Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Veria Khosrawipour, Cornell University, United States

REVIEWED BY Patrycja Salata, Wroclaw University of Environmental and Life Sciences, Poland Carolina Khosrawipour, Wroclaw Medical University, Poland

*CORRESPONDENCE Qi Ruan Qi qiruan2024@163.com Wang Liu Iuwang19811@163.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

RECEIVED 31 January 2025 ACCEPTED 02 June 2025 PUBLISHED 18 June 2025

CITATION

Liu F, Zou Y, Chen Q, Chen T, Xiao H, Xie T, Zheng L, Ruan Q and Liu W (2025) Robotic pancreatoduodenectomy provides better short-term outcomes as compared to its laparoscopic counterpart: a meta-analysis. *Front. Oncol.* 15:1568957. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2025.1568957

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Liu, Zou, Chen, Chen, Xiao, Xie, Zheng, Ruan and Liu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Robotic pancreatoduodenectomy provides better short-term outcomes as compared to its laparoscopic counterpart: a meta-analysis

Faying Liu[†], Yang Zou[†], Qing Chen, Tao Chen, He Xiao, Tingbing Xie, Lihe Zheng, Qi Ruan^{*} and Wang Liu^{*}

Department of General Surgery, ChengFei Hospital, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

Objective: Minimally invasive pancreaticoduodenectomy is becoming more and more popular among surgeons, but whether robotic pancreatoduodenectomy (RPD) is superior to laparoscopic surgery remains controversial. The study aims to assess the available literature and compare the perioperative outcomes of RPD and laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy (LPD).

Methods: A systematic literature search was performed in the PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, Web of Science databases (October 2024). Risk ratios (RRs) and mean differences (MDs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated.

Results: The 29 studies that met inclusion criteria included 15137 PDs, out of which 8935 were LPD and 6202 were RPD. Compared with LPD, RPD has lower overall complications (RR, 0.87), conversion rates (RR, 0.47) and blood transfusion rates (RR, 0.56), shorter length of stay (MD, -0.80 days), and higher number of harvested lymph nodes (MD, 1.77). There were no significant differences observed in 90-day mortality (RR, 0.92), major complications (RR, 1.00), operative time (MD, 3.93 mins), blood loss (MD, -22.50 mL), reoperation (RR, 0.96), bile leak (RR, 0.87), postoperative pancreatic fistula (RR, 1.00), delayed gastric emptying (RR, 1.19), and R0 resection (RR, 0.99) between the groups.

Conclusions: Robotic-assisted surgery for PD is safe and feasible. Compared to LPD, it offers better short-term outcomes.

KEYWORDS

robotic pancreatoduodenectomy, laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy, mortality, postoperative complications, meta-analysis

frontiersin.org

Introduction

Pancreatoduodenectomy (PD) is a challenging surgical procedure associated with high postoperative complications and mortality (1). With the advancement of surgical techniques and perioperative management, although the postoperative mortality rate of PD has been reduced to 5%, the postoperative complications is still as high as 40% (2). Postoperative complications will not only prolong hospital stay and increase hospital cost, but also affect the long-term prognosis of patients (3). Therefore, how to reduce postoperative complications is the key concern of pancreatic surgeons.

Compared with traditional open surgery, minimally invasive surgery (including laparoscopic surgery and robotic surgery) may have potential advantages in reducing postoperative complications and blood loss, and shortening hospital stay (4-6). Since Gagner et al. reported the first case of laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy (LPD) in 1994, LPD has been widely used in the world (7). However, laparoscopic surgery has disadvantages such as unstable camera platform, limited range of motion and two-dimensional imaging (3). The robotic surgical platform has a three-dimensional visual field of view and more flexible and precise manipulation of instruments, so it retains the advantages of minimally invasive surgery while overcoming the disadvantages of laparoscopic surgery (1, 8). Several studies have compared the effectiveness and safety of robotic and laparoscopic surgery in PD. However, whether robotic pancreatoduodenectomy (RPD) is superior to LPD remains controversial. Farah et al. 's (4) cohort study found that RPD significantly reduced the incidence of postoperative complications compared with LPD (51% vs. 38.9%, respectively). An international multicenter retrospective study by Emmen et al. (9), including 2,082 patients from 50 centers in 12 European countries, showed that the incidence of postoperative pancreatic leakage and delayed gastric emptying was higher in the RPD group than in the LPD group.

Therefore, in order to clarify the effectiveness and safety of robotic surgery in PD and to provide evidence-based medical evidence for surgeons when selecting surgical approaches. We comprehensively collected published evidence and conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the potential benefits of RPD versus LPD in short-term outcomes.

Methods

Search strategy

This study follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (10). Two authors (Faying Liu and Yang Zou) independently conducted a comprehensive literature search using the EMBASE, Web of Science, PubMed, and Cochrane Library databases to identify studies published before October 24, 2024. The search strategy is presented in Table 1. In addition, we checked the reference lists of the identified articles and related reviews to further screen for eligible studies. No language restrictions were applied during the search process.

Study selection

Studies included in this meta-analysis were chosen according to the PICOS criteria:

- a. Patient: patients undergoing pancreatoduodenectomy;
- b. Intervention: robotic pancreatoduodenectomy;
- c. Comparison: laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy;
- d. Outcomes: assessing any of the short-term outcomes of interest. Studies focusing solely on long-term survival or those without direct comparison between RPD and LPD were excluded. Primary outcomes included 90-day mortality, overall complications, and major complications (Clavien-Dindo III-V) (9). Secondary outcomes included blood loss, length of stay, operative duration, conversion, reoperation, bile leak, postoperative pancreatic fistula (POPF), delayed gastric emptying, blood transfusion, number of harvested lymph nodes, and R0 resection. 90day mortality was defined as any death within 90 days from surgery.The overall complications were defined as any complications and classified according to the Clavien-

TABLE 1 Search strategy.

Database	Search strategy	Number
PubMed	((da Vinci[Title/Abstract]) OR (robot*[Title/ Abstract]) OR (robot-assisted[Title/Abstract]) OR (robotic-assisted[Title/Abstract])) AND ((laparoscopy[MeSH Terms]) OR (Laparoscop* [Title/Abstract])) AND ((pancreatoduodenectomy[MeSH Terms]) OR (Pancreaticoduodenectom*[Title/Abstract]) OR (Duodenopancreatectom*[Title/Abstract]) OR (Whipple[Title/Abstract]) OR (Whipple's procedure[Title/Abstract]) OR (Kausch-Whipple [Title/Abstract]) OR (Kausch-Whipple procedure[Title/Abstract]))	339
Embase	(Pancreatoduodenectomy OR Pancreaticoduodenectom* OR Duodenopancreatectom* OR Whipple's procedure OR Kausch-Whipple OR Kausch- Whipple procedure).ab,kw,ti. AND (Da Vinci OR Robot* OR Robot-assisted OR Robotic- assisted).ab,kw,ti. AND (laparoscopy or Laparoscop*).ab,kw,ti.	570
Cochrane Library Trials	(((Pancreatoduodenectomy) OR (Pancreaticoduodenectom*) OR (Duodenopancreatectom*) OR (Whipple's procedure) OR (Kausch-Whipple) OR (Kausch- Whipple procedure)):ti,ab,kw) AND (((Da Vinci) OR Robot* OR Robot-assisted OR Robotic-assisted):ti,ab,kw) AND ((laparoscopy OR Laparoscop*):ti,ab,kw)	30
Web of Science	(TS=((Da Vinci) OR (Robot*) OR (Robot- assisted) OR (Robotic-assisted))) AND (TS= ((laparoscopy) OR (Laparoscop*))) AND TS= ((Pancreatoduodenectomy) OR (Pancreaticoduodenectom*) OR (Duodenopancreatectom*) OR (Whipple's procedure) OR (Kausch-Whipple) OR (Kausch- Whipple procedure))	597

Dindo classification (including both surgical complications and medical complications).

e. Study type: RCTs, cohort studies, and case-control studies.

