not assessed. 													
doi:10.1371/joumal.pone.	0120088.t003												

PLOS ONE

Variable	k	OR (95% CI) ^a	Heteroge	eneity betwe studies	en	Test for overall effect (P)
			Q statistic	P-value	l ²	
Male sex	33	0.85 (0.78, 0.92)	107.33	<0.00001	70%	0.0001
Unemployed	13	1.18 (1.07, 1.30)	12.99	0.37	8%	0.001
Income (Low)	19	1.23 (1.02, 1.49)	99.08	< 0.00001	82%	0.03
Haemoptysis	8	0.64 (0.40, 1.00)	39.86	< 0.00001	82%	0.05
Positive smear	7	1.77 (1.07, 2.94)	119.89	<0.00001	95%	0.03
Long travel time/distance to the first healthcare provider	11	1.39 (1.08, 1.78)	36.06	<0.0001	72%	0.01
Age (older)	31	1.01 (0.91, 1.11)	144.10	<0.00001	79%	0.87
Education(illiterate)	14	0.99 (0.78, 1.24)	45.23	<0.0001	71%	0.90
Rural residence	14	1.15 (0.99, 1.34)	42.25	<0.0001	69%	0.06
Chest radiographs	3	1.42 (0.78, 2.58)	27.72	<0.0001	93%	0.25
Consult with a public hospital	10	0.99 (0.65, 1.50)	66.39	<0.00001	86%	0.96

Table 4. Results of meta-analyses and test for heterogeneity of patient delay.

a. P-value for homogeneous studies (Q statistic, P \ge 0.10, or P<0.10, but I² \le 50%)—fixed-effect model; otherwise, P-value for significantly heterogeneous studies (Q statistic, P<0.10, but I² \ge 50%)—random effects model.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.t004

Provider delay studies

The provider (usually described as the health care system, doctor, or diagnostician) delay studies all used the first consultation at a health facility as the starting point. However, 18 studies used diagnosis as the endpoint, whereas 12 others used the start of anti-TB treatment. Moreover, different endpoint definitions may not necessarily be different points in time. The duration was ranged from 7 to 79 days.

Factors assessed. There were 30 studies associated with provider delay. The associated factors may be related to the aspect of provider delay for diagnosis and treatment. Among sociodemographic factors, 24 studies mentioned a connection between male sex and provider delay: two studies showed a positive relationship, two showed a negative relationship, and 20 showed no relationship. Other factors included older age (k = 24), illiterate or lack of education (k = 10), rural residence (k = 8), low income (k = 10), and unemployed (k = 4). Other factors, such as symptoms (cough, k = 2; hemoptysis, k = 8), examination (positive sputum smears: k = 8; chest radiographs: k = 5), and consulting with a public hospital (k = 12), were found to be correlated with provider delay in at least one study. Finally long travel time or distance from the patient's home to the health facility was reported to be correlated with provider delay in seven studies. (Table 5)

Meta-analysis. Male sex, older age, illiterate or lack of education, unemployment, rural residence, low income, hemoptysis, positive sputum smears, consulting with a public hospital,

					Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio						Odds Rabo		Odds Rabo	
-	Study or Subgroup	log(Odds Ratio)	SE	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	C	Study or Subgroup	loglOdds Ratio	SE SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	1 IV	Fixed, 95% CI	
	Tobe RG 2013	-0.8816	0.2353	2.2%	0.41 [0.26, 0.66]		· ·	Ahmad RA 2013	0.3147	0.1922	7.0%	1.37 [0.94, 2.00	1		
	Wang Y 2008	-0.7609	0.131	4,1%	0.47 (0.36, 0.60)			Choudhari M 2012	0.2949	0.3645	1.9%	1.34 [0.66, 2.74	i		
	Chang CT 2007	-0.7133	0.2503	2.1%	0.4910.30.0.801			Leung EC 2007	0.5306	0.1972	6.6%	1.70 11.15.2.50	i		
	Rumman KA 2008	-0 5997	0 2341	2 3%	0 55 10 35 0 871			LIX 2012	0.2231	0.2398	4.5%	1 25 10 78 2 00	i		
	Abroad RA 2012	0.4166	0 1226	4 196	0.66.10.61 0.961			Lin X 2009	0 1054	0.093	20.8%	1 11 10 92 1 22	1	+	
	Mining Por 2013	0.4155	0.1330	4,170	0.0010.51, 0.001			Max 7 2000	0.1034	0.093	1 30	1.1010.50, 1.33		_	
	Huong Ni 2007	-0.4071	0.120	4.270	0.07 [0.52, 0.00]			MOI 2 2013	0.3365	0.4430	1,370	1.40 10.56, 3.36		_	
	Choudhari M 2012	-0.3944	0.3154	1.5%	0.67 [0.36, 1.25]			Phoa LL 2005	0.0953	0.2023	6.3%	1.10 0.74, 1.64	1	—	
	LIX 2012	-0.3365	0.2254	2.4%	0.71 [0.46, 1.11]			Rumman KA 2008	0.2006	0.104	23.9%	1.22 [1.00, 1.50	1	-	
	Xu X 2013	-0.3299	0.0669	5.7%	0.72 [0.63, 0.82]	-		Selvarn JM 2003	-0.1588	0.1753	8.4%	0.85 [0.61, 1.20	1	-	
	Zhao X 2014	-0.3175	0.1573	3.5%	0.73 [0.53, 0.99]			Tamhane A 2012	0.6419	0.3812	1.8%	1.90 [0.90, 4.01	1		-
	Mor Z 2013	-0.2938	0.1904	29%	0.7510.51.1.081			Wang W 2007	0.6733	0.8064	0.4%	1.96 10.40, 9.52	i .		
	Toboay KJ 2006	-0.2627	0 4673	0.8%	0 77 10 31 1 921			Wang Y 2008	0.131	0.1989	6.5%	1.14 10.77. 1.68	i	+-	
	Thatar P 2010	.0 207	0 2770	1.0%	0.01 10 47 1 401			7hao ¥ 2014	.0.4944	0 4059	1.6%	0.6210.28 1.36	i —		
	Decest D 2000	0.1021	0.2110	2.0%	0.0210.01 1.271			2110012014	.0.404.	0.4035	1.0 %	0.02 (0.20, 1.00			
	Basnet R 2009	-0.1824	0.2555	2.0%	0.83 [0.51, 1.37]										
	Chiang CY 2005	-0.1744	0.1558	3.6%	0.84 [0.62, 1.14]			Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.18 [1.07, 1.30]			
	Zhou C 2012	-0.1739	0.2356	2.2%	0.84 [0.53, 1.33]			Heterogeneity, Chi*:	= 12.99, df = 12 (P	= 0.37); I*	= \$%		01.02	06 1 2	6 1
	Rundi C 2011	-0.1397	0.2508	2.1%	0.87 [0.53, 1.42]			Test for overall effect	t Z = 3.23 (P = 0.00)))			Enumere feb	adad Example	Banal
	Hoa NB 2011	-0.1222	0.0231	6.5%	0.88 (0.85, 0.93)	-							r aroura tan	when randonal	1001.91
	Karim F 2007	-0.082	0.0539	6.0%	0.9210.83, 1.021	-						Odds Ratio	0	dis Datio	
	Wapp W 2007	-0.0912	0 4357	0.9%	0.9210 39 2171		D	Churche and Curchaster	Instante Decisi		Inisht	Dandom Off C		odem Off C	
	Salvara IM 2002	-0.0740	0 1024	2.0%	0.0210 64 1 343		U	Study or Subgroup	REALCOOL RADOL	<u>N 1</u>	reight IV.	Random, 95% CI	IV. Ra	100000,9555.01	
	Servarin Sm 2003	-0.0749	0.1924	2.9%	0.03 [0.64, 1.35]			Bai LO 2004	-0.734	0.2398	14.4%	0.48 [0.30, 0.77]		-	
	Cheng G 2005	-0.0481	0.1913	2.9%	0.95 [0.66, 1.39]			Chiang CY 2005	-0.0305	0.1965	15.1%	0.97 [0.66, 1.43]		-	
	Rojpibulstit M 2006	0	0.1968	2.8%	1.00 [0.68, 1.47]			Güneyfioglu D 2004	-0.9143	0.4266	10.8%	0.40 [0.17, 0.92]		-	
	Ngamvithayapong J 2001	0.0392	0.192	2.9%	1.04 [0.71, 1.52]			Leuna EC 2007	-0.9289	0 2439	14 3%	0 3910 24 0 641			
	Kelkar-Khambete A 2008	0.0437	0.5018	0.7%	1.04 [0.39, 2.79]			LIV 2012	0.6921	3030.0	14.0%	0 60 00 20 0 021		-	
	Chen HG 2014	0.0649	0.1368	4.0%	1.07 (0.82, 1.40)			0	0.0000	0.1000	14.0 %	1.30 0.30,0.03			
	Enkthal S 1997	0.0677	0 2093	26%	1 07 10 71 1 611			Rumman KA 2008	0.3859	0.1483	12.9.9	1.4/[1.10, 1.9/]			
	Vu D 2007	0.0042	0.0644	6.0%	1 00 00 06 1 221	-		Tamhane A 2012	0.3365	0.7259	6.4%	1.40 [0.34, 5.81]			_
	A0 8 2007	0.0043	0.0044	5.0%	1.09 [0.90, 1.23]	-		Wang W 2007	-1.0584	0.5129	9.3%	0.35 [0.13, 0.95]		_	
	Ritat M 2011	0.0953	0.0589	5.9%	1.10[0.98, 1.23]										
	Aye R 2010	0.1815	0.1576	3.5%	1.20 [0.88, 1.63]			Total (95% CI)		1	00.0%	0.64 [0.40, 1.00]	-		
	Phoa LL 2005	0.1823	0.2466	2.1%	1.20 [0.74, 1.95]			Matanapanahy Tard-	0.00 OF - 00.00			#- 01%			
									U = U = U = U = U = U = U = U = U = U =	ff=7/P⊀	D DESERTS.				
	Güneyfioglu D 2004	0.2301	0.3025	1.6%	1.26 [0.70, 2.28]			Test for morall effert	7 = 1 96 /P = 0.05)	df=7(P <	0.00001);	r = 02%	0.1 0.2 0.5	1 2 5	5 10
	Güneylioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011	0.2301 0.4574	0.3025	1.6%	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71]			Test for overall effect	Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05)	df=7(P⊀	0.00001);	r = 02%	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours [shor	1 2 5 ter] Favours [lon	5 10 19]
	Güneyfioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011	0.2301 0.4574	0.3025 0.2759	1.6% 1.8%	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71]			Test for overall effect	Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05)	df = 7 (P ≺	0.00001);	Odds Ratio	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours [shor	1 2 5 ter) Favours (Ion	5 10
	Güneylioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI)	0.2301 0.4574	0.3025 0.2759	1.6% 1.8% 100.0%	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92]	•	F	Test for overall effect	Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05)	se w	(eight IV.	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor	1 2 5 ter] Favours (Ion dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Güneylioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ⁹ = 0.03;	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df=	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] P = 70%	•	Е	Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup	0.32, China 39,86, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) log(Odds Ratio)	SE W	/eight_IV.	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor Ox IV, Rat	1 2 5 ter) Favours (ton dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Güneylioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.03; Test for overall effect. Z = 3.	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001)	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);	1.26 (0.70, 2.28) 1.58 (0.92, 2.71) 0.85 (0.78, 0.92) P = 70%		Е	Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009	2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05)	SE W 0.2439 1	/eight_fV.	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2.00 [1.24, 3.23]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor OK IV. Rat	1 2 5 ter) Favours (Ion dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Güneylioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ⁹ = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3.	0.2301 0.4574 ChP = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001)	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1	1.26 (0.70, 2.28) 1.58 (0.92, 2.71) 0.85 (0.78, 0.92) P= 70%	0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours (shorter) Favours (long)	Е	Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Chen HG 2014	U.32, Crill = 39.86, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) log(Odds Ratio) 0.6931 1.5134	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1	Aeight IV.	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2.00 (1.24, 3.23) 4.54 (3.45, 5.98)	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor OK IV. Rat	1 2 5 terj Favours lion dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Ouneylioglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3.	0.2301 0.4574 ChP = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001)	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);	1.26 (0.70, 2.28) 1.58 (0.92, 2.71) 0.85 (0.78, 0.92) P = 70%	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long]	E	Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen HG 2014 Chiang CY 2005	0.32 Cril = 33.85, Z = 1.95 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 1.5134 0.1044	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1	/eight_IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5%	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2.00 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 5.98] 1.11 [0.82, 1.50]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor Ox IV. Rat	1 2 5 terj Favours (ton sds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Güneyiloglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3.	0.2301 0.4574 ChP = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001)	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);	1.26 (0.70, 2.28) 1.58 (0.92, 2.71) 0.85 (0.78, 0.92) P = 70%	O 2 0 5 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long]	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Chen HG 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013	0.52, CHI = 39.86, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 1.5134 0.1044 0.7474	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1	Velaht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1%	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2.00 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 5.98] 1.11 [0.82, 1.50] 2.11 [1.44, 3.10]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor OX IV. Rat	1 2 5 terj Favours Jon 3ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Güneşiloğlu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heteroşeneite, Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3.	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^a = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001)	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0	1.8% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] P= 70%	O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O S Atio	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen HG 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005	U32, CHP = 39.86, C Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 (1.5134) 0.7474 (0.5978)	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.2069 1	Velaht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9%	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2.00 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 5.98] 1.11 [0.82, 1.50] 2.11 [1.44, 3.10] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor Ov IV. Rat	1 2 5 terj Favours Don dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
	Güneyiloglu D 2004 Lock WA 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneih: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3; Study or Subgroup	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001)	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 SE	1.8% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); /	1.26 (0.70, 2.28) 1.58 (0.92, 2.71) 0.85 (0.78, 0.92) P = 70% Odds Ratio V. Random, 95% CI	0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours (shorter) Favours (long) Odds Ratio	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen HG 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Roinbulstit M 2006	Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) log(Odds Ratio) 0.6931 (1.5134 (0.7474 (0.5978 (-0.6576 (<u>SE W</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.2069 1 0.1786 1	Velaht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3%	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2:00 [1:24, 3:23] 4:54 [3:45, 5:98] 1:11 [0:82, 1:50] 2:11 [1:44, 3:10] 1:80 [1:20, 2:70] 0:52 [0:37, 0.74]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours [shor OX IV. Rat	1 2 5 terj Favours Don 3ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
_	Güneyiloglu D 2004 LeckWA 2011 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneit, Tau ^a = 0.03, Test for overall effect Z = 3, Study or Subgroup Basnel R 2009	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) log[Odds Ratio] 0	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1 Weight 5.1%	1.26 [0.70, 2.26] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] # = 70% Odds Ratio <u>N. Random, 95% C1</u> 1.00 10 59, 1.711	0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long] Odds Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Chen H0 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Roji Diulishi M 2006 Xu X 2013	2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) log[Odds Ratio] 0.6931 0.5134 0.1044 0.5978 -0.6576 0.9955	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.2069 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1	(eight_IV. 13.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 14.3%	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 200 (1.24, 3.23) 4.54 (3.45, 5.98) 1.11 (0.82, 1.50) 2.11 (1.44, 3.10) 1.80 (1.20, 2.70) 0.52 (0.37, 0.74) 2.69 (2.32, 3.12)	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours [shor OX IV. Rat	1 2 5 ter] Favours llon dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
-	Güneyiloglu D 2004 Lock VVA 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subgroup Basnel R 2009 Chane GT 2007	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) <u>Ioo(Odds Ratio)</u> 0.00/ct	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2735	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1 Weight 5.1% 5.7%	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] P = 70% Odds Ratio <u>IV Random, 95% C1</u> 1.00 [0.59, 1.71] 0.95 [0.71, 1.51]	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long] Odds Ratio IV.Random, 95% CI	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen HG 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Rojpbulst M 2006 Xu X 2013	0.32, CH = 39.85, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 1.002(Odds Ratio) 0.6931 1.5134 0.1044 0.7474 0.5878 -0.6576 0.9895	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.2069 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1	Veloht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1%	Odds Ratio Random, 95% CI 200 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 5.98] 1.11 [0.82, 1.50] 2.11 [1.44, 3.10] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70] 0.52 [0.37, 0.74] 2.69 [2.32, 3.12]	0.102 0.5 Favours (shor Oc IV. Rat	1 2 5 ter] Favours (ion sds Ratio ndom, 95% CI	5 10
_	Guneyilogiu D 2004 LockWA 2011 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.03; Testfor overall effect Z = 3. Study of Subaroup Basner R 2009 Chang CT 2007 Chang CT 2005	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) <u>Ioo(Odds Ratio)</u> 0 -0.0461	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2323 0.2323	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1 Weight 5.1% 5.7%	1.26 [0.70, 2.26] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] P = 70% Odds Ratio <u>N. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.00 [0.59, 1.71] 0.95 [0.61, 1.51]	0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long] Odds Ratio	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen H0 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Rojpbulst M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (56: CD	0.32, CH = 39.85, 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 1.0610dds Ratiol 0.6931 1.5134 0.7474 0.5978 -0.6576 0.9895	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.0757 1	Aviaht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0%	Codds Ratio Random, 95% CI 2.00 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 5.98] 1.11 [0.82, 1.50] 2.11 [1.44, 3.10] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70] 0.52 [0.37, 0.74] 2.69 [2.32, 3.12]	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours [shor Ox IV. Rat	1 2 5 ter) Favours (ton dds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	5 10
_	Güneyiloglu D 2004 Lock VVA 2011 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subgroup Basnel R 2009 Chang CT 2007 Cheng Q 2005	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) <u>IoofOdds Ratio1</u> 0 -0.0461 0.1044	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2323 0.1582	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); <u>Weight</u> 5.1% 5.7% 7.0%	1.26 [0.70, 2.28] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] # = 70% Odds Ratio <u>IV, Random, 95% (1</u> 1.00 [0.59, 1.71] 1.11 [0.81, 1.51] 1.11 [0.81, 1.51]	Odds Ratio	E	Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Chen H0 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibulsot M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (\$5% CI)	0.32, CHP = 39.86, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 1.06931 0.6931 0.1044 0.5978 -0.6576 0.9895	<u>SE W</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.2069 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1	Velaht IV. 13.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0%	Odds Ratio Random, <u>95% (1</u> 200 (1.24, 323) 4.54 (3.45, 5.98) 1.11 (0.22, 1.50) 1.80 (1.20, 2.70) 0.52 (0.37, 0.74) 2.69 (2.32, 3.12) 1.77 (1.07, 2.94)	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours (shor Or IV. Rat	1 2 5 teri Favours (ion sids Ratio notion, 95% Cl	5 10
	Ginerpioglu D 2004 Lock/WA 2011 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau* = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chang CT 2007 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) <u>IoalOdds Ratio</u>) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.1846	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2323 0.1582 0.3375	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001);1 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2%	1.26 [0.70, 2.26] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] #= 70% Odds Ratio <u>N. Random, 95% C1</u> 1.00 [0.59, 1.71] 0.95 [0.61, 1.51] 1.11 [0.81, 1.51] 0.83 [0.42, 1.61]	Odds Ratio	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnett R 2009 Chen H0 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Rojpbulst M 2005 Xu X 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Total (95% CI) Héderogenety, Tay* =	0.32 Chir = 3386, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 1.5134 0.6931 1.5134 0.7474 0.5976 0.6976 0.9995 0.43; Chir = 119.89	<u>SE W</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 10.0757 1 11 .df=6 (P	(eight IV, 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001)	Odds Ratio <u>Random, 95% CI</u> 200 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 598] 2.11 [1.44, 3.10] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70] 0.52 [0.37, 0.74] 2.69 [2.32, 3.12] 1.77 [1.07, 2.94] x,P = 95%	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours [shor OX IV. Rat	1 2 5 teri Favours (Ion dom 95% CI	100
	Ginerpiopiu D 2004 Lock VM 2011 Total (95% Cf) Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Shaftr or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2000 Cheng O 2005 Choudhai M 2012 Enkhab S 1997	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) log(Odds Ratio) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.1846 -0.0834	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2323 0.1592 0.3375 0.2215	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); Weight 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9%	1.26 [0.70, 2.26] 1.58 [0.92, 2.71] 0.85 [0.78, 0.92] * 70% Odds Ratio <u>N. Random, 95% C1</u> 1.00 [0.59, 1.71] 0.95 [0.61, 1.51] 0.83 [0.43, 1.61] 0.92 [0.60, 1.42]	Odds Ratio	E	Testforoveraileffect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen H0 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mod 2 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Rojobulstot M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (95% CI) Héterogenety, Tau* Testfor overail effect	0.32 Chi# = 3386, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 1002(2d5 Ratiol 0.6931 i 1.5134 0.1044 i 0.5476 i 0.5476 i 0.9995 i 0.43; Chi# = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03)	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 1 1 1, df= 6 (P	Velaht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001)	Codds Ratio Random, 955; C1 200 [1:24, 3:23] 4:54 [13:45; 3:23] 1.11 [0:02, 1:50] 2.11 [1:44, 3:10] 1.130 [1:20, 2:70] 0.52 [0:37, 0:74] 2:69 [2:32, 3:12] 1.77 [1:07, 2:94] 3; P = 95%	0.1 0/2 0/5 Favours [shor OX IV. Rat	1 2 5 ter() Favours (ion dis Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	100
_	Ginerpiopiu D 2004 Lock VM 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Testfor overail effect Z = 3. Shoft or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Choudhail M 2012 Enkbals 1997 Ounerpiopiu 2004	0.2301 0.4574 Chi [#] = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.1846 -0.0834 3.1114	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2323 0.1592 0.3375 0.2215 0.423	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); <u>Weight</u> 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2%	1.26 (0,70, 2.26) 1.58 (0.92, 2.71) 0.85 (0.78, 0.92) = 70% Odds Ratio V. Random, 95% CI V. Random, 95% CI 1.10 (0.59, 1.71) 0.95 (0.61, 1.51) 1.11 (0.81, 1.51) 0.93 (0.43, 1.61) 0.93 (0.61, 1.61) 0.93 (0.61, 1.61) 0.93 (0.61, 1.61)	Odds Ratio	E	Testfor overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chiang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Reipibuisti M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogenety: Tau ² = Testfor overall effect	0.12 Chi ² = 1386, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) <u>1002Odds Ratiol</u> 0.5931 0.1044 0.7474 0.5978 -0.5576 0.9995 i 0.43; Chi ² = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03)	<u>SE V)</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1956 1 0.1956 1 0.1956 1 0.1956 1 0.1957 1 1 1, df=6 (P	(elobit); 13.5% 14.5% 14.1% 14.1% 14.3% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001)	Odds Ratio Random, 955; CI 200 (1,24, 3,23) 4,54 (3,45, 5,98) 2,11 (1,24, 3,10) 1,80 (1,20, 2,70) 1,80 (1,20, 2,70) 2,69 (2,32, 3,12) 1,77 (1,07, 2,94) 1,77 (1,07, 2,94)	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours [shor OX IV. Rat	1 2 5 teri Favours (Ion dom, 95% CI	100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Suborcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Choudhai M 2012 Enkhal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Choudhai M 2012	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) -0.0461 0.1044 -0.01846 -0.0841 3.1114	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 <u>SE</u> 0.2735 0.2323 0.1592 0.3375 0.2423 0.2278	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.8%	1.26 (0,70, 2.26) 1.56 (0,92, 2.71) 0.85 (0,92, 2.71) 0.85 (0,78, 0,92) ≈ 70% Odds Ratio <u>IV. Random, 55% (1</u> 1.00 (0.59, 1.71) 0.95 (0.61, 1.51) 0.93 (0.60, 1.42) 0.92 (0.60, 1.42) 0.92 (0.60, 1.42)	Odds Ratio	E	Testforoverall effect Testforoverall effect Study or Suborcom Basnet R 2009 Chen H0 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibulist M 2006 XuX 2013 Total (95% CI) Héterogenety, Tau ^a = Testfor overall effect	0.12 Chi# = 3386, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 106/0458 Ratio 0.6931 15134 0.1044 0.1044 0.5976 0.05976 0.9995 0.42; Chi# = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03)	<u>SE W</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.0757 1 1 1, df= 6 (P	Veloht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001)	Codds Ratio Random, 555; C1 200 [1:24, 3:23] 4:54 [1:34, 5:34] 1.11 [0:02, 1:50] 2.11 [1:44, 3:10] 1.130 [1:20, 2:70] 0.52 [0:37, 0.74] 2.69 [2:32, 3:12] 1.77 [1:07, 2:94] 1.77 [1:07, 2:94] 1.78 [3:05] Codds Patio	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours [shor OX IV. Rai	1 2 5 ter() Favours ()on dom, 95% CI	100
