Quality of Evidence for Outcomes

YR + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: YR+HRT vs HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	**YR + HRT vs HRT**				
Total clinical response rate	**Study population**		**OR 1.99**	325	⊕⊕⊖⊖	
	373 per 1000	**542 per 1000** (432 to 648)	(1.28 to 3.1)	(3 studies)	**low**[1,2]	
	Medium risk population					
	400 per 1000	**570 per 1000** (460 to 674)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **3.28 lower** (4.42 to 2.14 lower)		447 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ **low**[1,3]	
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **1.62 lower** (2.71 to 0.53 lower)		447 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ **low**[1,3]	
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **33.33 higher**		447 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ **low**[1,3]	

		(31.71 to 34.94 higher)			
Adverse reactions	**Study population**		**OR 2.05**	80	⊕⊖⊖⊖
	25 per 1000	50 per 1000 (5 to 377)	(0.18 to 23.59)	(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,4]
	Medium risk population				
	25 per 1000	50 per 1000 (5 to 377)			

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

[4] Only one document was included.

LWDH + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: LWDH + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	LWDH + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	Study population		OR 1.56	409	⊕⊕⊖⊖	
	325 per 1000	429 per 1000 (334 to 531)	(1.04 to 2.35)	(5 studies)	low[1,2]	
	Medium risk population					
	350 per 1000	457 per 1000 (359 to 559)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **5.29 lower** (7.34 to 3.23 lower)		481 (7 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **3.75 lower** (4.96 to 2.54 lower)		590 (7 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **14.12 higher** (12.18 to 16.07 higher)		590 (7 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

XFZY + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with HRT

Settings:

Intervention: XFZY + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	XFZY + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	Study population		OR 2.17	158	⊕⊖⊖⊖	
	342 per 1000	530 per 1000 (374 to 681)	(1.15 to 4.1)	(3 studies)	very low[1,2,3]	
	Medium risk population					

	324 per 1000	**510 per 1000** (355 to 663)			
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **9.3 lower** (16.24 to 2.36 lower)		98 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **3.07 higher** (1.95 to 4.19 higher)		98 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **3.8 higher** (1.04 to 6.56 higher)		98 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
Adverse reactions	**Study population**		**OR 1** (0.13 to 7.6)	60 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
	67 per 1000	**67 per 1000** (9 to 353)			
	Medium risk population				
	67 per 1000	**67 per 1000** (9 to 353)			

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

PK + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: PK + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	PK + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	**Study population**		OR 2.62	65	⊕⊝⊝⊝	
	125 per 1000	**272 per 1000** (93 to 579)	(0.72 to 9.61)	(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]	
	Medium risk population					
	125 per 1000	**272 per 1000** (93 to 579)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **4.99 lower**		89 (2 studies)	⊕⊝⊝⊝ **very low**[1,2,4]	

		(7.9 to 2.07 lower)		
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **4.8 higher** (2.92 to 6.68 higher)	89 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,4]

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] Only one document was included.

[4] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

HCDZ + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: HCDZ + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	HCDZ + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	**Study population**		**OR 2.91**	135	⊕⊕⊖⊖	
	358 per 1000	**619 per 1000**	(1.44 to 5.86)	(2 studies)	**low**[1,2]	
		(445 to 766)				
	Medium risk population					
	356 per 1000	**617 per 1000**				
		(443 to 764)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **4.24 lower** (6.15 to 2.33 lower)		135 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]	
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **2.83 lower** (4.33 to 1.34 lower)		135 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]	
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **6.95 higher** (3.74 to 10.16 higher)		135 (2 studies)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]	
Adverse reactions	See comment	See comment	Not estimable	135 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ **low**[1,3]	

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

[3] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

ZHC + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: ZHC + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	ZHC + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	Study population		OR 2.2	135	⊕⊖⊖⊖	
	162 per 1000	298 per 1000 (157 to 494)	(0.96 to 5.05)	(2 studies)	very low[1,2,3]	
	Medium risk population					
	162 per 1000	298 per 1000 (157 to 494)				

FSH	The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **5.07 lower** (8.11 to 2.03 lower)		65 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,4]
E2	The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **41.79 higher** (26.73 to 56.85 higher)		65 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,4]
Adverse reactions	**Study population**	**OR 0.48** (0.08 to 2.84)	65 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,4]
	121 per 1000 **62 per 1000** (11 to 281)			
	Medium risk population			
	121 per 1000 **62 per 1000** (11 to 281)			

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

SW + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: SW + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	**SW + HRT vs HRT**				
Total clinical response rate	**Study population**		**OR 2.86**	164	⊕⊕⊖⊖	
	671 per 1000	**854 per 1000** (731 to 926)	(1.33 to 6.16)	(1 study)	**low**[1,2]	
	Medium risk population					
	671 per 1000	**854 per 1000** (731 to 926)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **3.1 lower** (4.5 to 1.7 lower)		164 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]	
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **5.2 lower** (8.21 to 2.19 lower)		164 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]	

E2	The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **5.5 higher** (4.01 to 6.99 higher)	164 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]	

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there was methodological flaw.