The exclusion criteria were as follows: reviews, case reports, editorials, conference abstracts, letters, single-arm studies, animal studies, and repeated publications. Studies with fewer than 10 patients in each group were excluded.

Data extraction

Data from all eligible studies were independently extracted by two investigators (Faying Liu and Yang Zou), and any disagreements were resolved by discussion with a third-party independent reviewer (Qi Ruan). The extracted data included author name, year of publication, country, study design, study population (sample size, age, body mass index, and sex), and short-term outcomes. When data of interest were unavailable, the corresponding author was contacted to obtain the necessary data.

Quality assessment

The risk of bias in RCTs was assessed independently by two authors (Faying Liu and Yang Zou) using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool 2 (11): (1) randomization process, (2) deviations from intended interventions, (3) missing outcome data, (4) measurement of the outcome, (5) selection of reported results, and (6) overall risk of bias. For non-RCTs, the quality assessment was conducted independently by two authors using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS), which assigns a score on a 9-point scale. A score of \geq 7 indicates high quality, and scores of 5–6 indicate moderate quality. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion, with intervention by a third author (Qi Ruan) whenever necessary.

Statistical analysis

The meta-analysis was performed using the Review Manager software (version 5.3). Risk ratios (RR) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated for qualitative variables and mean difference (MD) for quantitative data. The I² statistic was used to assess the degree of heterogeneity. A random-effects model was used if I² > 50%; otherwise, a fixed-effects model was employed (12). To explore the robustness of the results, we adopted the 1-study exclusion method to evaluate the impact of each study on the pooled effect size. When zero events were observed in one or both treatment groups in a trial, we excluded these studies to verify the robustness of our results. Publication bias was assessed using funnel plot for primary outcomes. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05.

Results

Literature retrieval

The search strategy retrieved 1540 studies, of which 544 duplicates were excluded. After reviewing titles and abstracts, 944 studies were excluded, and the full texts of the remaining 52 studies were evaluated. Finally, 29 studies (1, 4, 9, 13–38) were included in the final analysis (Figure 1).

Study characteristics and quality assessment

The main characteristics of the 29 included studies are summarized in Table 2. The studies were published between 2016 and 2024 and included 15137 patients (RPD group: 6202 patients; LPD group: 8935 patients). Among the included studies, 27 were retrospective cohort studies and 2 were prospective cohort studies. Nine studies adopted the PSM design. The included patients were mainly from the United States, China, Korea, The Netherlands, UK, Russia, Japan, and Singapore. All studies were considered of moderate to high quality, achieving a score of \geq 6 based on the NOS.

Meta-analysis

90-day mortality

Thirteen studies reported data on 90-day mortality. The combined results of the 13 studies showed that there was no significant difference between the RPD group and the LPD group regarding this outcome with low heterogeneity (RR 0.92, 95% CI 0.74, 1.15; Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.46) (Figure 2A).

Overall complications

Thirteen studies assessed overall complications. The pooled results suggested that RPD significantly reduced the overall complication rates (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.81, 0.94, P = 0.0002), with low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.59) (Figure 2B).

Major complications

Combined data from 18 studies showed that the rates of major complications (Clavien–Dindo \geq 3) were comparable between the RPD and LPD groups (RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.91, 1.09; Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 26\%$, P = 0.16) (Figure 2C).

Length of stay

The length of the hospital stay was reported in 23 studies. According to the results of this meta-analysis, RPD significantly reduced the length of the hospital stay as compared with the LPD group (MD, -0.80 days; 95% CI, -1.30, -0.29, P = 0.002) (Figure 3A).



Blood loss

Nineteen studies provided information on intraoperative blood loss. The combined results showed that the RPD group has similar intraoperative blood loss as compared with the LPD group (MD, -22.50 mL; 95% CI, -49.18, 4.18, P = 0.10; $I^2 = 86\%$) (Figure 3B).

Operation time

The operation time was reported in 21 trials. The combined results showed that the RPD group has similar operation time as compared with the LPD group (MD, 3.93 mins; 95% CI, -14.28, 22.13, P = 0.67) (Figure 3C).

R0 resection

R0 resection was reported in 9 studies, and the combined effect size suggested that the R0 resection rates were comparable between the two groups (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.95, 1.02, P = 0.36; $I^2 = 54\%$) (Figure 3D).

Number of lymph nodes harvested

Eleven trials reported the number of lymph nodes harvested. Compared with LPD, RPD significantly increased the number of lymph nodes harvested (MD, 1.77; 95% CI, 0.66, 2.88, P = 0.002; $I^2 = 85\%$) (Figure 4A).

Postoperative pancreatic fistula

Twenty-four studies evaluated the POPF. There was no significant difference in the incidence of POPF (RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.90, 1.11, P = 0.97) (Figure 4B) between the RPD and LPD groups.

Bile leak

Sixteen studies reported bile leaks. No significant differences were observed between the two groups (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.72, 1.06, P = 0.16), and heterogeneity was low ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.82) (Figure 4C).

TABLE 2 Study Characteristics of the 29 included studies.

First author, year	Country	Period of study	Sample size	Male	Study design	Age	ВМІ	Indication for surgery	Outcomes	NOS
Liu 2016 (13)	China	2015-2016	RPD: 27 LPD: 25	RPD:14 LPD: 12	RCS	RPD: 57.16(8.56) LPD: 60.54(18.25)	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Periampullary neoplasms	Overall complications, length of stay, delayed gastric emptying, R0 resection, bile leak, blood loss, operative time, conversion, reoperation, and number of harvested lymph nodes	6/9
Goh 2018 (14)	Singapore	2014-2017	RPD: 10 LPD: 20	RPD:5 LPD: 16	RCS	RPD: 70(53-78) LPD: 62.5(24-79)	RPD: 21.3(18-27.6) LPD: 20.6(14-26)	Periampullary tumours	90-day mortality, overall complications, major complications, blood loss, operative time, conversion, reoperation, POPF, and blood transfusion	7/9
Zhang 2018 (15)	China	2013-2017	RPD: 20 LPD: 20	RPD:12 LPD: 11	RCS	RPD: 68(50-78) LPD: 64(42-76)	RPD: 24.8(2.5) LPD: 24.0(3.5)	Periampullary tumors	Length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, operative time, and blood loss	7/9
Gall 2020 (38)	UK	2017-2019	RPD: 25 LPD: 41	RPD: 16 LPD: 23	RCS	RPD: 60.93(12.52) LPD: 65.18(11.36)	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Benign, or malignant disease	90-day mortality, overall complications, major complications, POPF, reoperation, R0 resection, blood transfusion, conversion, and blood loss	7/9
Klompmaker 2020 (16)	European centers	2012-2017	RPD: 191 LPD: 409	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RCS	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Solid premalignant tumors or cysts	Major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, and operative time	6/9
Oosten 2020 (17)	USA	2011-2019	RPD: 90 LPD: 90	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RCS, PSM	RPD: 67(60-73) LPD: 67(58-75)	RPD: 26(23-29) LPD: 25(22-29)	Benign, pre- malignant, or malignant disease	90-day mortality, overall complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, blood transfusion, operative time, and blood loss	8/9
Park 2021 (18)	Korea	2016-2020	RPD: 49 LPD: 43	RPD: 26 LPD: 30	RCS	RPD: 66.65(10.97) LPD: 65.70(12.97)	RPD: 23.59(4.28) LPD: 22.73(2.55)	Tumors confined to the pancreatic head or periampullary region	90-day mortality, overall complications, major complications, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, operative time, and blood loss	8/9
Choi 2022 (19)	Korea	2012-2020	RPD: 50 LPD: 50	RPD: 26 LPD: 29	RCS, PSM	RPD: 60.02(11.97) LPD: 60.42(11.14)	RPD: 23.57(3.18) LPD: 23.99(2.29)	Periampullary tumors	Overall complications, major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, blood transfusion, operative time, and blood loss	8/9
Guo 2022 (20)	China	2016-2020	RPD: 32 LPD: 21	RPD: 21 LPD: 12	RCS	RPD: 53.7(14.4) LPD: 52.1(13.5)	RPD: 21.7(3.0) LPD: 22.6(2.3)	Periampullary tumors	90-day mortality, length of stay, POPF, reoperation, bile leak, conversion, operative time, blood loss, and number of harvested lymph nodes	6/9
Heijde 2022 (21)	European	2019	RPD: 157 LPD: 401	RPD: 67 LPD: 168	PCS	RPD: 62.8(14.7) LPD: 61.8(15.5)	RPD: 26.2(5.0) LPD: 26.7(5.1)	Malignant and benign lesions	90-day mortality, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation,	7/9