	Ginerpiopiu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneity, Tau* = 0.03; Test for overail effect Z = 3. Study or Suborcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Cheng M 2012 Enkbal S 1997 Ouneptiopiu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Kiklar-Chamber A 2008	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^a = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.1846 -0.0834 3.1114 -0.0732 0.4419	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 0.2735 0.2735 0.2325 0.2325 0.2215 0.2215 0.2215 0.2231	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.8% 2.4%	1.26(0,70,228) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.85(0,78,0.92) 0.85(0,78,0.92) 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75% 0.75%	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long] Odds Ratio NV.Random, 95% CI	E	Study or subgroup, Just Study or subgroup Basnetik 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Pho LL 2005 Xu X 2013 Total (95% C) Heterogenety, Tay?= Test for overall effect Enderson Chiang Chiangenety Test for overall effect	2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) loc(2045 Ratio) 0.6931 + 0.7474 0.5978 + 0.9995 + 0.43; Chi# = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.42 + 2.22 (P = 0.03)	<u>SE V</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1959 1 0.1955 1 1 0.0757 1 1 1 1	(violuti); 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.1% 13.9% 14.1% 13.5% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% 4.00001) 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 1	Odds Ratio <u>Random 955 C(1</u> 2 00 (1).24, 3 23) 4 54 [3.45, 5 98] 1.11 [102, 1.50] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70] 0.52 [0.37, 0.74] 2.69 [2.32, 3 12] 1.77 [1.07, 2.94] x, P = 95% Odds Ratio Design 85, 67, 67, 67, 67, 67, 67, 67, 67, 67, 67	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours [shor Ox IV. Rat	1 2 5 cit Favours [ion dds Ratio dds Ratio dds Ratio dds Ratio	100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Stathr or Subcroup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Choughani M 2012 Enkhal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Choughani M 2012 Enkhal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Leu X 2009	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) -0.0461 0.1044 -0.01846 -0.0834 3.1114 -0.01846 -0.0834	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 5E 0.2735 0.2323 0.1592 0.3275 0.423 0.423 0.423 0.423	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.8% 2.4%	1.26(0,70,2.28) 1.58(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) #= 70% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.85(0,78,0.92) #= 70% Odds Ratio 0.85(0,78,0.92) 1.00(0,59,1.71) 0.95(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,51,1.52) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,50,1.55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,51,55) 1.58(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,4.50) 0.92(0,55,5,50) 0.92(0,55,5,50) 0.92(0,55,5,50) 0.92(0,55,5,50) 0.92(0	Odds Ratio	E	Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibulist M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (55% C) Heteropeney: Tay's Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup	0.12 Chi# = 3386, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6031 1.5134 0.7474 0.5976 0.6935 0.9955 0.42; Chi# = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) IcolOdds Ratiol	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1569 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 11 , df=6 (P SE W)	/eight_FV_ 13.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.3% 14.3% 14.3% 14.3% 14.3% 14.3% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001)	Odds Ratio Random 955 (C1 200 (1.24, 3.23) 4.54 (3.45, 5.98) 1.11 (0.22, 1.50) 1.20 (1.20, 2.70) 0.52 (0.37, 0.74) 2.69 (2.32, 3.12) 1.77 (1.07, 2.94) 1.77 (1.07, 2.94) 1.77 (1.07, 2.94) Codds Ratio Random 955 (C1	0.1 0/2 0.5 Favours [shor N. Rat 0.01 0.1	1 2 5 events level sads Ratio ndom 95% CI	100
-	Güneştingilu D 2004 Leck VM, 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneği, Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Studt or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2007 Güneştingingin D 2004 Na NB 2011 Kelar Nouribet A 2009 Lin X 2009	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.1044 3.1114 -0.0732 0.4418 0.1046	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 5 0.2735 0.2323 0.1582 0.2215 0.423 0.423 0.423 0.423 0.2276	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.8% 5.8%	1.26(0,70,228) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.85(0,78,0.92) 0.85(0,78,0.92) #= 70% Odds Ratio N. Randon, <u>95% C1</u> 1.00(0.59,171) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.95(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.90(0.50,42) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 1.58(0.55,4.40) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 0.95(0.51,42) 0.90(0.50,0.92) 0.95(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,42) 0.92(0.51,	Odds Ratio	F	Testforovenal effect Study or Schoroson Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2011 Chang Cr 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojbiolst M 2006 Sux Z 2013 Total (55% CI) Heterogenety: Tau*a Testforovenal effect Study or Schoroson	2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) tog(Odds Ratio) 0.631 (0.633 (0.633 (0.633 (0.633 (0.7474 (0.5776 (0.5975 (0.	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.0757 1 10,0757 1 10,0757 1 10,0757 1 10,0757 1	Action 17, 17, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18	Odds Ratio <u>Random, 955-C1</u> 2 00 [1,24, 323] 4 54 [2,45, 538] 1,11 [102, 1,50] 1,80 [1,20, 2,70] 0,52 [0,37, 0,74] 2,69 [2,32, 312] 1,77 [1,07, 2,94] x,I*=95% Odds Ratio <u>Random, 955-C1</u> 1,50 [0,61, 3,70]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours [shor NV. Rat	1 2 5 cit Favours [ion dds Ratio ndom 95% CI 1 10 dds Ratio ndom 95% CI	100
_	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subcroup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Choughani M 2012 Enkhal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Hoa 118 2011 Kelikar-Khambete A 2009 Lin X 2009 Leck VM 2011	0.2301 0.4574 Chi* = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 0.0461 0.1044 -0.0846 -0.0934 3.1114 -0.0732 0.4116 0.1076 0.1697	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 5E 0.2735 0.2323 0.1582 0.3375 0.2215 0.423 0.2215 0.423 0.2251 0.2531 0.0256 0.2808	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 5.7% 5.2% 5.8% 2.4% 5.8% 2.4% 5.6%	1.26(0,70,2.28) 1.58(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) P= 70% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.85(0,78,0.92) P= 70% Odds Ratio 0.85(0,81,51) 0.92(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,61,1.52) 0.92(0,	Odds Ratio	E F	Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibulist M 2006 Xu X 2013 Tosti (65% C) Heteropeney: Tay's Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005	0.32 (-m = 33.86, 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6331 (1.5134 (0.547 (0.547 (0.577	SE W 0.2439 1 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.0757 1 10,0757 1 11,df=6 (P SE W 0.4611 0.0314 1	Velaht IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001) Velaht IV. 5.4% 7.3%	Odds Ratio Random 955 (Cl 200 (1.24, 3.23) 4.54 (3.45, 5.98) 1.11 (0.2, 1.50) 1.80 (1.20, 2.70) 0.52 (0.37, 0.74) 2.69 (2.32, 3.12) 1.77 (1.07, 2.94) 1.77 (1.07, 2.94) 1.50 (0.64, 3.70) 1.50 (0.64, 3.70)	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor N. Rat	1 2 5 1	100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM, 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subaccoso Basnet R 2009 Chang O 21000 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Chenybash M 2012 Enkbash 1902 Chevbash 2004 Leck VX 2011 Keimman IX-2008 Leck VX 2011	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0172 0.4418 -0.1076 -0.1697	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 5E 0.2735 0.2223 0.2223 0.2278 0.423 0.423 0.424 0.531 0.0268 0.2808 0.1897	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 5.9% 4.2% 5.9% 5.8% 2.4% 8.5% 5.0% 6.5%	1.26(0,70,226) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) 0.65(0,78,0.92) *= 70% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 1.00(0,59,1,71) 0.95(0,61,51) 1.01(0,50,1,72) 0.92(0,60,1,52) 0.92(0,61,1,52) 0.92(0,61,1,52) 1.09(0,50,1,42) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.99(0,65,0,94) 1.10(0,65,0,94) 1.10(0,65,0,94) 1.10(0,65,0,94) 1.10(0,65,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,92) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,62,0,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.10(0,1,94) 1.1	Odds Ratio	F	Testforoverall effect Study or Schorosop Basneti R 2009 Chen Ho 2011 Chang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Mor Z 2013 Total (55% CI) Heterogenety, Tau*a Testfor overall effect Study or Schorosop Basneti R 2009 Cheng 0 2005 Cheg 0 2 005	0.32 C m = 3366, Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6331 (0.6331 (0.6331 (0.6331 (0.7474 (0.5776 (0.9595 (0.	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 11 ., df=6 (P <u>SE W</u>) 0.4611 0.0299	(eight IV, 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001) (eight IV, 5.4% 17.3% 9.0%	Odds Ratio Random 555 CT 200 [1.24, 3.23] 4.54 [3.45, 598] 1.11 [0.82, 1.50] 2.11 [1.44, 3.10] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70] 1.80 [1.20, 2.70] 2.69 [2.32, 3.12] 1.77 (1.07, 2.94] K, IF = 95% Odds Ratio Random 555 CT 1.59 [0.61, 3.70] 1.04 [0.98, 1.11] 1.69 [0.14, 3.70]	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor N. Bar 0.01 0.1	1 2 5 1	
	Günerficipilu D 2004 Lock VM 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Testfor overail effect Z = 3. Shoft or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang CI 2007 Cheng 0 2005 Choudhail M 2012 Enkbald S 1997 Gunerficipilu 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Keklas-(Anambét A 2008 Luix 2008 Lock VM 2011 Rumman KA 2008 Rundi C 2011	0.2301 0.4574 Chi* = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 0.0461 -0.0464 -0.0846 -0.0846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 0.10722 0.4118 -0.10756 0.1097 0.5306 -0.2917	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < () 0.2735 0.2735 0.2323 0.1592 0.3375 0.2215 0.423 0.2278 0.531 0.0256 0.2808 0.2808 0.1837 0.5307	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5%	1.2€(0,70,2.2€) 1.5€(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) 0.65(0,78,0.92) #= 70% Odds Ratio (V. Random, 55%-(C) 1.00(0.50,1.71) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.52) 0.92(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.52) 0.92(0.61,1.52) 0.92(0.61,1.52) 0.92(0.61,1.52) 1.56(0.55,4.40) 0.92(0.62,0.94) 1.56(0.55,4.40) 0.92(0.62,0.94) 1.10(0.62,0.95) 1.70(1.10,2.44) 0.92(0.62,0.94) 1.10(0.62,0.95) 1.70(1.10,2.44) 0.75(0.22,2.11)	Odds Ratio	F	Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibulist M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (55% C) Heteopenety Tay's Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Choudhai M 2012	0.32 (-m = 3386, 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6331 (1.5134 (0.7474 (0.7474 (0.7474 (0.9895 (0.43; Ch#= 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 100(Odds Ratiol 0.4055 (0.0392 (0.9886 (0.9895 (0.9956 (SE V) 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1595 1 0.1595 1 0.1595 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 11 .df=6 (P SE V) 0.4611 0.0314 1 0.2999	Velaht IV. 33.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.3% 13.9% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% < 0.00001) Velaht IV. 5.4% 17.3% 9.0% 6.4%	Codds Ratio Random, 555, C1 200 (1, 24, 3, 23) 4, 54 (1, 45, 5, 59) 2, 11 (1, 44, 3, 10) 2, 11 (1, 10, 44, 3, 10) 2, 11 (1, 14, 4, 3, 10) 2, 11 (1, 14, 4, 3, 10) 2, 69 (2, 32, 3, 12) 2, 69 (2, 14, 14, 14) 2, 69 (1, 14, 9, 4, 83) 2, 66 (1, 14, 9, 4, 83) 2, 66 (1, 14, 9, 4, 83)	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor IV. Rai	100 ms/s/s Ratio	
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneb; Tay" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subaroup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2009 Chang O 2009 Chang O 2005 Choudhai M 2012 Enkbal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Keikar-Khambete A 2008 Luk X 2001 Rumman KA 2000 Rundi C 2011 Thabur R 2010	0.2301 0.4574 Chi# = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 -0.0464 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01847 -0.10144 -0.01846 -0.01847 -0.01732 0.4418 -0.0197 0.5306	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 55 0.2735 0.2735 0.2233 0.2233 0.2215 0.423 0.2278 0.423 0.2278 0.423 0.2278 0.423 0.2278 0.423 0.226 0.423 0.2269	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.8% 2.4% 6.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.9%	1.26(0,70,2.28) 1.58(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) ** 70% Odds Rabo <i>IV</i> , Random, 55% C1 1.00(0,56,0,71) 0.95(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 1.16(0,55,4.40) 0.99(0,85,0.94) 1.16(0,55,4.40) 0.99(0,85,0.94) 1.16(0,55,4.40) 0.99(0,85,0.94) 1.170(1,10,2.44) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.240(1,10,4.86) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.240(1,10,4.86) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.240(1,10,4.86) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.74(1,0,4.86) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.74(1,0,4.86) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 0.75(0,26,2.12) 0.75(0,26,2.12) 0.75(0,26,2.12) 0.75(0,26,2.12) 0.75(0,26,2.12	Odds Ratio	F	Test for overall effect Study or Subcroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Rojpbulst M 2005 Rojpbulst M 2005 Tosti (95% CI) Heterogeneby, Tay" = Test for overall effect Study or Subcroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng 0 2005 Choudhan M 2012 Lock WA 2011	0.32 (-m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.98 (P = 0.05) 0.60/0458 Ratiol 0.15134 0.15144 0.7474 0.5776 0.43; Ch ² = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.05) 0.4055 0.4055 0.0052 0.9981 0.9981 0.9981	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1959 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.0757 1 10. , df = 6 (P SE W 0.4611 0.0314 1 0.299 0.4029 1	All All 13.5% 14.6% 14.6% 14.6% 14.3% 13.9% 14.3% 13.5% 14.3% 13.5% 14.3% 13.5% 14.3% 13.5% 14.3% 13.5% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) Celaht IV. 5.4% 5.4% 6.4% 14.6% 14.6%	Odds Ratio Random 555 C1 200 (1.24, 3.23) 4.54 (1.44, 3.10) 2.11 (1.14, 3.10) 2.11 (1.44, 3.10) 0.52 (0.37, 0.74) 4.56 (1.23, 2.74) 0.57 (1.07, 2.94) 5.77 (1.07, 2.94) 5.77 (1.07, 2.94) 5.78 (1.14, 3.70) 1.04 (0.93, 1.11) 1.05 (0.61, 3.70) 1.04 (0.93, 1.11) 2.68 (1.14, 4.63) 2.68 (1.14, 5.74) 2.68 (1.14, 5.74) 1.07 (0.27, 1.46)	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (short OC IV. Rat	1 2 5 1 7 2 5 1 7 2000 Bloom Star Cl Star Ratio Star Ratio St	- 100 - 100
	Günerficipilu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Testfor overail effect Z = 3. Shirth or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng 0 2005 Choudhailt M 2012 Enkbalt S 1997 Ounerficipilu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Keitar-Khambeth A 2008 Lin X 2008 Leck VM 2011 Rumman KA 2009 Numi C 2011 Thakur R 2010 Tobe R0 2013	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) -0.0451 0.1044 -0.1846 -0.0834 3.1114 -0.1846 -0.0834 -0.1076 0.1697 0.5306 -0.2917 0.5567	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 5 0.2735 0.2233 0.1592 0.3375 0.2215 0.423 0.531 0.2276 0.531 0.2266 0.2808 0.5307 0.3803 0.276	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.1% 5.7% 4.2% 5.9% 5.2% 5.2% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.0%	1.26(0,70,2.26) 1.58(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) = 70% Odds Ratio N. Random, 5% C1 1.00(0.59,1.71) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.95(0.51,1.51) 0.9	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [bnot] DV.Random, 95% CI	F	Test for overall effect Study or Suborcos Baselet 2000 Chan No 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Pho LL 2005 Rolpibulisti M 2006 XuX 2013 Total (85% C) Heterospecery Tau" = Test for overall effect Study or Suborcos Basnet R 2009 Chiego 2005 Chiego 2005	0.32 (m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.56 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 1.5194 0.7474 0.7474 0.5976 0.6955 0.6955 0.4576 0.9955 0.4576 0.9955 0.4555 0.0352 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355 0.0355	<u>SE W</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1559 1 0.1559 1 0.1559 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 11 .df=6 (P <u>SE W</u> 0.4611 0.0299 0.4029 0.4029	Non-Opticity Non-Opticity </td <td>Odds Ratio Random 55% CT 2001 124, 3231 454 1245, 5981 111 10 821, 553 2111 114 4, 3101 1500 120, 2701 052 10 37, 0741 269 123, 271 177 1107, 2943 1,77 1107, 2943 1,77 1107, 2943 1,79 55% Odds Ratio Ratio 269 114, 3701 150 1944, 4831 269 1149, 4831</td> <td>0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor IV. Rai</td> <td>ter 2 5 ter 2 5 ter</td> <td>100 100</td>	Odds Ratio Random 55% CT 2001 124, 3231 454 1245, 5981 111 10 821, 553 2111 114 4, 3101 1500 120, 2701 052 10 37, 0741 269 123, 271 177 1107, 2943 1,77 1107, 2943 1,77 1107, 2943 1,79 55% Odds Ratio Ratio 269 114, 3701 150 1944, 4831 269 1149, 4831	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor IV. Rai	ter 2 5 ter	100 100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneb; Tay" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2009 Chang O 2009 Chang O 2005 Choudhai M 2012 Enkhal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Leck VM 2011 Revina A 2009 Rundi C 2011 Tabakur R 2010 Tebe RO 2013 Vango Y 2007	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01847 0.5106 -0.1697 1.3504	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 0.2735 0.2323 0.1592 0.3375 0.2215 0.423 0.2215 0.423 0.2216 0.531 0.0256 0.2808 0.1837 0.5307 0.5307 0.5307 0.5307 0.5688	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 4.2% 5.9% 4.2% 5.8% 2.4% 5.0% 6.5% 5.0% 6.5% 5.0% 5.9% 5.0%	1.26(0,70,2.28) 1.58(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) 0.65(0,78,0.92) * 70% Odds Ratio V, Random, 55×C1 1.00(0.59,1.71) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 1.11(0.81,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 1.58(0.55,4.40) 0.99(0.85,0.94) 1.70(1.19,2.44) 0.75(0.26,2.11) 1.70(1.19,2.44) 0.75(0.26,2.11) 1.70(1.19,2.44) 0.75(0.26,2.11) 1.70(1.19,2.44) 0.75(0.26,2.11) 1.70(1.19,2.44) 0.75(0.26,2.11) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.74(1.10,2.80) 1.7	Odds Ratio	F	Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Ching CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojsbiust M 2005 Rojsbiust M 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneby, Tay?= Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 200 Cheung A 2015 Choudhaid M 2012 LockWA 2011 Rumman KA 2000 Rumdi C 2011	0.32 (-m = 13.86, P = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.60205d5 Ratio1 1.5134 0.1044 0.7474 0.5376 0.9895 0.42; ChP = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 100205d5 Ratio1 0.0455 0.0455 0.0455 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9881 0.9772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772 0.0772	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1565 1 1 0.0757 1 1 0.4611 0.0314 1 0.299 0.4029 0.4027 1 0.1357 1 0.13044	Reight IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 13.9% 14.1% 13.9% 15.1% 00.0% 00.00001) 15.1% 00.00001) 15.1% 00.00001) 15.4% 5.4% 8.8% 8.8% 2%	Odds Rabo Random 25% C1 2001 124, 323 454 124, 5398 111 [102, 156 211 [144, 310] 130 [12, 0, 270] 130 [12, 0, 270] 130 [12, 0, 270] 130 [12, 0, 270] 130 [12, 12, 120] 130 [12, 120] 130	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (short OC IV. Rat	10 2 5 14 7 2 5 15 Ratos potential 10 25 Ratos 10 25 Ratos 25 Ratos 25 Ratos 25 Ratos	100
	Ginerpiopiu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneity, Tau* = 0.03; Test for overail effect Z = 3. Study or Suborcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang OT 2007 Cheng O 2005 Choudhailt M 2012 Enkbals S 1997 Ginerpiopiu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Kuklar-Khambetk A 2008 Lin X 2009 Leck VM 2011 Riummas IXA 2008 Rundi C 2011 Thakur R 2010 Thabe RO 2013 Wang W 2007	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) 10000000000000000000000000000000	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 5E 0.2735 0.2233 0.1592 0.3375 0.2215 0.3375 0.2215 0.2278 0.531 0.2268 0.2808 0.1837 0.5307 0.3603 0.276 0.6888 0.61276	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.1% 5.1% 5.7% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.6% 6.5% 5.0% 6.5% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5	1.26(0,70,228) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) * 70% Odds Ratio N.Random, <u>95%</u> (1, 1.00(0,59,1,71) 0.55(0,61,151) 1.00(0,59,1,71) 0.55(0,61,151) 1.02(0,54,171) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.25(0,61,151) 0.2	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [shorter] Favours [long] 00d95 Ratio M. Random, 95% CI	F	Testifor overall effect Study of Schoroson Bannet R 2009 Chan HO 2014 Chan HO 2014 Chan HO 2014 Chan HO 2014 Rojzbutst M 2006 Sux 2013 Total (55- 01) Heterogeneby, Tay'e Study of Schoroson Basnet R 2009 Cheng O 2005 Cheg O 20	0.022 (m = 1386, 0 = 0.05) 1.00[Odds Batio] 0.6631 1.5134 0.1641 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7474 0.7475 0.7475 0.7475 0.7475 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7224 0.7244 0.7244 0.7244 0.7244	<u>SE W</u> 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1565 1 0.1786 1 0.0757 1 0.0757 1 0.0757 1 0.0299 0 0.4611 0.0299 0.4029 0.3044 0 0.299	Nonconty Nonconty 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.3% 15.1% 00.005 <0.00001)	Cods Ratio Ration 954- 200 [1 24, 3 23] 454 [245, 548] 111 [102, 154, 548] 111 [102, 154, 548] 111 [102, 154, 154] 101 [20, 27, 074] 102 [21, 21, 214] 1,77 [107, 2,94] 1,77 [107, 2,94] 1,97 [107, 2,94] 1,06 [103, 170] 1,04 [104, 170] 1,07 [104, 140] 2,05 [114, 170] 2,05 [114, 17	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore NV. Rat 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1	10 2 5 17 Facus Ion 35 Ratio 100m 555 Cl 	