[2] Only one document was included.

[3] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

ZG + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: ZG + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	ZG + HRT vs HRT				

Total clinical response rat	Study population		OR 3.45	50	⊕⊖⊖⊖
	120 per 1000	320 per 1000 (97 to 672)	(0.79 to 15.01)	(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]
	Medium risk population				
	120 per 1000	320 per 1000 (97 to 672)			
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **8.81 lower** (11.1 to 6.52 lower)		50 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **5.15 lower** (7.38 to 2.92 lower)		50 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **28.47 higher** (24.02 to 32.92 higher)		50 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] Only one document was included.

GS + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: GS + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	GS + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	Study population		OR 3.16	82	⊕⊖⊖⊖	
	268 per 1000	536 per 1000 (314 to 745)	(1.25 to 7.96)	(1 study)	very low[1,2,3]	
	Medium risk population					
	268 per 1000	536 per 1000 (314 to 745)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **7.59 lower** (8.94 to 6.24 lower)		82 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very low[1,2,3]	
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **5.54 lower**		82 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very low[1,2,3]	

	(6.32 to 4.76 lower)		
E2	The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **6.2 higher** (4.82 to 7.58 higher)	82 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] Only one document was included.

ZSYT + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: ZSYT + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)	Relative effect	No of Participants	Quality of the evidence	Comments

	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk	(95% CI)	(studies)	(GRADE)
	Control	**ZSYT + HRT vs HRT**			
Total clinical response rate	**Study population**		**OR 1.8**	78	⊕⊖⊖⊖
	179 per 1000	**282 per 1000**	(0.61 to 5.26)	(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]
		(117 to 534)			
	Medium risk population				
	180 per 1000	**283 per 1000**			
		(118 to 536)			
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was		78	⊕⊖⊖⊖
		6.71 lower		(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]
		(8.26 to 5.16 lower)			
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was		78	⊕⊖⊖⊖
		4.41 lower		(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]
		(5.44 to 3.38 lower)			
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was		78	⊕⊖⊖⊖
		26.39 higher		(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]
		(22.31 to 30.47 higher)			
Adverse reactions	**Study population**		**OR 1.37**	78	⊕⊖⊖⊖
	77 per 1000	**103 per 1000**	(0.29 to 6.58)	(1 study)	**very low**[1,2,3]
		(24 to 354)			
	Medium risk population				
	77 per 1000	**103 per 1000**			
		(24 to 354)			

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

[3] Only one document was included.

HS + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: HS + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	HS + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	Study population		OR 1.8 (0.88 to 3.69)	132 (1 study)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	
	303 per 1000	439 per 1000 (277 to 616)				

	Medium risk population				
	303 per 1000	**439 per 1000** (277 to 616)			
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was **5.38 lower** (6.71 to 4.05 lower)		132 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was **4.61 lower** (5.57 to 3.65 lower)		132 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **19.35 higher** (13.6 to 25.1 higher)		132 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]
Adverse reactions	See comment	See comment	Not estimable	132 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ **very low**[1,2,3]

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] Only one document was included.

[3] The number of cases included in the literature was low.

KT + HRT vs HRT for POF

Patient or population: patients with POF

Settings:

Intervention: KT + HRT

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Control	KT + HRT vs HRT				
Total clinical response rate	Study population		OR 2.3 (1.96 to 2.69)	2831 (30 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	
	468 per 1000	669 per 1000 (633 to 703)				
	Medium risk population					
	414 per 1000	619 per 1000 (581 to 655)				
FSH		The mean FSH in the intervention groups was 2.37 lower (2.5 to 2.24 lower)		3407 (34 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	
LH		The mean LH in the intervention groups was 3.84 lower (4.03 to 3.65 lower)		2775 (29 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low[1,2]	

E2		The mean E2 in the intervention groups was **1.26 higher** (1.09 to 1.42 higher)		3307 (33 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ **low**[1,2]
Adverse reactions	**Study population**		**OR 0.46** (0.3 to 0.72)	886 (9 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ **low**[1,2]
	152 per 1000	76 per 1000 (51 to 114)			
	Medium risk population				
	189 per 1000	97 per 1000 (65 to 144)			

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

CI: Confidence interval; **OR:** Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

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

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

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

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

[1] The blinding and distribution concealment methods was no metion in the literature, and there were methodological flaws.

[2] The funnel chart indicated publication bias.

P.S: HRT, hormone replacement therapy; YR, Fuke Yangrong Capsule; LWDH, Liuwei Dihuang Pills; XFZY, Xuefu Zhuyu Capsule; PK, Peikun pills; HCDZ, Heche Dazao pills; ZHC, Ziheche Capsule; SW, Siwu Mixture; ZG, Zuogui pills; GS, Guishen pills; ZSYT, Zishen Yutai pills; HS, Huanshao Capsule; KT, Kuntai Capsule.