(Continued)

10.3389/fonc.2025.1568957

TABLE 2 Continued

First author, year	Country	Period of study	Sample size	Male	Study design	Age	BMI	Indication for surgery	Outcomes	NOS
									bile leak, conversion, operative time, blood loss	
Jang 2022 (22)	Korea	2012-2020	RPD: 60 LPD: 60	RPD: 28 LPD: 24	RCS, PSM	RPD: 59.5(53.0-64.0) LPD: 58.5(50.0-69.0)	RPD: 23.5(21.6-25.0) LPD: 22.8(20.9-25.0)	Benign or malignant disease (soft pancreas with a small pancreatic duct)	90-day mortality, overall complications, major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, blood transfusion, conversion, operative time	8/9
Kim 2022 (23)	Korea	Till June 2020	RPD: 74 LPD: 74	RPD: 40 LPD: 42	RCS, PSM	RPD: 57.4(9.5) LPD: 57.8(12.6)	RPD: 23.5(2.7) LPD: 23.5(2.7)	Benign or malignant disease	Overall complications, major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, R0 resection, bile leak, blood transfusion, conversion, operative time, and number of harvested lymph nodes	6/9
Naffouje 2022 (24)	USA	2004-2017	RPD: 358 LPD: 1074	RPD: 181 LPD: 553	RCS, PSM	RPD: 67.79(10.69) LPD: 67.86(10.31)	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Stage I–III (T1–3 Nany M0) pancreatic adenocarcinoma	90-day mortality, length of stay, R0 resection, conversion, and number of harvested lymph nodes	9/9
Tyutyunnik 2022 (25)	Russia	2007-2015	RPD: 100 LPD: 100	RPD: 43 LPD: 42	RCS	RPD: 62.5(25-84) LPD: 62(34-82)	RPD: 23.1 LPD: 24.2	Malignant and benign tumors of the head of the pancreas and periampullary area	90-day mortality, major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, R0 resection, bile leak, blood transfusion, conversion, operative time, and blood loss	7/9
Wach 2022 (26)	USA	2016-2018	RPD: 73 LPD: 73	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RCS, PSM	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Benign or malignant disease	Overall complications, major complications, length of stay, and conversion	7/9
Zong 2022 (27)	China	2018-2022	RPD: 76 LPD: 114	RPD: 36 LPD: 77	RCS	RPD: 58.2(1.7) LPD: 58.1(1.4)	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Periampullary benign or malignant tumours	Length of stay POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, blood transfusion, conversion, operative time, and blood loss	7/9
Chao 2023 (28)	China	2014-2021	RPD: 75 LPD: 39	RPD: 42 LPD: 15	RCS	RPD: 65.5(58.1-75.5) LPD: 67.1(58.3-74.6)	RPD: 23.8(22.3-27) LPD: 23.7(21.2-25.6)	Periampullary tumors or gastric cancer with pancreatic head invasion	Overall complications, major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, conversion, operative time, blood loss, and number of harvested lymph nodes	7/9
Kalabin 2023 (29)	USA	2010-2018	RPD: 676 LPD: 2677	RPD: 347 LPD: 1390	RCS	RPD: 65.36(64.47-66.25) LPD: 64.97(64.55-65.39)	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Pancreatic adenocarcinoma	90-day mortality, length of stay, R0 resection, and number of harvested lymph nodes	7/9

(Continued)

TABLE 2 Continued

First author, year	Country	Period of study	Sample size	Male	Study design	Age	ВМІ	Indication for surgery	Outcomes	NOS
Khachfe 2023 (30)	USA	2014-2019	RPD: 885 LPD: 655	RPD: 462 LPD: 347	RCS	RPD: 67(59-73) LPD: 65(5772)	RPD: 27.1(23.7-31.1) LPD: 26.95(23.7-30.4)	Benign or malignant disease	Overall complications, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, blood transfusion, conversion, and operative time	7/9
Lee 2023 (31)	Korea	2015-2019	RPD: 21 LPD: 60	RPD: 10 LPD: 28	RCS	RPD: 57.7(11.6) LPD: 68.2(8.5)	RPD: 23.3(1.6) LPD: 23.6(2.3)	Distal bile duct cancer	Major complications, length of stay, POPF, R0 resection, blood transfusion, and blood loss	7/9
Uijterwijk 2023 (32)	8 centers (6 in Europe, 1 in Australia, and 1 in Asia)	2010-2021	RPD: 37 LPD: 53	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RCS	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Distal cholangiocarcinoma	Overall complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, bile leak, blood transfusion, operative time, blood loss, and number of harvested lymph nodes	6/9
Wei 2023 (33)	China	2014-2021	RPD: 78 LPD: 45	RPD: NA LPD: NA	PCS	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RPD: NA LPD: NA	NA	Major complications, POPF, and delayed gastric emptying	6/9
Zhang 2023 (1)	China	2015-2022	RPD: 1006 LPD: 1006	RPD: 612 LPD: 622	RCS, PSM	RPD: 60.5(52.0-67.0) LPD: 61.0(52.0-67.0)	RPD: 23.4(21.3-25.2) LPD: 23.1(20.9-25.5)	Benign, premalignant, or resectable malignant or borderline resectable tumors of the pancreatic and periampullary region	90-day mortality, length of stay, major complications, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, R0 resection, bile leak, blood transfusion, conversion, operative time, blood loss, and number of harvested lymph nodes	9/9
Dai 2024 (35)	China	2016-2023	RPD: 47 LPD: 54	RPD: 27 LPD: 32	RCS	RPD: 59.8(10.6) LPD: 60.5(12.2)	RPD: 22.44(3.31) LPD: 23.59(4.17)	Pancreatic Cancer	90-day mortality, major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, conversion, operative time, blood loss, and number of harvested lymph nodes	8/9
Kang 2024 (36)	Korea	2015-2020	RPD: 332 LPD: 178	RPD: 185 LPD: 94	RCS	RPD: 63.6(12.1) LPD: 67.5(11.8)	RPD: 23.5(2.6) LPD: 24.3(2.9)	Benign or malignant periampullary tumors	Major complications, length of stay, POPF, operative time, conversion, and blood loss	7/9
Kuriyama 2024 (37)	Japan	2020-2024	RPD: 41 LPD: 16	RPD: 23 LPD: 13	RCS	RPD: 65(39-84) LPD: 72(44-91)	RPD: 22.9(15.3-31.9) LPD: 22.7(16.9-31.1)	NA	Major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, operative time, and blood loss	7/9
Emmen 2024 (53)	50 centers in 12 European countries	2009-2020	RPD: 812 LPD: 812	RPD: 416 LPD: 428	RCS, PSM	RPD: 76(58-74) LPD: 66(57-73)	RPD: 24.7(22.5-27.7) LPD: 24.6(22.1-27.6)	NA	Major complications, length of stay, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, reoperation, bile leak, conversion, operative time, blood loss, and number of harvested lymph nodes	8/9