	Güneştingilu D 2004 Leck VM, 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Shabr or Saboroup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Chenba S 1997 Güneştingilu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Lix X 2008 Rumman KA 2008 Rumdi C 2011 Thakur R 2010 Tebe RO 2013 Wang W 2007 Wang Y 2008 Wang Y 2008	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.01846 -0.0834 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0185 -0.02817 -0.8751 -0.8751 -0.8751 -0.8751 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.2864 -0.28646 -0.28646 -0.28646 -0.28646 -0.	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < (0.2735 0.2735 0.2323 0.1582 0.375 0.2215 0.423 0.2278 0.423 0.2278 0.423 0.2278 0.5307 0.5307 0.5507 0.5507 0.5507 0.2768 0.2768 0.2769	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.0% 6.5% 2.4% 8.5% 5.0% 6.5% 2.4% 5.0% 5.0% 5.7% 7.4%	1.26(0,70,2.28) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) 0.65(0,78,0.92) * 70% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.55(0,78,0.92) * 70% Odds Ratio 0.55(0,78,0.92) 1.00(0,59,1.71) 0.95(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 1.58(0,55,4.40) 0.92(0,56,0.44) 1.70(1,0,2.44) 0.92(0,56,0.44) 1.70(1,0,2.44) 0.92(0,56,0.44) 1.70(1,0,2.44) 0.92(0,56,0.44) 1.70(1,0,2.44) 0.92(0,56,0.44) 1.70(1,0,2.44) 0.75(0,2,2.11) 0.71(0,0,0.99) 0.86(1,1,4,13)] 0.71(0,0,0.99) 0.86(1,1,4,13)]	Odds Ratio	F	Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Ching CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibulist M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneby, Tay?= Test for overall effect Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng O 1200 Choudhan M 2012 DeckWA 2011 Rumman KA 2009 Rundi C 2011 Subayon W 2012 Selvarn J 2012	0.32 (-m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.98 (P = 0.05) 0.0931 (SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.0757 1 10 0.1766 1 0.0757 1 10 0.14611 0.0314 1 0.2999 0.1451 1 0.4029 0.1357 1 0.3042 0.745 1 0.745 1 0	Reight IV. 13.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.1% 13.9% 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) reight IV. 5.4% 9.0% 6.4% 8.8% 2.7% 13.2%	Odds Rabo Rabdom 2554 C1 2001 124, 323 454 124, 5398 111 1022, 155 101 120, 270 111 1022, 150 150 120, 270 150 120, 270 10	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore 0.0 IV. Rat	ti 2 2 5 ti 7 Savus Ipon 358 Ratio 000m 955 CI	100 ¹
	Ginerpilogiu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2005 Cheng D	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0451 0.1046 -0.0866 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01847 -0.01847 -0.01847 -0.01847 -0.01847 -0.01847 -0.01847 -0.02917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < () 5E 0.2735 0.2223 0.2278 0.3375 0.2213 0.2278 0.3375 0.2213 0.2278 0.3375 0.2215 0.2325 0.2213 0.2278 0.2325 0.2213 0.2278 0.2325 0.2228 0.2375 0.2228 0.2375 0.2228 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.2278 0.	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.9% 5.2% 5.2% 5.2% 5.5% 2.4% 8.5% 5.6% 2.4% 8.5% 5.0% 1.7% 7.7% 7.7%	1.26(0,70,226) 1.56(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) ** 70% Codds Ratio (N, Random, 95% C1 1.00(0,59,1,71) 0.55(0,61,51) 0.52(0,61,51) 0.52(0,61,51) 0.52(0,61,51) 0.52(0,61,51) 0.52(0,61,51) 0.52(0,61,52) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,55,440) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,55,440) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,55,440) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,55,440) 0.59(0,26,211) 1.56(0,54,440) 0.59(0,44,1430) 0.67(0,64,1430) 0.67(0,61,1430) 0.67(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,71,100) 0.68(0,	Odds Ratio	F	Testifor overall effect Study or Schorosop Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2011 Chaing Cr 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojzbuisti M 2006 Xox 2013 Total (55% CI) Heterogenety: Tau*= Testifor overall effect Study or Schorosop Basnet R 2009 Cheng O 2005 Cheg O 20	0.32 (-m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 1.5134 0.1044 0.7474 0.0474 0.0474 0.0476 0.43; Chr# = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.43; Chr# = 0.055 0.4355 0.0352 0.9556 0.0352 0.9556 0.0352 0.9556 0.0723 0.0775 0.0275 0.0	SE W 0.1401 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1736 1 1 0.0757 1 1 0.0757 1 1 0.0757 1 1 0.0214 1 0.0214 1 0.0244 1 0.024 1 0.0244 1	Reight IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 13.9% 13.9% 15.1% 00.0% 00.0% 0.00001) 15.1% 00.0% 00.0% 0.00001) 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) 1.0% 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) 1.0% 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) 1.0% 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) 1.0% 15.1% 00.0% 0.00001) 1.0% 14.6% 8.8% 2.7% 13.2% 5.7% 13.2%	Odds Ratio Ratiom 92%-(1, 2001) 24, 323] 454 (25, 568) 111 (102, 155, 568) 111 (102, 155, 568) 110 (12, 0, 720) 110 (12, 0, 720) 120 (12, 12,	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore NV. Rat	ter 2 s ter 2 s ter 2 sources too ter 2 sources	
	Günerficipilu D 2004 Lock VM 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Testfor overail effect Z = 3. Shirth or Subarcour Basnet R 2009 Cheng 0 2005 Choudhail M 2012 Enkbabl S 1997 Gunerficipilu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Keklas-Khambét A 2008 Luin X 2008 Lock VM 2011 Rumman KA 2000 Luin X 2008 Lock VM 2011 Thakur R 2010 Thabe R0 2013 Wang W 2007 Wang Y 2009 Xu B 2007 Zhao X 2014	0.2301 0.4574 Chi ^p = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.0184 -0.01732 0.4418 -0.10732 0.4418 -0.10732 0.4418 -0.10732 0.4418 -0.10732 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 -0.2917 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5506 0.5	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < (0.2735 0.2735 0.2735 0.2735 0.2323 0.01592 0.3755 0.2215 0.2215 0.2215 0.2215 0.2215 0.2307 0.5307 0.5307 0.3803 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2806 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.2905 0.290	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.9% 3.2% 5.0% 6.5% 2.4% 8.5% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.7% 7.3% 7.3%	1.2€(0,70,2.2€) 1.5€(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) P= 70% Odds Ratio Odds Ratio (V, Random, 55×CC 1.00(0.59,1.71) 0.95(0.61,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.92(0.50,1.42) 1.11(0.81,1.51) 0.92(0.60,1.42) 0.92(0.50,1.42) 1.56(0.55,4.40) 1.90(0.55,9.40) 1.70(1.9,2.46) 1.70(1.9,2.46) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.02,2.40) 1.74(1.	Odds Ratio	F	Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Rojpibust M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (555 CI) Heterogeneby Tau? = Study or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Choudhai M 2012 LockWA 2011 Subdy or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheuron K 2005 Choudhai M 2012 LockWA 2011 Subdy or Suboroup Saberan M 2021 Saberan W 2012 Saberan W 2012	0.32 (-m = 1386; P = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6020458 Ratio1 0.5031 (0.5031 (0.5031 (0.576 (0.9895 (0.42; Ch ² = 119.69 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 10020458 Ratio1 0.43551 (0.43551 (SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.1545 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.2069 1 0.757 1 10. 0.757 1 11. 0.757 1 0.0757 1 0.0314 1 0.299 0.40215 1 0.3044 0 0.72 0.745 1 0.735 1 0.2315 1	Reight IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.3% 15.1% 00.0% 00.0001) reight IV. 5.4% 9.0% 6.4% 8.8% 2.7% 13.2% 5.7% 11.1%	Odds Ratio Random 555, C1 2001 124, 323 454 124, 5581 111 [102, 155 1001 124, 313 110 [124, 5161 111 [102, 156] 121 [114, 3101 1301 120, 270 1301 120, 271 1301 [101, 120] 1301 [101, 120] 1401 [101, 120] 1401 [101, 120] 1501 [101, 120] 150	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore 0.0 10.0 0.1 0.01 0.1	ter Facus Inco Sta Rato Sta Rato Dom 55% CI	- 100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM, 2011 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Shuft or Subarceup Basnet R 2009 Chang O Z 2007 Chang O Z 2007 Cheng O 2004 Güneştioglu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Lex X 2008 Rumman KA 2008 Rumman KA 2008 Rumman KA 2008 Rumma R X 2010 Tebakur R 2010 Tebakur R 2010 Tebakur 2010 Zhab 2014 Zhou 2012	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01847 0.01972 0.4418 -0.01976 0.01997 0.5306 -0.2917 -0.2917 -0.2914 -0.2914 -0.1543 0.0033 -0.1543 0.0073	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < () 0.2735 0.2233 0.1592 0.3375 0.2213 0.2215 0.2213 0.2215 0.2215 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.2216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.0216 0.020	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.1% 5.9% 3.2% 5.8% 2.4% 3.9% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5	1.2€(0,70,228) 1.5€(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) *= 70% Odds Ratio 0.7, Ran6om, 95-5, C1 1.00(0,59,1,71) 0.55(0,61,51) 0.32(0,61,52) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0.32(0,61,21) 0	Odds Ratio	F	Testforoverall effect Study or Schorosop Basneti R 2009 Chen Ho 2011 Chaing Cr 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phos LL 2005 Mor Z 2013 Total (55% CI) Heterogenety, Tau*= Testforoverall effect Study or Schorosop Basneti R 2009 Cheng O 2005 Cheudhan M 2012 LockWA 2011 Rumman KA 2009 Rundi C 2011 Selawoon W 2012 Selawoon W 2012 Selawoon W 2013 Zhao X 2011 Zhao C 2012	0.32 (-m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 1.5134 0.1044 0.7474 0.9975 0.42 (-m = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.425 0.4055 0.0952 0.0052 0.0055 0.0052 0.0055 0.0052 0.0055	SE W 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1555 1 0.1555 1 0.1756 1 0.1756 1 0.1756 1 0.1756 1 0.1756 1 0.1756 1 0.0757 1 1 1 0.2309 1 0.2309 1 0.2300 1 0.2	Image: Constraint of the	Codds Ration Random, 92%, CL 2001 124, 2231 454 124, 55 6981 111 1022, 156 121 11 102 121	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor OV IV. Rat 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1	ter 2 s ter 2 sources too ter	
	Günerficipilu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overail effect Z = 3 Shirdr or Suboroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng 0 2005 Choudhail M 2012 Enkbalt S 1997 Ounerficipilu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Keklar-Khambeth A 2008 Lin X 2008 Leck VM 2011 Rumman KA 2009 Leck VM 2011 Thakur R 2010 Tobe R0 2013 Wang Y 2007 Xing Y 2009 Xing S 2007 Zhao X 2014 Zhou C 2012	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) -0.0451 0.1044 -0.1846 -0.0834 3.1114 -0.1846 -0.0834 -0.1846 -0.0834 -0.1846 -0.2917 0.5306 -0.2917 0.5567 1.3504 -0.2644 -0.1543 0.0038 0.6073	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < 0 0.2735 0.2323 0.2323 0.2323 0.2325 0.2323 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2326 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2366 0.2365 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2355 0.2323 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2226 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.236 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326 0.2326	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.1% 5.1% 5.1% 5.2% 5.2% 5.0% 6.5% 2.4% 5.0% 6.5% 2.4% 5.0% 1.7% 7.4% 7.3% 5.2%	1.26(0,70,226) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0,92) = 70% Odds Ratio N.Random, <u>5%</u> (1) 1.00(0,59,171) 1.10(0,59,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 0.95(0,61,171) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 0.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0,50,941) 1.90(0	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [long] 0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [long] 0.405s Ratio PM.Random, 95% CI	F	Test for overall effect Study or Suborcos Baselet R 2000 Chain NO 2014 Chiang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Pho LL 2005 Rolpibulistit 2006 XuX 2013 Total (85% C) Heterospecery Tau" = Test for overall effect Study or Suborcos Basnet R 2009 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2005 Subdy or Suborcos Basnet R 2009 Rundl 2 2011 Salawoo W 2012 Selam J/2001 Zhao X 2014 Zhao C 2012	0.32 (-m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 1.5194 0.1514 0.1514 0.5976 0.6995 0.4955 0.4955 0.4955 0.9981 0.9982	SE V) 22439 1 21401 1 21545 1 21595 1 2059 1 2059 1 2059 1 2059 1 0.0757 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Reight IV. 3.5% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.3% 15.1% 00.00% 0.00001) Veight IV. 5.1% 00.0% < 0.000011	Construction of the second sec	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore OK IV. Ran 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 IV. Ran	10 2 5 10 Facus Ion 35 Rato 10 25 Rato 10 25 Rato 25 Rato 10 25 Rato	- 100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.03; Test for overail effect Z = 3. Study or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2000 Cheng O 200	0.2301 0.4574 Chi#=107.33, df= 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 0.1044 -0.01846 -0.0834 3.1114 -0.01732 0.4418 -0.10732 0.4418 -0.10732 0.4516 -0.2817 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 1.3504 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2807 -0.2	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < () 0.2735 0.2213 0.1592 0.3375 0.2213 0.423 0.3375 0.423 0.3375 0.423 0.423 0.4245 0.423 0.4268 0.1402 0.0468 0.04802 0.04802 0.04802	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 5.7% 4.2% 5.5% 4.2% 5.5% 4.2% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5	1.26(0,70,226) 1.58(0,92,271) 0.65(0,78,0.92) * 70% Odds Ratio <i>IV</i> , Random, 55%, C1 1.00(0,59,1,71) 0.55(0,61,1,51) 0.52(0,61,1,51) 0.52(0,61,1,51) 0.52(0,61,1,52) 0.52(0,61,1,52) 0.52(0,61,1,52) 0.52(0,61,1,52) 1.56(0,55,4,40) 0.59(0,55,4,40) 1.70(11,0,2,44) 0.75(0,26,2,11) 1.70(11,0,2,44) 0.75(0,26,2,11) 1.70(10,0,99) 0.68(0,71,1,04,486) 1.74(11,0,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07) 1.64(10,3,07)	Odds Ratio	F	Test for overall effect Study or Schoroup Basneti R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chang CY 2005 Mor Z 2013 Phoa LL 2005 Rojbiust M 2006 Xu X 2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau*a Test for overall effect Study or Schoroup Basneti R 2009 Cheng O 2005 Cheng O 2012 Cheng O 2012	0.32 (-m = 1386; 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6931 i 1.5134 i 0.7474 i 0.9375 i 0.43; Ch ² = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.43; Ch ² = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.4355 i 0.0555 i 0.0522 i 0.9881 i 0.9585 i 0.0723 i 0.9743 i 0.9743 i 0.9745 i 0	SE W 0.2439 0.12431 0.1401 0.1565 0.1595 0.1576 0.0757 11 0.0314 0.049 0.4561 0.0304 0.429 0.429 0.3044 0.720 0.1357 0.3044 0.725 0.4236 0.2315 0.43356	Leight IV. 13.5% 14.6% 14.6% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 13.9% 14.3% 13.9% 6.1% 13.9% 14.3% 13.9% 6.1% 14.3% 00.0% 00.0% 0.000011 13.2% 5.4% 13.2% 5.7% 11.1% 5.8% 00.0% 6%	Odds Ratio Random 25%, C1 2001 124, 3231 454 124, 5498 111 (1022, 156) 211 (114, 310) 110 (120, 270) 211 (114, 310) 110 (120, 170) 221 (115,	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore 0.0 IV. Rat 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1	ter 2 5 ter	100 100
	Günerficipiu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.03; Test for overail effect Z = 3. Study or Subarcoup Basnet R 2009 Chang C1 2007 Cheng O 2005 Choudhait M 2012 Enkbal S 1997 Ounerficipiu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Kkita-Khambeth A 2008 Lin X 2008 Leck VM 2011 Rumman KA 2008 Leck VM 2011 Thakur R 2010 Teabe R0 2013 Wang W 2007 Xina C 2014 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% C1)	0.2301 0.4574 Chi*= 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 1000458 Ratiol. 0.00451 0.1044 0.1046 0.1046 0.1046 0.1046 0.1047 0.1046 0.1047 0.5067 1.3504 0.0038 0.6073 Chi*= 99.08, df = 1	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < () 0.2735 0.2223 0.2223 0.1502 0.2213 0.2276 0.2213 0.2276 0.2375 0.2213 0.2276 0.2375 0.2213 0.2276 0.2375 0.2213 0.2276 0.2375 0.2213 0.2276 0.2375 0.2213 0.2276 0.2375 0.2213 0.2276 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2273 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2276 0.2776 0.2776 0.2776 0.2776 0.2776 0.2776 0.2776 0.2776 0.276	1.6% 1.8% 100.0% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5	1.26(0,70,2.26) 1.56(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) *= 70% Odds Ratio N.Random, <u>95%</u> (1, 1.00(0,59,1.71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.65(0,61,71) 0.75(0,62,711) 2.46(1,01,71,71) 1.61(0,52,711) 1.61(0,52,711) 1.74(1,02,100) 3.86(1,04,14.31) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.65(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,60,0.99) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0,71,1.04) 0.77(0	0.2 0.5 2 5 Favours [long] Odds Ratio M. Random, 95% Cl	F	Testfor overall effect Study or Suborcos Bannet R 2009 Chain H0 2014 Todal (65% CI) Hethropenety Tau*a Study or Suborcos Bannet R 2009 Chain H0 2009 Ch	0.022 (m = 1386, 0 = 0.05) 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.6631 1.5134 0.1044 0.7474 0.2474 0.2474 0.46576 0.4055 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.03951 0.039	str 7/P < SE VD 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1565 1 0.1593 1 0.1766 1 0.0757 1 1 df 0.0314 1 0.0314 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.01357 1 0.02315 1 0.43356 1 0.43356 1	Automatic Automatic Automatic Automatic <tr tr=""> <tr tr=""> Automatic A</tr></tr>	Cods Ratio Ratiom 95-C1 200 24 223 454 (245 598) 111 102, 154 101 20, 154 104	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shor OK IV. Ran 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 OX IV. Ran	10 2 5 10 7 2005 100 358 Ratio 0000 555 Cl 	100 100
	Güneştioglu D 2004 Leck VM 2011 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.03; Test for overall effect Z = 3. Study or Subaroup Basnet R 2009 Chang O 2009 Chang O 2009 Chang O 2005 Choudhai M 2012 Enkbal S 1997 Güneştioglu D 2004 Hoa NB 2011 Leck VM 2011 Revitar Alamibete A 2008 Luck 2018 Tabakur R 2010 Total (95% C1) Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.11; Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.11; Heterogeneb; Tau" = 0.11;	0.2301 0.4574 Chi [#] = 107.33, df = 84 (P = 0.0001) 0 -0.0461 -0.0464 -0.01846 -0.01846 -0.01842 -0.01732 0.4418 -0.01732 0.4418 -0.01732 0.4418 -0.05306 -0.2917 1.3504 -0.2905 1.3504 -0.2905 0.5505 -0.2917 1.3504 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 0.5505 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.2900 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0450 -0.0506 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.0500 -0.05000 -0.0500 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.050000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.05000 -0.0500	0.3025 0.2759 32 (P < (0.2735 0.2735 0.2223 0.2735 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2305 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.235 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2325 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.2355 0.23555 0.23555 0.235	1.6% 1.8% 1.8% 0.00001); 5.1% 5.7% 7.0% 4.2% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5	1.26(0,70,2.26) 1.58(0,92,2.71) 0.65(0,78,0.92) ** 70% Odds Rabo <i>V. Random, 55×</i> C1 1.00(0,59,1.71) 0.95(0,61,1.51) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 1.15(0,05,1.42) 0.92(0,60,1.42) 1.24(5)(10,55,4.40) 0.99(0,55,0.44) 1.70(1,0,2,44) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 1.70(1,0,2,44) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 1.70(1,0,2,44) 0.75(0,26,2.11) 1.70(1,0,2,44) 0.75(0,2,2,11) 1.64(1,1,0,2,14) 1.23(1,0,2,1.49) = 82%	Odds Ratio M. Bandom SSN CI M. Bandom SSN CI	F	Test for overall effect Study or Subcroup Basnet R 2009 Chen Ho 2014 Chang CY 2005 Mor 2 2013 Phosa LL 2005 Rojpbulst M 2005 Rojpbulst M 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tay" = Study or Subcroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng 0 2005 Choudhad M 2012 Lock WA 2011 Runnan X& 2008 Runnan X& 2008 Runnan X& 2008 Runnan X& 2008 Runnan X& 2008 Runnan X& 2003 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tay" =	0.32 CHF = 1386, 0 2 = 1.96 (P = 0.05) 0.60205d5 Ratio1 0.5134 0.15134 0.15134 0.15134 0.5376 0.432 CHF = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.432 CHF = 119.89 Z = 2.22 (P = 0.03) 0.435 Ratio1 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.435 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455 0.455	SE W) 0.2439 1 0.2439 1 0.1401 1 0.1565 1 0.1595 1 0.0757 1 1 1 0.0757 1 0.01401 0.2499 0.0757 1 0.0249 0.249 0.4029 0.3044 0.7485 1 0.4355 10.4355 14f=10 (P	Reight IV. 13.5% 13.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 14.5% 15.1% 00.0% 00.001 17.73% 9.0% 8.8% 9.2% 13.2% 5.4% 8.8% 9.2% 13.2% 5.3% 5.7% 11.1% 5.8% 0.00.0% 0.0001);	Odds Rabo Rabdom 25% C1 2001 124, 323 454 124, 5398 111 [102, 156 101 124, 323 110 [124, 326] 111 [102, 156 101 [10, 270] 121 [124, 310] 130 [120, 270] 130	0.1 0.2 0.5 Favours (shore 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1 0.01 0.1	10 55 Rato 55 Rato 55 Rato 55 Rato 55 Rato 55 Rato 55 Rato	100 100

Fig 2. Forest plots of meta-analysis of factors associated with patient delay. This figure shows forest plots for the meta-analysis of five factors associated with patient delay. OR and 95% CI for each factor are given. Notes: A- Male sex; B- Low income; C- Unemployed occupation; D- Haemoptysis; E- Smear positive; F- Long travel time/distance to the first healthcare provider.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.g002

and long travel time or distance had sufficient information to calculate ORs and 95% CIs. Only male sex and consultation with a public hospital negatively correlated with provider delays, whereas long travel time or distance to the first healthcare provider positively associated with provider delay (P<0.05). The pooled effect size for the factors in these studies are shown in Table 6, indicating that male patients and the first consultation with a public hospital had shorter provider delays, whereas long travel time or distance to the first healthcare provider may have longer delays (Fig. 3).

Discussion

Although the prevalence of TB in most Asian countries has been decreasing annually in recent years [63], there is still an epidemiological challenge for TB control. Moreover, case detection is often late. This meta-analysis reviewed the factors correlated to delays in TB diagnosis and treatment, which could provide valuable data for TB programs. A meta-analysis regarding TB treatment delays in Asia was not previously conducted. Understanding the factors that are closely associated with delays is essential to effectively controlling TB, accessing TB services, as well as reducing delays for seeking prompt diagnosis and treatment [64]. As reported by Glanz

Table 5. Factors as	sessed for as	sociatio	on with F	provider delay	(k = 30).								
Citation	Delay = 1st sx to (interval)	Male sex	Old age	Education	Unemployed	Rural residence	Income Iow Ievel	Haemoptysis	Cough	Smear positive	Chest radiographs	Consult with a public hospital	Long trravel time/ distance
Wang W (2007) [18]	Diagnosis (8 days)	×	×	×	×	1	×	×		1	×	I	I
Yamasaki- Nakagawa M (2001) [<u>22</u>]	Diagnosis (1 month)	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	1	I	I	I	1
Rojpibulstit M (2006) [24]	Diagnosis (interval ot recorded)	×	~	I	I	l	1	I	1	×	I	←	1
Zhou C (2012) [27]	Diagnosis (14 days)	×	\rightarrow	×	I	×	×	I	I	I	Ι	\rightarrow	←
Chang CT (2007) [28]	Diagnosis (22 days)	×	I	I	I		×	×	I	I	I	I	I
Basnet R (2009) [<u>30]</u>	Diagnosis (30 days)	×	×	×		I	×		I	×		I	×
Xu X (2013) [<u>36]</u>	Diagnosis (2 weeks)	×	×	I	I		I	I	I	\rightarrow	Ι	I	I
Cheng G (2005) [39]	Diagnosis (interval not recorded)	←	×	×	1	I	×	I	1	1	I	×	×
Shu W (2014) [42]	Diagnosis (interval not recorded)	1	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	\rightarrow	I	I	I
Ngamvithayapong J (2001) [43]	Diagnosis (7 days)	\rightarrow	×	×	I	I	I		I	I		I	I
Kelkar-Khambete A (2008) [<u>46]</u>	Diagnosis (7 days)	×	×	×	I	×	←	I	1	1	I	I	I
Bai LQ (2004) [53]	Diagnosis (14 days)	I	I		I		1	×	1	1	I	1	1
Sabawoon W (2012) [55]	Diagnosis (interval not recorded)	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	←
Karim F (2007) [56]	Diagnosis (interval not recorded)	×	×	I	l	l	I	I	I	I	I	I	1
Lönnroth K (1999) [58]	Diagnosis (4 weeks)	\rightarrow	I	I	I	\rightarrow	I		I	I	I	←	I
Rajeswari R (2002) [59]	Diagnosis (7days)	×	\leftarrow	×	←	×	×	I	I	I	Ι	×	←
Lin HP (2009) [60]	Diagnosis (9 days)	×	\leftarrow	I	I		I	I	I	\rightarrow	Aberrant: 🔱	I	I
Wang WB (2006) [61]	Diagnosis (interval not recorded)	×	×	×	l	I	×	←	1	I	×	I	I
												0	ontinued)

Table 5. (Continue	d)												
Citation	Delay = 1st sx to (interval)	Male sex	Old age	Education	Unemployed	Rural residence	Income Iow Ievel	Haemoptysis	Cough	Smear positive	Chest radiographs	Consult with a public hospital	Long travel time/ distance
Leung EC (2007) [19]	Anti-TB treatment (20 days)	I	<i>←</i>	I	1	1		1		1		1	
Huong NT (2007) [20]	Anti-TB treatment (6 weeks)	×	×	I	1	\rightarrow	I	I	1	I	I	←	I
Enkhbat S (1996) [21]	Anti-TB treatment (1 month)	×	×	I	I	×	×	I		I	I	×	I
Chiang CY (2005) [23]	Anti-TB treatment (23 days)	←	×	I	I	I	I	←	\rightarrow	←	←	÷	I
Selvam JM (2003) [44]	Anti-TB treatment (14 days)	×	×	←	×	I	I	I	I	I	I	\rightarrow	←
Ayé R (2010) [47]	Anti-TB treatment (interval not recorded)	×	×	I	I	×	I	I	I	I	I	×	I
Tobgay KJ (2006) [48]	Anti-TB treatment (7 days)	×	×	I	I	I	1	I	1	I	I	\rightarrow	1
Mor Z (2013) [51]	Anti-TB treatment (79 days)	×	×	I	×	I	I	I	I	×	I	I	I
Rifat M (2011) [52]	Anti-TB treatment (9 weeks)	×	<i>←</i>	I	I	<i>←</i>	I	I		I	I	I	I
Tamhane A (2012) [54]	Anti-TB treatment (14 days)	I	×	×	I	I	×	×	I	I	I	1	×
Thakur R (2010) [57]	Anti-TB treatment (1 day)	×	×	×	I	×	×	I	1	I	I	\rightarrow	I
Lin CY (2010) [62]	Anti-TB treatment (7 days)	×	<i>←</i>	I	I	I	1	×	×	\rightarrow	I	1	1
x. Assessed but P ≥ ↓. Negatively correla ↑. Positively correlat —. Not assessed.	≥ 0.05 ated with delay, ted with delay, I	P < 0.05 P < 0.05	ъ.,										

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.t005

Variable	k	OR (95% CI) ^a	Heterog	Test for overall effect (P)		
			Q statistic			statistic P-value
Male sex	24	0.96 (0.93, 1.00)	30.26	0.14	24%	0.03
Consult with a public hospital	12	0.43 (0.20, 0.91)	286.39	<0.00001	96%	0.03
Long travel time/distance to the first healthcare provider	7	1.68 (1.12, 2.51)	36.13	<0.00001	83%	0.01
Age (older)	24	1.17 (0.91, 1.51)	962.61	<0.00001	98%	0.21
Education (illiterate)	10	0.88 (0.74, 1.05)	7.32	0.60	0%	0.15
Rural residence	8	1.20 (0.76, 1.88)	62.37	<0.00001	89%	0.44
Income (low)	10	1.13 (0.80, 1.58)	27.44	0.0010	67%	0.50
Unemployed	4	1.68 (0.72, 3.94)	38.51	< 0.00001	92%	0.23
Haemoptysis	8	0.78 (0.42, 1.44)	53.68	<0.00001	87%	0.42
Positive smear	8	0.61 (0.13, 2.96)	2313.32	<0.00001	100%	0.54
Chest radiographs	5	0.72 (0.31, 1.70)	182.38	<0.00001	98%	0.46

Table 6. Results of meta-analyses and test for heterogeneity of provider delay.

a. P-value for homogeneous studies (Q statistic, P \ge 0.10, or P<0.10, but I² \le 50%)—fixed-effect model; otherwise, P-value for significantly heterogeneous studies (Q statistic, P<0.10, but I²>50%)—random effects model.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.t006

et al. [65], individual-level factors include socio-demographics, TB symptoms, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. Furthermore, due to the ease of data collection, socio-demographic characteristics were the majority of independent variables that were assessed for correlation with patient or provider delays.

Our data showed that male sex served as an important determinant of both patient and provider delays. Despite the cross-sectional nature and sufficient sample size to detect correlations with delay, male sex negatively correlated with delays in seeking diagnosis and treatment for TB. Similar findings were reported in studies from other countries [66, 67]. In addition, cultural factors are likely to be involved in gender differences. Because of the higher TB prevalence in males, TB is likely suspected and investigated more readily in men [68]. Therefore, men are likely to seek health care earlier when symptoms appeared; thus, TB propaganda regarding disease control and diagnosis is more necessary for men. Moreover, biological differences between males and females with respect to TB incidence and the sensitivity of smear examinations may play an essential role [69]. In addition, gender-specific themes were particularly pervasive within financial, stigma, and health literacy barriers. Studies [70, 71] for gender-related differences in barriers and delays in TB diagnosis and treatment services found that women experienced greater financial barriers and greater stigma than men; the identified barriers were genderspecific in the majority of studies. It is therefore challenging to overcome gender-specific barriers that require intervention. We propose that female patients with symptoms suggestive of TB should receive more attention before and after seeking care.