(Continued)

First author, year	Country	Period of study	Sample size	Male	Study design	Age	BMI	Indication for surgery	Outcomes	NOS
Farah 2024 (4)	USA	2014-2021	RPD: 175 LPD: 100	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RCS	RPD: NA LPD: NA	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Pancreatic cancer	Overall complications, major complications, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, blood transfusion, and conversion	6/2
Wehrle 2024 (34)	USA	2010-2020	RPD: 625 LPD: 625	RPD: 323 LPD: 332	RCS, PSM	RPD: 6.5(10.4) LPD: 65.6(10.1)	RPD: NA LPD: NA	Pancreatic cancer	90-day mortality, length of stay, R0 resection, conversion, and number of harvested lymph nodes	6/6
LPD, laparoscopic pane	creaticoduod enectomy;	NA, not available;	PCS, prospective re	strospective cohort s	study; POPF, F	oostoperative pancreatic fistula;	PSM, propensity score mate	ching; RCS, retrospective co	hort study; RPD, robotic pancreaticoduodenectc	imy.

Conversion rate

Conversion rate was evaluated in 19 studies, and the pooled results showed that RPD had lower conversion rate than LPD (RR 0.47, 95% CI 0.38, 0.59; heterogeneity: $I^2 = 58\%$, P = 0.0010) (Figure 5A).

Blood transfusion

Thirteen studies compared blood transfusion rates between the RPD and LPD groups. The combined results showed that RPD was effective in reducing the blood transfusion rate (RR 0.56, 95% CI 0.45, 0.70, P<0.00001) (Figure 5B).

Delayed gastric emptying

Delayed gastric emptying was reported in 20 studies, and there was no significant difference in the incidence of delayed gastric emptying (RR 1.19, 95% CI 0.86, 1.66, P = 0.30) (Figure 5C) between the two groups.

Reoperation

Eighteen trials reported the reoperation rates. There were no significant differences between the two groups, and heterogeneity was low (RR 0.96, 95% CI 0.79, 1.16; Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.95; Figure 5D).

Sensitivity analysis

According to the funnel plots (Figure 6) and Egger tests, and no significant publication bias was observed for 90-day mortality, overall complications, and major complications. Sensitivity analysis showed that no single study affected the overall effect size of the length of stay, blood transfusion, conversion rate, 90-day mortality, overall complications, major complications, reoperation, bile leak, operation time, delayed gastric emptying, POPF, number of lymph nodes harvested, blood loss, or R0 resection. Excluding these studies with no events in one or both groups did not change the total effect size of blood transfusion, conversion rate, 90-day mortality, reoperation, bile leak, delayed gastric emptying, and POPF.

Discussion

In recent years, minimally invasive surgery has been widely used in pancreatic surgery. However, whether RPD is superior to LPD remains controversial. Although two previous meta-analyses (39, 40) were conducted, they included only six and nine studies, respectively, limiting the reliability of their conclusions. In comparison, our study included 29 studies, including data from 15137 patients. Our meta-analysis showed that compared with traditional LPD, RPD effectively reduced postoperative complications, blood transfusion, and conversion rates, shortened hospital stay, and increased the number of lymph nodes harvested. In addition, there were no significant differences in postoperative mortality, reoperation rates, operation time, intraoperative blood loss, and R0 resection rates between the two groups. Our results

FABLE 2 Continued



have important clinical value as we provide evidence that RPD is not inferior to LPD in the short term and can provide potential benefits. These results may help pancreatic surgeons in their choice of surgical approaches.

Postoperative complications are associated with a poorer longterm prognosis (3). Cho et al. (41) analyzed 200 patients with periampullary cancer who underwent pancreatoduodenectomy and showed that 3-year overall survival and disease-free survival were significantly lower in patients with postoperative complications (31.0% and 22.3%, respectively) than in patients without postoperative complications (49.0% and 40.0%, respectively). The high complication rate after PD is troubling pancreatic surgeons, and minimally invasive surgery may be a potential strategy to improve the postoperative morbidity of PD. Surgeons' enthusiasm



FIGURE 3

resection

for LPD waned due to the high mortality rates reported in the LEOPARD-2 trial (42). In addition, subsequent meta-analyses (43) based on RCTs have also failed to demonstrate the benefit of LPD in terms of postoperative complications, leading to increasing hopes for RPD. Our results showed that RPD significantly reduced the incidence of postoperative complications compared with LPD. Given the impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival, lower postoperative complications may have potential benefits for patients' long-term outcomes. In 2020, Kamarajah et al. (39) conducted a meta-analysis of six non-RCTs, involving 3,462 patients. Their results indicated that there was no significant difference in the incidence of postoperative complications and



POPF compared with LPD and RPD. In 2022, Ouyang et al. (40) conducted an updated meta-analysis, and their study included nine retrospective studies. The results of the meta-analysis indicated that there were no significant differences between RPD and LPD in terms of total postoperative complications, major complications, POPF, delayed gastric emptying, and reoperation. Furthermore, the meta-analysis by Armengor-Garcia et al. (44) included 17 studies

involving a total of 5,483 patients. The results indicated that compared with LPD, RPD did not significantly reduce postoperative hemorrhage, delayed gastric emptying, mortality, or readmission rates. However, Armengol-Garcia et al. did not evaluate the data of total postoperative complications and major complications. A meta-analysis by Tang et al. (45), which included 17 studies and 9,417 subjects, indicated that RPD could significantly