and the second s	loofOdde l	Ratio	SE	Weight	IV. Fixed 95%	CI N	Fixed	95% CI	
Avé R 2010	.0	1832	0.1428	1 3%	0.83 (0.63 1	101			
Basnet R 2009	0	2231	0 2815	0.3%	1 25 10 72 2	171	-		
Chang CT 2007	ň	2151	0 2845	0.3%	1 24 10 71 21	171	-+		
Cheng G 2005		0.462	0.1941	0.7%	1.59 (1.08.2)	321			
Chiang CY 2005	0	3177	0 1535	1 2%	1 37 11 02 1 1	861	H		
Enkhbat S 1997		0	0 2082	0.6%	1 00 10 66 1	501	-		
Hunna NT 2007	-0	1863	0 2008	0.7%	0 83 10 56 1	231 -		-	
Karim F 2007	ő	0879	0.3319	0.2%	1 09 10 57 21	- 100	-		
Kelkar-Khambete A 2	008 -	0.334	0.4372	0.1%	0.72 10.30, 1.4	591	-		
Lin CY 2010	-0	3011	0.3321	0.2%	0.74 10.39.1.4	421	-		
Lin HP 2009	-0	0419	0.019	75.4%	0.96 (0.92, 1.0	001			
Lönnroth K 1999	-0	4636	0.2316	0.5%	0.63 (0.40, 0.9	991	-		
Mor Z 2013	-0	1062	0.1842	0.8%	0.90 [0.63, 1.1	29]	-	-	
Ngamvithayapong J 2	-001	3598	0.1803	0.8%	0.70 [0.49, 0.9	991 -	-		
Rajeswari R 2002	-0	2458	0.2115	0.6%	0.78 [0.52, 1.1	18] -		-	
Rifat M 2011		0	0.056	8.7%	1.00 [0.90, 1.1	12]	+		
Rojpibulstit M 2006	0	1484	0.1896	0.8%	1.16 [0.80, 1.0	58]	+		
Selvam JM 2003	-0	.0538	0.1915	0.7%	0.95 [0.65, 1.3	38]	-+	-	
Thakur R 2010	-0	4382	0.2814	0.3%	0.65 [0.37, 1.1	12]		• 5	
Tobgay KJ 2006	0	2852	0.4208	0.2%	1.33 [0.58, 3.0	03] -	-		
Wang W 2007	0	3887	0.4923	0.1%	1.48 [0.56, 3.1	87] -	-+		
Wang WB 2006		0.157	0.1952	0.7%	1.17 [0.80, 1.1	72]	+		
Xu X 2013	-0	.0198	0.0829	4.0%	0.98 [0.83, 1.1	15]	-	-	
Zhou C 2012	-0	1512	0.2353	0.5%	0.86 [0.54, 1.3	36] -			
							1		
Total (95% CI)				100.0%	0.96 [0.93, 1.0	[00]	۰.		a.
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	30.26, df = 23 (P =	0.14);	P= 24%			02 05		-	-
Test for overall effect	Z = 2.17 (P = 0.03))				Favours (she	Interl	Favours (long)	
				04	de Datio	044	Dati		
Study or Subgroup	loofOdde Patiol		Weigh	Od	ds Ratio	Odd	s Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE 0 2022	Weigh	Od t IV. Ra	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio	5% CI	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005	log[Odds Ratio] -0.4894 0.7701	0.3037	Weigh	Od <u>IV. Ra</u> 0.6	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl 51 [0.34, 1.11]	Odd IV, Rand	s Ratio	-	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005	100[Odds Ratio] -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128	0.3037	Weigh 8.49 7.79	Od t IV. Ra 0.0 2.1	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 87 [1.26, 2.22]	Odd IV, Rand	s Ratio	5% CI	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkibat S 1997	1001Odds Ratio1 -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365	0.3037 0.4886 0.1445	Weigh 8.49 7.79 5 8.79	Od <u>IV. Ra</u> 0.6 2.1 1.6 1.6	ds Ratio ndom, 95% CI 61 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 67 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08]	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Hunga NT 2007	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1 2954	0.3037 0.4888 0.1445 0.2032	Weigh 8.49 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69	Od 1. IV. Rai 0.0 2.1 1.0 1.0 0.0	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47]	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Libong MK (1999	log[Odds Ratio] -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71	0.3037 0.4880 0.1445 0.2037 0.2731 0.2731	Weigh 8.49 7.79 8.79 8.79 8.69 8.59	Od t IV. Ra 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 1.4 5 0.2	ds Ratio ndom. 95% Cl 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 02 [1.01, 4.12]	Odd IV, Rand	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Pairscraft R 2002	log[Odds Ratio] -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672	0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2037 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203	Weigh 8.49 7.79 8.79 8.69 8.69 8.59 7.8.29	Od <u>IV. Ra</u> 0.6 2.1 1.6 1.6 1.6 0.2 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 03 [1.01, 4.12] 11 [0.95, 2.01]	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratic	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojnbulett M 2006	log[Odds Ratio] -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978	58 0.3037 0.4880 0.1449 0.2037 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2203	Weigh 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 8 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 8 8.69	Od V. Ra 0.6 2.1 1.6 1.6 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 57 (1.26, 2.22) 40 (0.94, 2.08) 27 (0.16, 0.47) 03 (1.01, 4.12) 31 (0.85, 2.01) 55 (0.35, 0.86)	Odd IV, Rand	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulsti M 2006 Sebarn (M 2003	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4912	58 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2037 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2306 0.2306	Weigh 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 8 8.59 8 8.69 5 8.69 5 8.69	Od t IV. Ra 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 1.6 5 2.0 5 1.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5	ds Ratio ndom, 95% Cl 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 67 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 03 [1.01, 4.12] 31 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 9 [0.06, 0.12]	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswarik R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Teakur R 2010	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.149	SE 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2032 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2203 0.2306 0.2072	Weight 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 5 8.69 2 8.69	Od t IV. Rai 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 1.6 5 2.6 5 1.6 5 2.6 5 1.6 5 0.6 5	ds Ratio ndom, 95% C1 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 13 [1.01, 4.12] 31 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 08 [0.06, 0.13] 19 [0.06, 0.26]	Odd IV. Rend	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Seivarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Thakur R 2010	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -2.4909	58 0.3037 0.4880 0.1445 0.2037 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2306 0.2077 0.2306 0.2077 0.3537 0.3537 0.3537	Weight 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 5 8.69 2 8.69 7 8.29 7 8.29	Od t IV. Rai 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6	ds Ratio ndom, 95% C1 51 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 31 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 08 [0.06, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36]	Odd <u>IV. Rand</u>	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zou C 2012	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.9124	58 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2032 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.203 0.	Weigh 8.49 7.79 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.6	Od t IV. Rai 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 0.2 5 0.2 5 0.2 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.6 5	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 61 [0.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 67 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 93 [1.01, 4.12] 93 [1.01, 4.12] 93 [1.01, 4.12] 93 [0.05, 0.86] 95 [0.05, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 93 [0.01, 0.07] 95 [0.02, 0.13] 95 [0.02, 0.13]	Odd IV. Rend	s Ratio	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Seivam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134	58 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2032 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2306 0.2077 0.2353 0.2353 0.2353 0.2553 0.3885	Weigh 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.19	Od t IV. Rai 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 2.6 5 0.6 5	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 07 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 17 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.06, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 19 (0.03, 0.13]	Odd IV. Rend 	s Ratic om. 95	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Tobal (95% CD	log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134	58 0.303 0.4880 0.1445 0.203 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2306 0.2077 0.3537 0.4583 0.3889	Weigh 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 5 8.69 2 8.69 3 8.69 5 8.79 8 8.69 3 8.69 3 8.69 8 8.99 8 8.99	Od t IV. Rai 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 1.4 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 2.0 5 2.0 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 7 1.6 7	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 (0.83, 5.63] 57 (1.56, 2.22] 10 (0.94, 2.08] 17 (0.16, 0.47] 33 (1.01, 4.12] 31 (0.85, 2.01] 35 (0.35, 0.86] 38 (0.06, 0.13] 18 (0.09, 0.36] 38 (0.07, 0.07] 36 (0.03, 0.13] 31 (0.20, 0.91)	Odd <u>IV. Rand</u>	s Ratic	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heteroneneity Tau ² =	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.65: Chiff = 286.33	SE 0.3037 0.4886 0.2037 0.2037 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2306 0.2077 0.3533 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2077 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2077 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085 0.2085	Weigh 8.49 5.779 5.8799 2.8699 1.8597 7.829 3.869 5.869 7.829 3.869 5.869 7.829 3.869 5.869 7.839 8.19 100.09 1.00.09	Od t V. Rai 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5 1.6 5 1.4 5 0.6 5	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 57 (1.26, 2.22) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 27 (0.16, 0.47) 33 (1.01, 4.12) 13 (0.85, 2.01) 15 (0.35, 0.86) 10 (0.56, 0.13) 18 (0.09, 0.36) 13 (0.01, 0.07) 16 (0.03, 0.13) 13 (0.20, 0.91) ************************************	Odd IV. Rend	s Ratic	- -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Seham JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau [®] = 1 Teet for rowall affect =	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi [#] = 286.33 7 = 2.20 (P = 0.03)	SE 0.3037 0.4886 0.2037 0.2037 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2306 0.2077 0.3537 0.4583 0.3886 9, df = 1	Weigh 7 8.49 6 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 2 8.69 3 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.19 100.09 11 (P < 0.1	Od t V. Rai 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 2.0 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 17 [0.85, 2.01] 15 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.06, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 13 [0.01, 0.07] 16 [0.03, 0.13] 13 [0.20, 0.91] ** 96%	Odd IV. Rend	s Ratic om, 95	- - - 10 100	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Test for overall effect 2	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.71 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi [#] = 286.39 Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03)	SE 0.3037 0.4886 0.1448 0.2032 0.2731 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2306 0.2072 0.3533 0.4583 0.3885 9, df = 1	Weight 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 5 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 7.89 9 8.19 100.09 11 (P < 0.10)	Od t V. Rai 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.6 5 0.6	ds Ratio ndom.95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.56, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 77 [0.16, 0.47] 37 [0.16, 0.47] 31 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 58 [0.06, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 30 [0.01, 0.7] 30 [0.01, 0.7] 31 [0.20, 0.91] * 96%	Odd IV. Rand	Fave	5% CI 	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^s = 1 Test for overall effect 2	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi ^a = 286.34 z = 2.20 (P = 0.03)	SE 0.3037 0.4886 0.1448 0.2032 0.2731 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2306 0.2072 0.3537 0.4583 0.3889 9, df = 1	Weight 8.49 5.7.79 5.8.79 2.8.69 1.8.59 7.8.29 8.8.69 2.8.69 2.8.69 2.8.69 2.8.69 2.8.69 2.8.69 2.8.69 3.7.89 3.8.19 100.09 11 (P < 0.1)	Od t N.Rai 5 21 5 21 5 1.6 5 1.6 5 1.6 5 0.2 5 0.2 5 0.0 5 2.0 1.4 5 0.0 5 2.1 5 0.0 5 2.0 5 0.0 5 2.0 5 2.0 5 0.0 5 2.0 5 0.0 5 2.0 5 0.0 5 0.0	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 57 (1.26, 2.22) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 27 (0.16, 0.47) 33 (1.01, 4.12) 13 (0.85, 2.01) 55 (0.35, 0.86) 08 (0.06, 0.13) 13 (0.51, 0.36) 13 (0.01, 0.07) 13 (0.02, 0.91) ** 96% ds Ratio	Odd IV. Rend	Faw		
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^s = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi" = 286.31 z = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio)	SE 0.3037 0.4886 0.2032 0.2731 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2303 0.2203 0.2033 0.2033 0.2033 0.2033 0.2033 0.2035 0.2035 0.2035 0.2035 0.3888 9, df = 1	Weight 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 3 8.69 5 8.69 2 8.69 3 8.69 5 8.29 8 8.99 8 8.19 100.09 11 (P < 0.12 5 8.69 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09 100.09	Od t N.Ra 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 1.4 5 1.4 5 2.0 5 2.0 5 2.0 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.0 5 0.0 6 0.0	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 10 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 11 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.06, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 10 (0.01, 0.7] 16 [0.03, 0.13] 13 [0.20, 0.91] ** 96% ds Ratio ndom, 95% C1	Odd IV. Rand	Favo	- - - 10 100 ours [shorter] Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Seivarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009	Ioo(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi [#] = 286.31 Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Ioo(Odds Ratio)	SE 0.3037 0.4986 0.2032 0.2731 0.3597 0.2203 0.2203 0.2307 0.2307 0.2307 0.2307 0.3537 0.4583 0.3889 9, df = 1 SE 0.5274	Weight 7 8.49 6 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 2 8.69 2 8.69 2 8.69 3 7.89 3 7.89 3 7.89 100.09 11 (P < 0.1) 2 Weight	Od t N.Ra 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 2.0 5 2.0 5 2.0 5 0.0 5 0.0 6 0.	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 40 [0.94, 2.08] 17 [0.16, 0.47] 13 [1.01, 4.12] 13 [1.01, 4.12] 13 [0.01, 4.12] 13 [0.06, 0.13] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.31] 13 [0.20, 0.91] * 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 (10 [0.5] + 97]	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio om, 9 	0 5% CI - - - 10 100 purs [shorter] Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2005	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi ^a = 286.33 Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.01	56 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2032 0.2032 0.2032 0.2306 0.2072 0.3537 0.4583 0.3885 9, df = 1 56 0.5274 0.031	Weight Weight 6 7 8.49 6 7 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.19 100.0* 11 (P < 0.1	Od t IV. Rai 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 0.2 5	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 57 (1.26, 2.22) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 27 (0.16, 0.47) 33 (1.01, 4.12) 13 (0.85, 2.01) 55 (0.35, 0.86) 08 (0.06, 0.13) 18 (0.09, 0.36) 33 (0.01, 0.07) 36 (0.03, 0.13) 13 (0.20, 0.91) ** 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 70 (0.25, 1.97) 10 (95, 1.07) 10 (95, 1.07	Odd IV. Rend	s Ratio om. 9: 	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau [#] = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi" = 286.31 Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.01 0.4244	St 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2037 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.2203 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3585 0.3885 9. df = 1 St 0.5274 0.5274 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.2011 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3031 0.5274 0.3031 0.145 0.3031 0.145 0.3031 0.145 0.3031 0.145 0.3031 0.145 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35577 0.35777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.355777 0.3557777 0.35577777777 0.35577777777777777777777777777777777777	Weight 7 8.49 6 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 7.89 9 8.19 100.09 1 (P < 0.1 2 0.09 2 21.89 2 18.59 2 8.69 7 8.29 8 7.89 9 8.19 100.09 1 0.09 1 0.09 1 0.09 2 1.89 2 1.89 2 1.89	Od t N.Ra 6 0.8 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.7 5 0.5 5 0.	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 10 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 11 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 19 (0.03, 0.13] 13 [0.20, 0.91] ** 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 70 [0.25, 1.97] 11 [0.95, 1.07] 15 (1.05, 2.22]	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio om, 9 	10 100 10 100 ours [shorter] Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Seivarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawmon W 2012	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi" = 286.31 ≥ 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.01 0.4244 1.65	Sife 0.3037 0.4886 0.1445 0.2032 0.2731 0.2203 0.2306 0.2073 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2203 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3593 0.2035 0.3033 0.3593 0.2035 0.3033 0.3593 0.2035 0.3033 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.3593 0.35	Weight 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 2 8.69 3 8.69 3 8.69 3 8.69 3 8.69 3 8.69 3 8.19 100.05 1 (P < 0.) 1 (P < 0.) 5 Weight 4 9.09 2 1.89 3 18.59 3 7.19 4 9.09 2 1.89 3 18.59 3 7.19 5 8.69 5 8.99 5	Od t N.Ra 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 2.6 5 2.6 5 0.2 5 0.	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11] 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 10 [0.94, 2.08] 17 [0.16, 0.47] 13 [1.01, 4.12] 13 [10.85, 2.01] 15 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.33] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 19 [0.03, 0.13] 13 [0.20, 0.91] *= 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 0 [0.25, 1.97] 01 [0.95, 1.07] 53 [1.05, 2.22] 11 [51, 17 cm]	Odd IV. Rand	S Ratio	0 5% CI - - - - - - - - - - - - -	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2000 Selvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawoon W 2012	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi ^a = 286.33 2 = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.011 0.4244 1.65 0.4541	Sff 0.3033 0.4886 0.1445 0.2035 0.22306 0.2273 0.22306 0.2273 0.3553 0.2200 0.2273 0.3553 0.2200 0.2273 0.3553 0.3886 9, df = 1 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.5274 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3553 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3777 0.3777 0.3777 0.3777 0.3777 0.3777 0.3777 0.3777 0.37777 0.37777 0.37777 0.37777 0.377777 0.37777777777	Weigh 7 8.49 6 7.79 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.19 100.09 11 (P < 0.1 Weight 9.09 2.189 8.159 9.819 18.59 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1.00.09 1	Od t IV.Ra 6 0.8 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 2.5 5 1.4 5 2.6 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 1.4 5 0.5 5 0.5 6 0.4 000001); I Odd t IV.Ra 5 0.3 5 1.6 5 0.5 5 0.5	ds Ratio ndom. 95% CI 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 57 (1.26, 2.28) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 11 (0.85, 2.01) 15 (0.35, 0.86) 10 (0.55, 2.01) 15 (0.35, 0.86) 10 (0.03, 0.13) 13 (0.01, 0.07) 13 (0.01, 0.07) 13 (0.20, 0.91) *= 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% CI 70 (0.25, 1.97) 13 (1.05, 2.22) 11 (1.57, 1.790) 11 (0.55, 1.07) 13 (1.05, 2.22) 11 (1.57, 1.790)	Odd IV. Rend	S Ratio	10 100 Dours (shorter) Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lionnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawoon W 2012 Selvarn JM 2003 Tambane A 2012	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi" = 286.31 2 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.011 0.4244 1.65 0.4541 0.7885	Si 0.3033 0.4886 0.2033 0.2203 0.2207 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.3886 9. df = 1 Si 0.5277 0.0313 0.632 0.632 0.632 0.6426 0.1476 0.6476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476 0.1476	Weigh 7 8.49 6 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 8 8.69 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 7 8.29 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 7 8.99 8 7 8 8.99 8 7 8 9 8 7 8	Od t IV.Ra 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.6 5 2.6 5 2.6 5 2.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6 0.6 6	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.23] 10 [0.34, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 11 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 19 (0.03, 0.13] 13 [0.20, 0.91] ** 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 70 [0.25, 1.97] 11 [0.95, 1.07] 15 [0.5, 1.22] 11 [1.5, 1.22] 11 [1.5, 1.22] 11 [1.5, 1.22] 11 [1.5, 1.22] 11 [1.5, 1.22] 11 [1.5, 2.22] 11 [1.5, 2.22] 11 [1.5, 2.22] 11 [1.5, 2.22] 11 [1.5, 2.22] 11 [1.5, 2.22] 11 [1.2, 2.11] 10 [1.5, 6.63] 10 [1.2, 2.21] 10 [1.5, 6.63] 10 [1.2, 2.21] 10 [1.5, 6.63] 10 [1.2, 2.21] 10 [1.5, 6.63] 10 [1.2, 2.21] 10 [1.5, 6.63] 10 [1.2, 2.21] 11 [1.2, 2.2	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratic om, 95	0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawoon W 2012 Seharn JM 2003 Tamhane A 2012	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.717 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi" = 286.31 2 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) 0.3567 0.01 0.4244 1.65 0.4541 0.7885 1.2776	Sig 0.3037 0.4886 0.2037 0.2037 0.2207 0.3539 0.2207 0.3539 0.2207 0.3539 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.3886 0.3886 0.5274 0.0312 0.1895 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.1415 0.141500000000000000000000	Weight 7 8.49 5 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 2 8.69 3 8.69 5 8.69 2 8.69 3 8.29 3 7.89 9 8.19 100.05 1 (P < 0.) 5 Weight 4 9.09 2 1.89 3 7.19 9 19.09 5 7.19 9 19.09 5 7.99 1 0.09 5 7.99 1 0.09 5 7.99 1 0.09 5 7.99 5 8.69 5 8.79 5 8.79 5 8.79 5 8.99 5 8.99	Od t IV. Rai 5 0.6 5 1.4 5 0.4 6	dis Ratio ndom. 95% CI 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 37 (1.26, 2.22) 37 (1.26, 2.23) 37 (1.26, 2.24) 31 (0.85, 2.04) 31 (0.85, 2.01) 35 (0.35, 0.86) 10 (0.96, 0.13) 18 (0.09, 0.36) 33 (0.01, 0.07) 36 (0.03, 0.13) 18 (0.20, 0.91) ** 96% dis Ratio ndom. 95% CI 70 (0.25, 1.97) 30 (0.95, 1.97) 33 (1.05, 2.22) 11 (51, 1.790) 31 (0.5, 2.21) 20 (1.95, 5.61) 71 (1.2, 2.21) 20 (1.95, 5.61) 31	Odd IV. Rand	S Ratio	10 100 Jun 100 Jun 100 Juns [shorter] Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lönnröth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulsti M 2000 Sehvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawoon W 2012 Sehvam JM 2003 Tamhane A 2012 Zhou C 2012	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi ^p = 286.33 Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.01 0.4244 1.65 0.4541 0.7885 1.2779	Sig 0.3037 0.4886 0.1444 0.2037 0.2201 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.2306 0.33885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.3885 0.5274 0.35274 0.35274 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3527 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3557 0.3577 0.3557 0.3577 0.3577 0.3557 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3577 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.3770 0.37700 0.37700 0.37700 0.37700 0.37700 0.37700 0.37700 0.377000 0.3770000000000	Weight 7 8.49 6 7.79 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.69 8.19 100.09 11 (P < 0.1 Weight 9.09 2.189 8.19 18.59 9.819 100.09 11.09 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1.199 1	Od t IV.Ra 6 0.8 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 2.5 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 1.4 5 0.4 6 0.4 000001); I 000001); I 000001); I 000001; I 000001; I 000001; I 000001; I 0000001; I 0000001; I 0000001; I 000000000000000; I 000000000000000; I 000000000000000; I 00000000000000; I 00000000000000; I 0000000000000; I 0000000000000; I 0000000000000; I 00000000000000; I 000000000000; I 0000000000000; I 00000000000; I 0000000000000; I 0000000000; I 00000000000; I 0000000000; I 000000000000; I 0000000000000; I 00000000000; I 00000000000; I 0000000000; I 0000000000; I 000000000; I 000000000; I 000000000; I 00000000; I 00000000; I 00000000; I 000000000; I 0000000000; I 00000000; I 0000000; I 00000000; I 0000000; I 000000; I 000000; I 000000; I 000000; I 000000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 00000; I 0000; I 00000; I 0000; I 000; I 0000; I 0000; I 0000; I 000; I 0000; I 0000; I	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 31 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 77 (1.26, 2.22) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 11 (0.85, 2.01) 15 (0.35, 0.86) 10 (0.95, 0.36) 10 (0.95, 0.36) 13 (0.01, 0.07) 13 (0.01, 0.07) 13 (0.02, 0.91) ** 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 70 (0.25, 1.97) 13 (1.05, 2.22) 11 (1.5, 1.790) 17 (1.12, 2.21) 20 (0.86, 5.63) 59 (1.95, 6.60)	Odd IV. Rend	s Ratio	10 100 purs (shorter) Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lionnroth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2006 Selvarn JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Test for overall effect 2 Study or Subgroup Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawoon W 2012 Selvarn JM 2003 Tamhane A 2012 Zhou C 2012	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.711 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi" = 286.31 Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) -0.3567 0.011 0.4244 1.65 0.4541 0.7885 1.2779	Si 0.3037 0.4886 0.2037 0.2037 0.2207 0.2207 0.2207 0.3537 0.4583 0.4583 0.3886 0.3886 0.3886 0.5274 0.3187 0.3187 0.3187 0.3116 0.1145 0.3106 0.1145 0.3106 0.1145 0.3106 0.1145 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1458 0.1445 0.1445 0.1445 0.1458 0.1445 0.1458 0.1445 0.1458 0.1458 0.1445 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.1458 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588 0.14588	Weigh Weigh 7 8.49 6 7.79 5 8.79 2 8.69 1 8.59 8 8.69 8 8.69 7 8.29 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 7.89 8 7.89 8 7.89 9 8.19 100.05 100.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05 10.05	Od t N.Ra 5 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 2.5 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 1.4 5 0.2 5 1.4 5 0.4 6 0.4 000001); I 00 6 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4	ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 10.34, 1.11 16 [0.83, 5.63] 57 [1.26, 2.22] 10 [0.94, 2.08] 27 [0.16, 0.47] 33 [1.01, 4.12] 11 [0.85, 2.01] 55 [0.35, 0.86] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 18 [0.09, 0.36] 19 [0.03, 0.13] 13 [0.20, 0.91] ** 96% ds Ratio ndom. 95% C1 70 [0.25, 1.97] 10 [0.55, 1.07] 10 [0.85, 1.07] 10 [0.86, 5.63] 59 [1.95, 6.60] 88 [1.12, 2.51]	Odd IV. Rand	Favor	10 100 10 100 ours [shorter] Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	
Study or Subgroup Ayé R 2010 Cheng G 2005 Chiang CY 2005 Enkhbat S 1997 Huong NT 2007 Lionnoth K 1999 Rajeswari R 2002 Rojpibulstit M 2000 Sehvam JM 2003 Thakur R 2010 Tobgay KJ 2006 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1 Total (95% CI) Basnet R 2009 Cheng G 2005 Rajeswari R 2002 Sabawoon W 2012 Sehvam JM 2003 Tamhane A 2012 Zhou C 2012 Total (95% CI)	Log(Odds Ratio) -0.4894 0.7701 0.5128 0.3365 -1.2954 0.717 0.2672 -0.5978 -2.4813 -1.7148 -3.4999 -2.8134 1.66; Chi [#] = 286.31 2 2.20 (P = 0.03) Log(Odds Ratio) 0.3567 0.01 0.4244 1.655 0.4541 0.7885 1.2779 0.19; Chi [#] = 36.13	Signature 2 Signat	Weight 7 8.49 6 7.79 8 8.79 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 8 8.69 9 8.19 100.01 (P < 0.01	Od t IV.Rat 6 0.6 5 2.1 5 1.4 5 0.5 5 1.4 5 0.5 5 1.4 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.5 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6 5 0.6	dis Ratio ndom. 95% CI 51 (0.34, 1.11) 16 (0.83, 5.63) 57 (1.26, 2.22) 10 (0.94, 2.08) 27 (0.16, 0.47) 33 (1.01, 4.12) 11 (0.85, 2.01) 155 (0.35, 0.86) 188 (0.09, 0.36) 138 (0.09, 0.36) 138 (0.09, 0.36) 138 (0.09, 0.36) 138 (0.09, 0.36) 139 (0.01, 0.07) 136 (0.03, 0.13) 13 (0.20, 0.91) ** 96% dis Ratio ndom. 95% CI 10 (0.95, 1.07) 153 (1.05, 2.22) 11 (51, 17.90) 10 (0.95, 1.07) 157 (1.12, 2.21) 20 (0.86, 5.63) 59 (1.95, 6.60) 18 (1.12, 2.51) 83%	Odd IV. Rand	s Ratio	10 100 ours [shorter] Odds Ratio Random, 95% C	