A Study or Subgroup	RPD Events	Total	LPD	Total	Weight	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
2016 Liu	0	27	1	25	0.5%	0.31 [0.01, 7.26]	
2018 Goh	0	10	4	20	0.6%	0.21 [0.01, 3.59]	
2020 Gall 2022 Guo	0	25	10	41	0.6%	0.08 [0.00, 1.26]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2022 Heijde	11	234	23	167	5.9%	0.34 [0.17, 0.68]	
2022 Jang	0	60	4	60	0.5%	0.11 [0.01, 2.02]	
2022 Kim	0	74	6	74	0.6%	0.08 [0.00, 1.34]	
2022 Nattouje 2022 Tvutvunnik	51	358	2/9	1074	11.8%	0.55 [0.42, 0.72]	
2022 Wach	21	73	23	73	8.3%	0.91 [0.56, 1.50]	+
2022 Zong	5	76	6	114	2.9%	1.25 [0.40, 3.95]	
2023 Chao	2	75	3	39	1.4%	0.35 [0.06, 1.99]	
2023 Khachie 2023 Zhang	38	1006	205	1006	9.9%	0.43 [0.35, 0.52]	
2024 Dai	2	47	16	54	2.0%	0.14 [0.03, 0.59]	
2024 Emmen	54	812	146	812	11.4%	0.37 [0.27, 0.50]	+
2024 Farah	23	175	39	100	8.9%	0.34 [0.21, 0.53]	
2024 Kang 2024 Webde	92	332 625	18	1/8	6.9% 12.2%	0.66 [0.36, 1.19]	-
LOL4 WORKS	01	020	120	010	12.2.70	0.70 [0.07, 0.00]	
Total (95% CI)		5026		5238	100.0%	0.47 [0.38, 0.59]	•
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ²	442 = 0.08: Chi ²	= 42.36	994 5. df = 18	(P = 0.	0010): l² :	= 58%	++
Test for overall effect	ct: Z = 6.74 (I	P < 0.00	0001)		,		0.005 0.1 1 10 200 Favours [RPD] Favours [LPD]
	RPD	,	LPD			Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
B_Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Random, 95% C	M-H. Random, 95% Cl
2018 Goh	3	10	3	20	2.3%	2.00 [0.49, 8.18]	
2020 Gall 2020 Oceton	0	25	0	41	1.0%	Not estimable	
2020 Costen 2022 Choi	1	90 50	2	90 50	0.9%	0.09 [0.01, 0.69]	
2022 Jang	4	60	4	60	2.6%	1.00 [0.26, 3.81]	
2022 Kim	5	74	4	74	2.8%	1.25 [0.35, 4.47]	
2022 Tyutyunnik	9	100	15	100	6.8%	0.60 [0.28, 1.31]	
2022 Zong 2023 Khachfe	9 07	71	122	108	7.8% 27.8%	0.65 [0.32, 1.34]	
2023 Lee	02	21	10	60	1.2%	0.29 [0.04, 2,10]	
2023 Uijterwijk	9	37	12	53	7.2%	1.07 [0.50, 2.29]	+-
2023 Zhang	59	1006	121	1006	24.8%	0.49 [0.36, 0.66]	-
2024 Farah	24	175	30	100	14.6%	0.46 [0.28, 0.74]	-
Total (95% CI)		2604		2417	100.0%	0.56 [0.45. 0.70]	◆
Total events	207		355				
Heterogeneity: Tau ^a	^e = 0.03; Chi ^a	= 14.02	2, df = 11	(P = 0.	23); l² = 2	2%	
Test for overall effect	ct: Z = 5.11 (I	P < 0.00	0001)				Favours [RPD] Favours [LPD]
	RPD		I PD			Risk Ratio	Rick Ratio
C_Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Random, 95% C	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2016 Liu	2	27	3	25	2.6%	0.62 [0.11, 3.39]	
2018 Zhang	2	20	- 1	20	1.7%	2.00 (0.20, 20, 33)	
0000 Kissessies	20	404	07	400	7 400	2 00 14 05 4 001	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten	39 7	191 90	27 10	409	7.4%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park	39 7 0	191 90 49	27 10 0	409 90 43	7.4% 5.2%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi	39 7 0 3	191 90 49 50	27 10 0 6	409 90 43 50	7.4% 5.2% 3.6%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde	39 7 0 3 42	191 90 49 50 234	27 10 6 11	409 90 43 50 167	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13]	-+
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Kim	39 7 0 3 42 5 4	191 90 49 50 234 60 74	27 10 6 11 11	409 90 43 50 167 60 74	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1, 38]	~
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Kim 2022 Tvutyunnik	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 43	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100	27 10 6 11 11 9 10	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07]	-+
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Kim 2022 Tyutyunnik 2022 Zong	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 43 8	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71	27 10 6 11 11 9 10 12	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5%	3.0.9 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36]	-+-
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Kim 2022 Tyutyunnik 2022 Zong 2023 Chao	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 43 8 9	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75	27 10 6 11 11 9 10 12 4	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.17 [0.38, 3.56]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Kim 2022 Tyutyunnik 2022 Tyutyunnik 2023 Chao 2023 Chao 2023 Khachfe	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885	27 10 6 11 11 9 10 12 4 106	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.17 [0.38, 3.56] 1.06 [0.85, 1.33]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Zong 2023 Chao 2023 Chao 2023 Uijterwijk 2023 Uijterwijk	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 43 8 9 152 8	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78	27 10 6 11 11 9 10 12 4 106 14	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 4E	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.28, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.17 [0.38, 3.56] 1.06 [0.65, 1.33] 0.62 [0.38, 1.73]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Ocstan 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Haijde 2022 Jang 2022 Tyutyunnik 2022 Tyutyunnik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2023 Chao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Zhang	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 43 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006	27 10 6 11 11 9 10 12 4 106 14 5 135	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9% 4.7% 8.2%	3.00 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.70] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [145, 5.13] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.06 [0.88, 1.33] 0.62 [0.38, 1.75] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Klumik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2023 Chao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Wiei 2023 Zhang 2023 Zhang 2024 Dai	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 120 5	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47	27 10 6 11 11 11 9 10 12 4 106 14 5 135 6	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9% 4.7% 8.2% 4.3%	3.09 [1.95, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 1.47 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.06 [0.85, 1.33] 0.82 [0.38, 1.75] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 0.89 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.31, 2.94]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Kim 2022 Tyutyunik 2022 Zyutyunik 2023 Chao 2023 Chao 2023 Chao 2023 Uijterwijk 2023 Uijterwijk 2023 Zhang 2024 Dai 2024 Emmen	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812	277 100 6 111 111 9 100 122 4 100 124 100 14 5 135 6 600	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54 812	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9% 4.7% 8.2% 4.3% 8.1%	3.00 [1.96, 4.90] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [145, 5.13] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.06 [0.68, 1.33] 0.82 [0.38, 1.76] 1.06 [0.68, 1.33] 0.82 [0.38, 1.75] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 0.88 [0.71, 1.12] 0.66 [0.31, 2.94] 0.86 [0.31, 2.14] 0.86 [0.31, 2.14] 0.85 [0.31, 2.14]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Jang 2022 Xim 2022 Zong 2023 Khachfe 2023 Khachfe 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Hang 2024 Dai 2024 Farah 2024 Farah	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 43 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173 27 7 0	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812 175 41	10 0 6 11 11 11 10 12 4 106 14 5 135 6 60 117	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54 812 100 6 54 2 1006	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.5% 4.4% 8.2% 4.3% 8.2% 4.3%	3.09 [1.95, 4.40) 1.07 [0.25, 1.76] Not estimable 5.