Fig 3. Forest plots of meta-analysis of factors associated with provider delay. This figure shows forest plots for the meta-analysis of male sex factor associated with provider delay. OR and 95% CI for the factor are given. Notes: A- Male sex; B- Consult with a public hospital; C- Long travel time/distance to the first healthcare provider.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120088.g003

Regarding the behavior of patients, long travel time or distance to the first healthcare provider was found to be a significant determinant that correlated with both patient and provider delays. Previous reviews of the factors associated with patient and diagnostic delays in China and sub-Saharan African countries [14, 15] reported that the majority of factors associated with delays in TB diagnosis and treatment were related to the place of first consultation, travel time, or distance from the health facility. A study conducted in rural Ethiopia agreed that the difficulty of geographic access to health facilities was identified as one of the primary reasons for patient delay [72], indicating that geographic issues can also influence the timeliness of medical service, particularly in remote and poor areas.

This meta-analysis highlights that socio-demographic factors, including low level of income and unemployment, were positively associated with long patient delay. According to WHO determinants of TB control, risk factors of delayed diagnosis can be divided into three levels: socio-economic, clinical, and health system factors [73]. Most Asian countries have a considerable rural population due to their developing economics. Due to lower incomes, potential TB patients may be less likely to seek care after persistent cough for 3 weeks compared to higherincome individuals [74]. Additionally, there are fewer health facilities in low-economic areas and it is more difficult for patients to seek health-care, subsequently affecting patient delay. Previous studies have shown that unemployment is an independent risk factor for delay in seeking treatment [58]. Pooling the factors together, the data indicate that poverty may discourage patients from seeking health care in a timely manner. Community health workers should design individualized and community-based propaganda and education to address the symptoms of TB. Moreover, community health workers can be effective in the referral of potential patients to rural and national TB control institutions. Therefore, when there is a global emphasis on the use of community health service personnel for disease prevention and control at the rural level, rural health workers could play a key role in the fight against TB [75].

Another factor associated with patient delay was hemoptysis, which negatively correlated with delay. The presence of hemoptysis may be the most characteristic and severe symptom of TB, and it is not surprising that it prompts the initial health consultation [25]. A previous study suggested why hemoptysis can lead to timely physical examinations and a TB diagnosis [76]. It is important to balance the TB severity and the costs associated with seeking care to continue with diagnosis and treatment. In the current report, consultation with a public hospital for the first visit negatively correlated with provider delays. Storla et al. [77] reported similar results in a systematic review, showing that selection of a traditional practitioner for the first visit is associated with prolonged delays in diagnosis in a range of studies. It was also reported that the number and type of provider first consulted were the most important risk factors for diagnosis delay [13]. Thus, understanding how patients seek health care and to attempt to provide sufficient public health care is very important for TB control.

This meta-analysis was limited by the study designs of the included articles, which may explain the heterogeneity to some extent. Almost all included studies were cross-sectional in design, which used a consecutive method of sampling. Cross-sectional studies have a number of inherent limitations that potentially bias the results, such as its low comparability and that it is includes certain confounders. Thus, these studies do not obtain the causality of the observed associations. Although some of the studies were controlled by logistic regressions for these confounders, their residual effect might still have introduced bias. In addition, although the NOS scores of included studies were a little low, they were still in the moderate quality (most 5 or 6 scores) [78,79]. Therefore, it should make the the reliability of this review.

The available studies had different definitions of provider delay, as well as multiple classifications of socio-demographic variables, such as income, education, and types of health facility consulted by TB patients, which limit the comparability of these studies. Although there were varying cut-off points for delay duration (particularly for provider delay), most studies used the same starting point and end point (provider delay had two different end points). However, when the two types of delay are combined, the correlated factors of delays can be better analyzed [24].

Conclusion

This meta-analysis confirms that socio-demographic characteristics, symptoms of TB patients, and long travel distance to the first provider have critical roles in patient delay in TB diagnosis

PLOS ONE

and treatment. However, only male sex and long travel distance to the first provider correlated to both patient and provider delays, suggesting that availability, and particularly timeliness, of public healthcare providers should be primary concerns of policymakers. However, these studies are not comparable because of their weak and sole study designs and various cut-off points for the duration of delays, particularly for provider delay. Future studies are required that use stronger designs (cohort or case-control studies) and can establish causality among affected factors. Moreover, a standard definition of delay will allow for more appropriate comparisons across studies.

Supporting Information

S1 Table. PRISMA Checklist.

(DOC)

S2 Table. List of Reasons for Exclusion 42 Full-text Articles. (DOC)

S3 Table. Results of subgroup analysis and test for heterogeneity of provider's delay. (DOC)

S4 Table. List of all the scores for each item of the NOS of the included 45 studies. (DOC)

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: JC XW AM. Analyzed the data: JC QW. Wrote the paper: JC QW. Conducted the literature search and extraction of data: JC XW XH. Revised and edited the study: AM YL. In charge of English editing: AM QW.

References

- Goodchild M, Sahu S, Wares F, Dewan P, Shukla RS, Chauhan LS, et al. A cost-benefit analysis of scaling up tuberculosis control in India. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2011; 15(3): 358–362. PMID: <u>21333103</u>
- 2. WHO. China: health, poverty and economic development. 2005 Dec [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: www.who.int/macrohealth/action/CMH_China.pdf.
- WHO. Global Tuberculosis Report 2013. 2013 Nov [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: <u>http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/91355/1/9789241564656_eng.pdf</u>.
- WHO. Fact sheets on tuberculosis. 2013 [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: <u>http://www.who.int/tb/publications/factsheet_global.pdf?ua=1</u>.
- 5. Bjune G. Tuberculosis in the 21st century: an emerging pandemic? Nor Epidemiol. 2005; 15(2): 133–139.
- Yimer S, Bjune G, Alene G. Diagnostic and treatment delay among pulmonary tuberculosis patients in Ethiopia: a cross sectional study. BMC Infect Dis. 2005; 5: 112. PMID: <u>16343350</u>
- 7. Ward HA, Marciniuk DD, Pahwa P, Hoeppner VH. Extent of pulmonary tuberculosis in patients diagnosed by active compared to passive case finding. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 20048(5): 593–597.
- Aldhubhani AH, Izham MI, Pazilah I, Anaam MS. Effect of delay in diagnosis on the rate of tuberculosis among close contacts of tuberculosis patients. East Mediterr Health J. 2013; 19(10): 837–842. PMID: 24313146
- Nkosi D, Janssen S, Padanilam X, Louw R, Menezes CN, Grobusch MP. Factors influencing specialist care referral of multidrug- and extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis patients in Gauteng/South Africa: a descriptive questionnaire-based study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2013; 13: 268. doi: <u>10.1186/1472-6963-13-268</u> PMID: <u>23837531</u>
- Farah MG, Rygh JH, Steen TW, Selmer R, Heldal E, Bjune G. Patient and health care system delays in the start of tuberculosis treatment in Norway. BMC Infect Dis. 2006; 6: 33. PMID: <u>16504113</u>