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [1.45, 5.13] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.40 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.26] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 1.04 [0.37, 2.91] 1.05 [0.71, 1.12] 0.95 [0.31, 2.94] 0.95 [0.31, 2.94] 0.95 [0.31, 2.94] 0.91 [0.52, 1.58] 0.31 [0.34] 1.95 0.31 [0.34]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Ooslen 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Haijde 2022 Haijde 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Cruguunnik 2022 Zong 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Chao 2023 Shanfg 2023 Shanfg 2023 Shanfg 2023 Shanfg 2023 Shanfg 2023 Shanfg 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Kuriyama	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 43 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173 27 0	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812 175 41	10 0 6 11 11 11 9 10 12 4 106 14 5 135 6 60 17 1	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54 812 100 16	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9% 4.7% 8.2% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0%	3.06 [1 95 4; 40] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not cellimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [145, 5.13] 0.45 [0,14, 1.84] 4.30 [2.29, 6.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.86] 1.10 [0.44, 2.86] 1.10 [0.44, 2.86] 1.10 [0.45, 5.13] 0.48 [0.14, 1.84] 1.06 [0.65, 1.33] 0.48 [0.71, 1.12] 0.49 [0.73, 2.91] 0.49 [0.73, 2.91] 0.49 [0.71, 1.24] 0.48 [2.19, 3.00] 0.49 [0.82, 1.58] 0.41 [0.22, 1.86] 0.41 [0.01, 3.15]	
2020 Kiompmaker 2020 Ooslew 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Kim 2022 Tytytynnik 2022 Zytytynnik 2022 Zytytynnik 2022 Zytytynnik 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Zhang 2024 Animen 2024 Farah 2024 Kirrytynan Total (85% CI)	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173 3 27 0	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812 175 41 4122	27 10 0 6 111 11 9 100 12 4 106 14 5 1355 6 60 177 1	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54 812 100 16 3926	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.7% 8.2% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0% 100.0%	3.09 [155, 4.09] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14.5, 5.13] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.06 [0.51, 1.69] 0.46 [0.17, 1.23] 0.46 [0.17, 1.23] 0.46 [0.17, 1.23] 0.47 [0.17, 1.23] 0.48 [0.17, 1.24] 0.48 [0.17, 1.12] 0.48 [0.17, 1.12] 0.49 [0.31, 2.49] 0.49 [0.31, 2.49] 0.48 [0.17, 1.12] 0.49 [0.31, 2.49] 0.48 [0.17, 1.12] 0.48 [0.17, 1.12] 0.49 [0.31, 2.49] 0.48 [0.10, 1.315] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Ooslem 2021 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Zivytvunnik 2022 Zivytvunnik 2022 Zivytvunnik 2022 Zivytvunnik 2023 Klinahfe 2023 Klinahfe 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Kimyama 2024 Kuriyama Total (95% CI) Total events	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 9 152 8 9 9 1200 5 173 27 7 0 0 6588	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812 175 41 4122	277 10 0 6 111 11 9 100 12 4 106 14 5 1355 6 6 60 177 1 1	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54 812 100 654 812 100 654	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.5% 4.7% 8.2% 4.7% 8.2% 4.7% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0%	3.00 (15.6 4.00) 0.70 (0.28.1.76) Not cellmable 0.50 (0.13.1.89) 2.72 (14.5 6.13) 0.45 (0.17.1.23) 0.44 (0.14.1.38) 4.30 (2.29.807) 1.01 (0.44, 2.36) 1.10 (0.45, 1.33) 1.06 (0.55, 1.33) 1.06 (0.55, 1.33) 1.06 (0.55, 1.33) 1.06 (0.53, 1.35) 1.09 (0.71, 1.12) 0.98 (0.71, 1.12) 0.98 (0.71, 1.28) 0.93 (0.21, 2.84) 0.93 (0.21, 2.84) 0.91 (0.22, 1.84) 0.91 (0.22, 1.84) 0.91 (0.21, 2.84) 0.91 (0.21, 2.84) 0.91 (0.21, 2.84) 0.91 (0.22, 1.84) 0.91 (0.21, 2.84) 0.91 (
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Park 2022 Park 2022 Hajde 2022 Hajde 2022 King 2022 King 2022 King 2022 King 2022 King 2022 King 2022 King 2023 King 2023 King 2023 King 2023 King 2023 King 2023 King 2023 King 2023 King 2024 King 2025 K	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 5 173 3 27 0	191 90 49 50 234 100 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(27 27 10 0 6 11 11 11 9 10 12 4 106 14 4 5 135 6 6 0 0 17 1 1 2 4 448 8 0, df = 18	409 90 43 50 167 60 108 39 655 53 53 45 1006 54 812 100 16 3926 (P < 0.	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 4.4% 8.3% 4.7% 8.2% 4.7% 8.2% 4.7% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0% 100.0%	3.00 [195 € 400] 0.07 [195 € 400] 0.07 [0.28, 1.76] Not cellimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.99] 2.12 [145, 5.13] 0.45 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 6.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.10 [0.44, 2.36] 1.10 [0.45, 1.33] 0.42 [0.14, 1.38] 1.06 [0.65, 1.33] 0.42 [0.34, 2.46] 1.06 [0.65, 1.33] 0.48 [0.71, 1.12] 0.48 [0.73, 2.91] 0.48 [0.73, 2.91] 0.49 [0.74, 1.26] 1.40 [0.25, 1.53] 0.48 [0.71, 1.12] 0.48 [0.71, 1.12] 0.48 [0.73, 2.91] 0.49 [0.25, 1.58] 0.13 [0.01, 3.15] 1.19 [0.86, 1.66] = 81%	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Ooslem 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hoide 2022 Hoide 2022 Hoide 2022 Xing 2022 Xing 2022 Xing 2022 Xing 2022 Xing 2023 Xinachfe 2023 Xinachfe 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2024 Farah 2024	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 5 8 9 120 5 173 3 27 0 8 58 8 ° = 0.33; Chi ^p 1 [°] 2 [°] 7 1 [°] 2 [°]	191 90 49 50 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 100 47 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(27 10 0 6 11 11 9 10 12 4 106 14 5 135 6 60 0 17 1 448 0, df = 18 0)	409 90 43 50 167 60 108 39 655 53 53 545 1006 54 812 100 16 3926 (P < 0.	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9% 4.7% 8.2% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 4.3% 4.3% 4.3% 4.3% 4.3% 4.3% 4.3% 4.3		
2020 Kiompmaker 2020 Oxisen 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Huijde 2022 Kim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2023 Ximahfe 2023 Ximahfe 2023 Ximahfe 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2024 Farman 2024 Farman 2024 Farman 2024 Farman 2024 Farman 2024 Forman 2024 Forman 2020 Forma	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 173 173 170 5 177 0 8 8 8 9 9 120 5 173 173 2 7 0 8 8 8 9 9 120 5 120 5 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(277 10 6 11 11 9 9 10 12 4 10 6 10 6 6 0 177 1 7 1 3 5 6 6 0 177 1 7 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 10 6 11 11 11 9 9 9 10 12 4 4 10 10 12 12 4 10 10 12 12 14 10 12 12 10 10 12 12 14 10 12 12 14 10 12 12 10 10 12 12 14 10 10 12 12 10 10 12 12 10 10 12 12 10 10 12 12 10 10 12 10 10 12 12 10 10 10 12 10 10 12 11 10 12 10 10 10 12 10 10 10 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 9655 53 45 53 45 100 16 3926 (P < 0.	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.3% 8.3% 5.9% 4.7% 8.2% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0% 100.0%	3.00 [155 4.60] 0.70 [125 4.60] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not celimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [145, 5.13] 0.44 [0.47, 1.23] 0.43 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.41, 1.86] 1.01 [0.44, 2.86] 1.10 [0.45, 1.33] 0.64 [0.17, 1.23] 0.62 [0.35, 1.37] 0.62 [0.34, 1.76] 1.06 [0.57, 1.23] 0.64 [0.71, 1.24] 0.64 [0.71, 1.24] 0.65 [0.37, 2.81] 0.64 [0.37, 2.81] 0.64 [0.24, 1.86] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] = 81%	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours [RPD] Favours [LPD]