- 11. WHO. Tuberculosis in the WHO South-East Asia Region. 2010 [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: <u>http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/88/3/09-073874/en/</u>. doi: <u>10.2471/</u> <u>BLT.09.073874</u> PMID: <u>20428378</u>
- Sreeramareddy CT, Panduru KV, Menten J, Van den Ende J. Time delays in diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis: a systematic review of literature. BMC Infect Dis. 2009; 9: 91. doi: <u>10.1186/1471-2334-9-91</u> PMID: <u>19519917</u>
- Sreeramareddy CT, Qin ZZ, Satyanarayana S, Subbaraman R, Pai M. Delays in diagnosis and treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis in India: a systematic review. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2014; 18(3): 255–266. doi: 10.5588/ijtld.13.0585 PMID: 24670558
- Li Y, Ehiri J, Tang S, Li D, Bian Y, Lin H, et al. Factors associated with patient, and diagnostic delays in Chinese TB patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med. 2013; 11: 156. doi: <u>10.1186/</u> <u>1741-7015-11-156</u> PMID: <u>23819847</u>
- 15. Finnie RK, Khoza LB, van den Borne B, Mabunda T, Abotchie P, Mullen PD. Factors associated with patient and health care system delay in diagnosis and treatment for TB in sub-Saharan African countries with high burdens of TB and HIV. Trop Med Int Health. 2011; 16(4): 394–411. doi: <u>10.1111/j.1365-3156.2010.02718.x</u> PMID: 21320240
- Glynn JR. Resurgence of tuberculosis and the impact of HIV infection. Br Med Bull. 1998; 54(3): 579–593. PMID: <u>10326286</u>
- 17. Wells GA, Shea B, O'connell D, Peterson JEA, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2000. Available: <u>http://www.medicine.mcgill.ca/rtamblyn/Readings/The%20Newcastle%20-%20Scale%20for%20assessing</u>%20the%20quality%20of%20nonrandomised%20studies%20in%20meta-analyses.pdf.
- Wang W, Jiang Q, Abdullah AS, Xu B. Barriers in accessing to tuberculosis care among non-residents in Shanghai: a descriptive study of delays in diagnosis. Eur J Public Health. 2007; 17(5): 419–423. PMID: <u>17412714</u>
- Leung EC, Leung CC, Tam CM. Delayed presentation and treatment of newly diagnosed pulmonary tuberculosis patients in Hong Kong. Hong Kong Med J. 2007; 13(3): 221–227. PMID: <u>17548911</u>
- Huong NT, Vree M, Duong BD, Khanh VT, Loan VT, Co NV, et al. Delays in the diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis patients in Vietnam: a cross-sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2007; 7: 110. PMID: <u>17567521</u>
- Enkhbat S, Toyota M, Yasuda N, Ohara H. Differing influence on delays in the case-finding process for tuberculosis between general physicians and specialists in Mongolia. J Epidemiol. 1997; 7(2): 93–98.
 PMID: <u>9255030</u>
- 22. Yamasaki-Nakagawa M, Ozasa K, Yamada N, Osuga K, Shimouchi A, Ishikawa N, et al. Gender difference in delays to diagnosis and health care seeking behaviour in a rural area of Nepal. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2001; 5(1): 24–31. PMID: <u>11263512</u>
- Chiang CY, Chang CT, Chang RE, Li CT, Huang RM. Patient and health system delays in the diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis in Southern Taiwan. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2005; 9(9): 1006–1012. PMID: 16158893
- Rojpibulstit M, Kanjanakiritamrong J, Chongsuvivatwong V. Patient and health system delays in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in Southern Thailand after health care reform. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2006; 10(4): 422–428. PMID: <u>16602407</u>
- Li X, Jiang S, Li X, Mei J, Zhong Q, Xu W, et al. Predictors on delay of initial health-seeking in new pulmonary tuberculosis cases among migrants population in East China. PLoS One. 2012; 7(2): e31995. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0031995 PMID: 22384123
- Lock WA, Ahmad RA, Ruiter RA, van der Werf MJ, Bos AE, Mahendradhata Y, et al. Patient delay determinants for patients with suspected tuberculosis in Yogyakarta province, Indonesia. Trop Med Int Health. 2011; 16(12): 1501–1510. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02864.x PMID: 21838716
- Zhou C, Tobe RG, Chu J, Gen H, Wang X, Xu L. Detection delay of pulmonary tuberculosis patients among migrants in China: a cross-sectional study. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2012; 16(12): 1630–1636. doi: <u>10.5588/ijtld.12.0227</u> PMID: <u>23131261</u>
- Chang CT, Esterman A. Diagnostic delay among pulmonary tuberculosis patients in Sarawak, Malaysia: a cross-sectional study. Rural Remote Health. 2007; 7(2): 667. PMID: <u>17511524</u>
- Lin X, Chongsuvivatwong V, Geater A, Lijuan R. The effect of geographical distance on TB patient delays in a mountainous province of China. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2008; 12(3): 288–293. PMID: 18284834
- **30.** Basnet R, Hinderaker SG, Enarson D, Malla P, Mørkve O. Delay in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in Nepal. BMC Public Health. 2009; 9: 236. doi: <u>10.1186/1471-2458-9-236</u> PMID: <u>19602255</u>
- Güneylioglu D, Yilmaz A, Bilgin S, Bayram U, Akkaya E. Factors affecting delays in diagnosis and treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis in a tertiary care hospital in Istanbul, Turkey. Med Sci Monit. 2004; 10(2): CR62–67. PMID: <u>14737045</u>

- 32. Hoa NB, Tiemersma EW, Sy DN, Nhung NV, Vree M, Borgdorff MW, et al. Health-seeking behaviour among adults with prolonged cough in Vietnam. Trop Med Int Health. 2011; 16(10):1260–1267. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02823.x</u> PMID: <u>21692960</u>
- Xu B, Diwan VK, Bogg L. Access to tuberculosis care: what did chronic cough patients experience in the way of healthcare-seeking? Scand J Public Health. 2007; 35(4): 396–402. PMID: <u>17786803</u>
- Ahmad RA, Richardus JH, de Vlas SJ. Care-seeking behaviour among individuals with TB symptoms in Jogjakarta Province, Indonesia: a community-based study. Int Health. 2013 Mar; 5(1):51–7. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1093/inthealth/ihs002</u> PMID: <u>24029846</u>
- Phoa LL, Teleman MD, Wang YT, Chee CB. Characteristics of patients with delayed diagnosis of infectious pulmonary tuberculosis. Respirology. 2005; 10(2): 196–200. PMID: <u>15823185</u>
- Xu X, Liu JH, Cao SY, Zhao Y, Dong XX, Liang Y, et al. Delays in care seeking, diagnosis and treatment among pulmonary tuberculosis patients in Shenzhen, China. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2013; 17(5): 615–620. doi: 10.5588/ijtld.12.0231 PMID: 23575326
- Rundi C, Fielding K, Godfrey-Faussett P, Rodrigues LC, Mangtani P. Delays in seeking treatment for symptomatic tuberculosis in Sabah, East Malaysia: factors for patient delay. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2011; 15(9): 1231–1238, doi: <u>10.5588/ijtld.10.0585</u> PMID: <u>21943851</u>
- Zhao X, Yang P, Gai R, Mei L, Wang X, Xu L. Determinants of health care-seeking delay among tuberculosis patients in Shandong Province, China. Eur J Public Health. 2014; 24(5): 757–761. doi: <u>10.1093/</u> <u>eurpub/ckt113</u> PMID: <u>23975893</u>
- Cheng G, Tolhurst R, Li RZ, Meng QY, Tang S. Factors affecting delays in tuberculosis diagnosis in rural China: a case study in four counties in Shandong Province. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2005; 99(5): 355–362. PMID: <u>15780342</u>
- 40. Tobe RG, Xu L, Zhou C, Yuan Q, Geng H, Wang X. Factors affecting patient delay of diagnosis and completion of Direct Observation Therapy, Short-course (DOTS) among the migrant population in Shandong, China. Biosci Trends. 2013; 7(3): 122–128. PMID: <u>23836035</u>
- Choudhari M, Jha N, Yadav DK, Chaudhary D. Factors associated with patient delay in diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in a district. J Nepal Health Res Counc. 2012; 10(22): 234–238. PMID: 23281458
- Shu W, Chen W, Zhu S, Hou Y, Mei J, Bai L, et al. Factors causing delay of access to tuberculosis diagnosis among new, active tuberculosis patients: a prospective cohort study. Asia Pac J Public Health. 2014; 26(1):33–41. doi: 10.1177/1010539513502523 PMID: 24097935
- Ngamvithayapong J, Yanai H, Winkvist A, Diwan V. Health seeking behaviour and diagnosis for pulmonary tuberculosis in an HIV-epidemic mountainous area of Thailand. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2001; 5(11): 1013–1020. PMID: <u>11716337</u>
- 44. Selvam JM, Wares F, Perumal M, Gopi PG, Sudha G, Chandrasekaran V, et al. Health-seeking behaviour of new smear-positive TB patients under a DOTS programme in Tamil Nadu, India, 2003. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2007; 11(2): 161–167. PMID: 17263286
- 45. Chen HG, Liu M, Jiang SW, Gu FH, Huang SP, Gao TJ, et al. Impact of diabetes on diagnostic delay for pulmonary tuberculosis in Beijing. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2014; 18(3): 267–271. doi: <u>10.5588/ijtld.13.</u> 0140 PMID: <u>24670559</u>
- Kelkar-Khambete A, Kielmann K, Pawar S, Porter J, Inamdar V, Datye A, et al. India's Revised National Tuberculosis Control Programme: looking beyond detection and cure. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2008; 12(1): 87–92. PMID: 18173883
- Ayé R, Wyss K, Abdualimova H, Saidaliev S. Patient's site of first access to health system influences length of delay for tuberculosis treatment in Tajikistan. BMC Health Serv Res. 2010; 10: 10. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1186/1472-6963-10-10</u> PMID: <u>20064224</u>
- Tobgay KJ, Sarma PS, Thankappan KR. Predictors of treatment delays for tuberculosis in Sikkim. Natl Med J India. 2006; 19(2): 60–63. PMID: <u>16756190</u>
- Rumman KA, Sabra NA, Bakri F, Seita A, Bassili A. Prevalence of tuberculosis suspects and their healthcare-seeking behavior in urban and rural Jordan. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2008; 79(4): 545–551. PMID: 18840742
- 50. Wang Y, Long Q, Liu Q, Tolhurst R, Tang S. Treatment seeking for symptoms suggestive of TB: comparison between migrants and permanent urban residents in Chongqing, China. Trop Med Int Health. 2008; 13(7): 927–933. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2008.02093.x PMID: 18482198
- Mor Z, Kolb H, Lidji M, Migliori G, Leventhal A. Tuberculosis diagnostic delay and therapy outcomes of non-national migrants in Tel Aviv, 1998–2008. Euro Surveill. 2013; 18(12): pii 20433.
- 52. Rifat M, Rusen ID, Islam MA, Enarson DA, Ahmed F, Ahmed SM, et al. Why are tuberculosis patients not treated earlier? A study of informal health practitioners in Bangladesh. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2011; 15(5): 647–651. doi: 10.5588/ijtld.10.0205 PMID: 21756516

- 53. Bai LQ, Xiao SY. Factors associated with diagnostic delay for patients with smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis in rural Hunan, China. Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi. 2004; 27(9): 617–620. PMID: 15498275
- Tamhane A, Ambe G, Vermund SH, Kohler CL, Karande A, Sathiakumar N. Pulmonary tuberculosis in mumbai, India: factors responsible for patient and treatment delays. Int J Prev Med. 2012; 3(8): 569–580. PMID: 22973488
- Sabawoon W, Sato H, Kobayashi Y. Delay in the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis: a report from Afghanistan. Environ Health Prev Med. 2012; 17(1): 53–61. doi: 10.1007/s12199-011-0219-9 PMID: 21590428
- Karim F, Islam MA, Chowdhury AM, Johansson E, Diwan VK. Gender differences in delays in diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis. Health Policy Plan. 2007; 22(5): 329–334. PMID: <u>17698889</u>
- Thakur R, Murhekar M. Delay in diagnosis and treatment among TB patients registered under RNTCP Mandi, Himachal Pradesh, India, 2010. Indian J Tuberc. 2013; 60(1): 37–45. PMID: <u>23540087</u>
- Lönnroth K, Thuong LM, Linh PD, Diwan VK. Delay and discontinuity—a survey of TB patients' search of a diagnosis in a diversified health care system. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 1999; 3(11): 992–1000. PMID: 10587321
- 59. Rajeswari R, Chandrasekaran V, Suhadev M, Sivasubramaniam S, Sudha G, Renu G. Factors associated with patient and health system delays in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in South India. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. 2002; 6(9): 789–795. PMID: <u>12234134</u>
- Lin HP, Deng CY, Chou P. Diagnosis and treatment delay among pulmonary tuberculosis patients identified using the Taiwan reporting enquiry system, 2002–2006. BMC Public Health. 2009; 9: 55. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1186/1471-2458-9-55</u> PMID: <u>19216733</u>
- 61. Wang WB, Xiu Y, Jiang WL, Jiang QW, Xu B. Diagnostic delay and its factors in access to tuberculosis care in northern rural Jiangsu province. Fudan Xuebao (Yixuekexueban). 2006; 33(1): 33–38.
- Lin CY, Lin WR, Chen TC, Lu PL, Huang PM, Tsai ZR, et al. Why is in-hospital diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis delayed in southern Taiwan? J Formos Med Assoc. 2010; 109(4): 269–277. doi: <u>10.1016/</u> <u>S0929-6646(10)60052-6</u> PMID: <u>20434036</u>
- 63. WHO. Cases: Mortality and prevalence by country (all years). 2007 [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: http://apps.who.int/gho/data/view.main.57020ALL?lang = en
- 64. WHO. Early detection of tuberculosis: an overview of approaches, guidelines and tools. 2011 [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: <u>https://extranet.who.int/iris/restricted/ bitstream/10665/70824/1/WHO_HTM_STB_PSI_2011.21_eng.pdf</u>.
- Glanz KR, Rimer BK, Viswanath K. Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice. 4th ed. John Wiley & Sons; 2008.
- Sendagire I, Schim Van der Loeff M, Mubiru M, Konde-Lule J, Cobelens F. Long delays and missed opportunities in diagnosing smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis in Kampala, Uganda: a cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2010; 5(12): e14459. doi: <u>10.1371/journal.pone.0014459</u> PMID: <u>21206746</u>
- Jurcev-Savicevic A, Mulic R, Kozul K, Ban B, Valic J, Bacun-Ivcek L, et al. Health system delay in pulmonary tuberculosis treatment in a country with an intermediate burden of tuberculosis: a crosssectional study. BMC Public Health. 2013; 13: 250. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-250 PMID: 23517315
- Jurcev-Savicevic A, Kardum G. Health-care seeking behaviour for tuberculosis symptoms in Croatia. Eur J Public Health. 2012; 22(4): 573–577. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckr132 PMID: 21920849
- Long NH, Diwan VK, Winkvist A. Difference in symptoms suggesting pulmonary tuberculosis among men and women. J Clin Epidemiol. 2002; 55(2): 115–120. PMID: 11809348
- Yang WT, Gounder CR, Akande T, De Neve JW, McIntire KN, Chandrasekhar A, et al. Barriers and delays in tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment services: does gender matter? Tuberc Res Treat. 2014; 2014: 461935. doi: <u>10.1155/2014/461935</u> PMID: <u>24876956</u>
- Krishnan L, Akande T, Shankar AV, McIntire KN, Gounder CR, Gupta A, et al. Gender-related barriers and delays in accessing tuberculosis diagnostic and treatment services: a systematic r1eview of qualitative studies. Tuberc Res Treat. 2014; 2014: 215059. doi: 10.1155/2014/215059 PMID: 24900921
- Tadesse T, Demissie M, Berhane Y, Kebede Y, Abebe M. Long distance travelling and financial burdens discourage tuberculosis DOTs treatment initiation and compliance in Ethiopia: a qualitative study. BMC Public Health. 2013; 13: 424. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-424 PMID: 23634650
- 73. WHO. The global plan to stop TB 2011–2015: transforming the fight towards elimination of tuberculosis. 2010 [cited 17 August 2014] Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: <u>http://apps.who.int/iris/ bitstream/10665/44437/1/9789241500340_eng.pdf?ua=1</u>. doi: <u>10.1371/journal.pone.0108591</u> PMID: 25251404
- Zhang T, Tang S, Jun G, Whitehead M. Persistent problems of access to appropriate, affordable TB services in rural China: experiences of different socio-economic groups. BMC Public Health. 2007; 7: 19. PMID: <u>17288593</u>

- Hipgrave D. Communicable disease control in China: From Mao to now. J Glob Health. 2011; 1(2): 224–238. PMID: <u>23198121</u>
- 76. Meyssonnier V, Li X, Shen X, Wang H, Li DY, Liu ZM, et al. Factors associated with delayed tuberculosis diagnosis in China. Eur J Public Health. 2013; 23(2): 253–257. doi: <u>10.1093/eurpub/cks037</u> PMID: <u>22874738</u>
- Storla DG, Yimer S, Bjune GA. A systematic review of delay in the diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis. BMC Public Health. 2008; 8: 15. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-8-15 PMID: 18194573
- 78. van Dijk GM, Maneva M, Colpani V, Dhana K, Muka T, Jaspers L, et al. The association between vasomotor symptoms and metabolic health in peri- and postmenopausal women: A systematic review. Maturitas. 2015; 80(2): 140–147. doi: <u>10.1016/j.maturitas.2014.11.016</u> PMID: <u>25532993</u>
- 79. Bechard LJ, Rothpletz-Puglia P, Touger-Decker R, Duggan C, Mehta NM. Influence of obesity on clinical outcomes in hospitalized children: a systematic review. JAMA Pediatr. 2013; 167(5): 476–482. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.13 PMID: 23478891