2020 Kiompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hajde 2022 Hajde 2022 Hajde 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2023 Xina 2024 Xinyi 2024 Xinyi 2025 Xina 2025 Xina 2026 Xina 2026 Xina 2026 Xina 2026 Xina 2027 Xina 2026 Xina 2027 Xina 2026 Xina 2026 Xina 2027 Xina 2026 Xina 2027 Xinyi Xinyi Xina 2026 Xinyi	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 43 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 5 7 7 0 5 5 7 7 0 5 5 8 9 152 5 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 1000 71 75 885 37 78 1006 47 7 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(5) 90 50.5(1) 90 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	277 100 0 6 111 111 9 100 122 4 106 135 6 60 0 177 1 4488 0, df = 18 D) LPPI	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 8 9 655 53 45 100 16 3926 (P < 0.	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.9% 4.3% 8.2% 4.3% 8.2% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0% 100.0%	3.00 [155, 4.00] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14.5, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.06 [0.85, 1.33] 0.46 [0.38, 1.76] 1.04 [0.38, 3.66] 1.06 [0.31, 2.34] 0.89 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.31, 2.34] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] = 81%	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) Rike Ratio
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Kim 2022 Tyutyunnik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2022 Zyutyunnik 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2024 Farnh 2024 Fa	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 125 125 125 125 125 125 125	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 812 175 41 4122 = 96.50 90 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	, 7 7 10 0 6 6 11 1 11 1 1 9 9 0 0 12 4 4 106 14 4 8 6 0 0 17 1 1 4488 0, df = 18 0, 17 1	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 39 45 1006 54 812 1000 16 3926 (P < 0.)	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 4.3% 8.9% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 1.0% 100.0%	3.000 [15.6 4.00] 0.70 [0.28.1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14.5, 6.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.42, 2.36] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.08 [0.31, 2.44] 0.89 [0.71, 1.22] 0.89 [0.31, 2.44] 1.19 [0.86, 1.66] = 81%	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) Risk Ratio MH: Fixed. 35% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Leijde 2022 Leijde 2022 Lydyunnik 2022 Zydyunnik 2022 Zydyunnik 2022 Zydyunnik 2022 Zydyunnik 2022 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Kinyama Total (effs CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effer D. Study or Subgrou 2016 Liu 2016 Cinh	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 8 9 152 7 0 5 173 27 0 658 ⁸ = 0.33; Ch ² 5 173 27 0 8 8 9 152 175 175 120 175 120 175 120 175 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	191 90 499 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(41 4122 = 96.5(70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	409 90 43 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 39 655 53 1006 54 812 1006 54 812 1006 654 (P < 0.) (P < 0.) 20 50 50 167 100 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 4.4% 8.3% 6.6% 4.4% 8.3% 4.7% 8.2% 4.3% 8.1% 6.9% 4.3% 8.1% 0.0001; F	- 3.09 [19.5 4.00] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not celimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14.5, 5.13] 0.45 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 (22.9, 8.07) 1.01 [0.44, 2.88] 1.17 [0.38, 3.86] 1.06 [0.55, 1.33] 0.26 [0.31, 2.24] 0.39 [0.71, 1.12] 0.96 [0.31, 2.24] 0.31 [0.01, 2.8] 0.13 [0.01, 3.15] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] = 81% Risk Ratio MH-Fixed, 95% CI 0.31 [0.01, 7.28] 0.31 [0.01, 7.28] 0.13 [0.01, 7.28] 0.14 [0.01, 7.28] 0.14 [0.01, 7.28] 0.15 [0.01, 7.28]	0.01 0.1 10 100 Risk Ratio MH-Fixed, 95% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Ooslew 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hojiće 2022 Hojiće 2022 Hojiće 2022 Julijev 2022 Kim 2022 Tytiyumik 2022 Zytiyumik 2022 Zytiyumik 2022 Kimaher 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Wei 2023 Kinachfe 2024 Kinryiama Total (85% CI) Total events Heterogeneily. Tau ² Test for overall effect D. <u>Study or Subgroup</u> 2016 Liu 2016 Goh 2018 Zinag	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 9 152 5 173 77 0 5 8 120 5 173 277 0 8 8 9 9 152 2 7 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 9 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 9 9 9 8 8 8 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 9 9 8 8 8 8 9 9 8 8 8 8 9 9 9 8 8 8 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 8	191 90 499 50 234 60 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 815 175 41 4122 = 96.5(41 4122 = 96.5(7 7 0 0 Total 27 100 0 0 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	409 90 433 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 54 812 100 16 3926 (P < 0. 20	7.4% 5.2% 5.5% 6.5% 6.6% 4.8% 4.3% 5.5% 4.4% 5.5% 4.4% 5.5% 4.3% 5.5% 1.0% 100.0% 00001); F	3.00 [15,6 4.00] 0.70 [0.28,1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14,5, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.36] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.06 [0.37, 1.24] 0.89 [0.77, 1.12] 0.89 [0.77, 1.12] 0.30 [0.36, 1.66] = 81%	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2022 Oxslem 2022 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Leijde 2022 Leijde 2022 Leijde 2022 Leijdewick 2023 Zhao 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Zhao 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Zhao 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Zhao 2024 Farah 2024 Chor verall effe 2016 Lu 2016 Goh 2016 Zhang 2020 Gail	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 152 8 7 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 0 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 175 885 37 78 812 6 47 812 41 4122 = 96.5(41 4122 0 Total 27 10 0 23	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	409 90 433 50 167 60 100 108 39 655 53 45 1006 53 45 1006 54 812 100 16 3926 (P < 0. 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 6.5% 4.3% 6.5% 4.3% 6.5% 4.3% 6.4% 4.3% 6.9% 1.0% 00001); F 100.0%	3.00 [155, 4.00] 0.70 [125, 4.00] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not celimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14, 55, 13] 0.44 [0.14, 138] 4.30 [2.20, 8.07] 1.01 [0.44, 2.26] 1.06 [0.85, 133] 1.06 [0.85, 133] 1.06 [0.85, 133] 1.06 [0.27, 1.28] 2.08 [0.71, 1.28] 2.08 [0.71, 1.28] 2.08 [0.71, 1.28] 2.08 [0.27, 1.81] 0.91 [0.22, 1.81]	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours [RPD] Favours [LPD] Risk Ratio
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Ooslew 2021 Park 2022 Choil 2022 Hajde 2022 Hajde 2022 Hajde 2022 Hajde 2022 Xima 2022 Xima 2022 Xima 2022 Xima 2022 Xima 2022 Xima 2023 Xima 2024 Ximyiana 2024 Ximyiana 2025 Xima 2025 Xima 2027 Ximyiana 2027 Xima 2027 Ximyiana 2027 Xima 2027 Ximyiana 2027 Ximyiana	39 7 0 3 42 42 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 5 173 27 7 0 8 8 8 9 120 5 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 1 8 9 9 152 8 8 9 9 152 8 153 173 127 0 0 153 173 127 0 0 12 17 0 0 12 17 1 2 17 0 12 1 1 12 1 1 12 1 12	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 175 885 37 78 78 1006 47 812 296.5(175 41 4122 = 96.5(77 10 20 20 21 10 20 21 41 21 41 22 41 27 41 27 41 27 41 27 41 27 41 20 49 90 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	409 90 433 50 167 60 108 53 45 53 53 45 54 812 100 65 54 812 100 (P < 0. (P < 0. 25 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	7.4% 5.2% 5.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6	-3.09 [1:55, 4:09] -0.79 [1:56, 4:09] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1:38] 1.30 [2:28, 8:07] 1.01 [0:44, 2:26] 1.06 [0:05, 1:33] 0.46 [0:17, 1:23] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.89 [0:31, 2:49] 0.89 [0:37, 1:12] 0.96 [0:31, 2:49] 0.13 [0:01, 3:15] 1.19 [0:86, 1.86] = 81% Risk Ratio MH-H. Fixed, 38%, C1 0.31 [0:01, 7.26] 0.33 [0:01, 7.28] 0.33 [0:01, 7.28] 0.33 [0:01, 7.28]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2020 Costen 2022 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Kim 2022 Strukumik 2022 Zyukyumik 2022 Zyukyumik 2023 Zhao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Zhao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Zhao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Zhao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Zhao 2024 Kanishe 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Godi D Study or Subgrou 2016 Liu 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2016 Goh 2017 Godi 2017 Consten 2010 Consten	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 152 152 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 5 173 27 0 8 5 8 8 9 9 120 0 5 5 173 27 0 8 5 8 9 9 120 0 0 5 5 27 0 8 8 9 9 120 0 6 5 8 8 9 9 120 0 5 5 27 0 8 9 9 120 0 5 5 27 0 8 8 9 9 120 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 5 8 8 9 120 5 5 5 7 7 7 0 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 5 5 7 7 7 0 0 8 8 8 9 120 5 5 7 7 7 0 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 5 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 5 7 7 7 0 0 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 5 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 5 8 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 0 173 27 0 0 173 27 0 0 173 27 0 0 173 27 0 0 173 27 27 0 0 0 173 27 27 0 0 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120	191 900 234 600 74 1000 71 75 885 77 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(74 41 27 100 200 200 201 2191 900 201 202 203 203 203 203 204 204 204 204 204 204 204 204 204 204	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 90 433 50 167 60 74 100 108 39 655 53 345 1006 54 812 1000 16 3926 (P < 0. 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 2	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 5.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 8.3% 8.4.8% 8.4.8% 8.4.8% 8.4.8% 8.4.8% 8.1% 6.9% 8.1% 0.00001): F 100.0% 1.5% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%0.0.8% 0.0.8%%0.0.8%% 0.0.8%%0.0.8%%0.0.8%%0.0.8%%0.0.8%%0.0.8%%%0.0.8%%%%%%%%%%	3.00 (15,6 4.00) 0.70 (0.28,1.76) NO testimable 0.50 (0.13,1.89) 2.72 (14,5,6.13) 0.45 (0.17,1.23) 0.44 (0.14,1.38) 4.30 (2.29,8.07) 1.01 (0.44, 2.36) 1.07 (0.38,3.56) 1.07 (0.38,3.56) 1.06 (0.85,1.33) 0.62 (0.38,3.57) 1.04 (0.37,26) 0.69 (0.31,24) 0.69 (0.31,24) 1.19 (0.86,1.66) = 81% Rink Ratio 0.31 (0.17,726) 0.31 (0.17,726) 0.33 (0.24,427) 3.39 (0.33,3.56) 1.20 (0.75,206) 1.20 (0.75	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) Risk Ratio MH, Fixed. 35% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2022 Choil 2022 Hajde 2022 Choil 2022 Hajde 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2023 Kimahfe 2023 Kimahfe 2024 Kimyama Total (e9% CI) 2016 Liu 2016 Goh 2016 Liu 2016 Goh 2016 Liu 2016 Goh 2016 Choil 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Choil 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Choil 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Choil 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Choil 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Choil 2020 Kimyamate 2020 Choil	39 7 0 3 42 5 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 9 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 5 8 9 9 0 5 5 173 27 0 8 8 9 9 20 5 5 8 8 9 9 20 5 5 27 0 0 5 5 27 0 8 8 9 9 20 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2	191 900 234 1000 74 1000 74 1000 74 1000 71 78 885 37 78 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 27 100 20 20 30 191 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90	277 100 6 6 111 11 9 100 12 4 4 106 6 0 135 5 1355 5 1355 1355 6 0 0 177 1 4 4 8 6 0 0 177 1 1 2 2 3 3 3 1 1 2 2 3 3 3 1 2 1 2 2 2 3 3 3 1 2 1 2	200 409 900 433 500 167 600 108 39 655 53 39 655 53 1006 54 812 1000 16 3926 (P < 0. 200 38 200 200 38 409 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 5.5% 6.5% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.3% 5.5% 4.4% 4.3% 5.5% 4.4% 4.3% 8.1% 100.0% 100.0% 10.0% 1.5% 0.8% 1.10% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.	3.00 [156] 4.00 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not celimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [145, 5.13] 0.44 [0.14, 1.30] 4.30 (229, 8.07, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.30] 1.06 [105, 1.33] 0.62 [0.35, 1.33] 0.62 [0.35, 1.33] 0.62 [0.35, 1.33] 0.62 [0.35, 1.33] 0.62 [0.35, 1.33] 0.62 [0.35, 1.34] 0.69 [0.71, 1.12] 0.69 [0.71, 1.24] 2.68 [0.71, 0.12] 0.69 [0.71, 2.41] 0.69 [0.71, 2.41] 0.60 [0.71, 2.61] 0.60 [0.71, 2.61] 0.10 [0.02, 1.83] 0.10 [0.02, 1.83] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] 1.20 [0.72, 2.61] 1.00 [0.23, 4.37] 1.00 [0.23, 4.37] 1.00 [0.23, 4.37] 1.00 [0.23, 4.37] 1.20 [0.75, 2.61] 0.01 [0.24, 4.31] 1.20 [0.75, 2.61] 0.20 [0.71, 7.25] 1.20 [0.75, 2.61] 0.20 [0.75, 2.61] 0.20 [0.75, 2.61] 0.20 [0.75, 2.61] 0.21 [0.75, 2.75] 0.21 [0.75, 2.75] 0.21 [0.75, 2.75] 0.21 [0.75, 2.75] 0.21 [0.75, 2.7	0.01 0.1 10 100 Risk Ratio MH-Fixed, 95% CI
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2022 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Vinjvurnik 2022 Zyutyurnik 2022 Zyutyurnik 2022 Xinachfe 2023 Uljerwijk 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Guin 2016 Liu 2016 Chang 2020 Oxsten 2020 Oxsten 2020 Costen 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Choi	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 5 173 3 27 0 7 0 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 9 120 5 173 12 8 9 120 5 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 1	191 900 234 1000 74 1000 71 75 8855 37 78 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 175 812 175 100 6 71 100 9 0 23 191 9 0 0 0 0 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 900 433 50 167 74 1000 108 39 655 53 39 655 53 45 1000 16 3926 (P < 0. 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 6.5% 4.8% 4.3% 4.3% 5.5% 8.2% 4.4% 4.3% 4.7% 8.2% 4.4% 4.3% 4.4% 4.3% 4.4% 4.3% 1.0% 0.0001); F 100.0% 0.0% 1.1.7% 0.0% 1.1.7% 1.0% 0.0% 1.1.7% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0	- 3.09 [15,6 4.09] 0.79 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14,5, 6.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.46 [0.48, 1.36] 1.07 [0.38, 3.66] 1.07 [0.38, 3.66] 1.08 [0.37, 2.44] 0.89 [0.37, 1.24] 0.89 [0.37, 1.24] 0.80 [0.34, 1.05] 1.19 [0.36, 1.66] 1.25 [0.75, 2.08] 2.00 [0.38, 1.065] 1.25 [0.75, 2.08] 2.00 [0.38, 1.065] 1.25 [0.75, 2.08] 2.00 [0.38, 1.065] 0.29 [0.01, 7.22] 0.29 [0.00, 55, 3.34] 0.66 [0.17, 6.24] 2.00 [0.05, 5.34] 0.66 [0.17, 6.26] 2.00 [0.05, 5.34] 0.66 [0.16, 4.34]	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) Risk Ratio MH. Fixed, 95% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2023 Kina 2024 Kinya 2024 Kinya 2020 Kinya 2022	39 7 7 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 5 173 175 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 120 0 120 0 120 0 3 22 1 2 21 1 4 4 4 3 152 2 7 0 120 0 3 27 27 0 120 0 120 0 120 0 120 120 120 120 120	191 900 234 600 74 1000 785 885 885 400 77 812 97 812 99 50 37 78 812 99 50 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 900 409 900 167 60 74 1000 74 1000 74 1000 108 39 655 54 812 1000 16 53 45 54 812 1000 16 53 45 54 812 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 5.6% 4.8% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 8.3% 6.6% 8.3% 6.9% 1.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 1.5% 1.0% 1.17% 1.17% 1.10% 1.5% 1.17% 1.10%	-3.09 [1:55, 4:00] 0.70 [1:55, 4:00] 0.70 [0:28, 1:76] Not celimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.44 [0:41, 138] 4.30 [2:28, 8:07] 1.01 [0:44, 2:26] 1.01 [0:44, 2:26] 1.06 [0:55, 133] 1.06 [0:55, 133] 0.45 [0:7, 2:81] 1.06 [0:25, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.91 [0:22, 1:86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,86] 0.93 [0:02, 2:1,87] 0.93 [0:02, 7,28] 1.00 [0:23, 4:37] 1.93 [0:04, 7,28] 1.93 [0:04, 7,28] 1.93 [0:05, 7,28] 1.93 [0:06, 7,28]	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours [RPD] Favours [LPD]
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2022 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Kim 2022 Tytyturnik 2022 Zytytyurnik 2022 Zytytyurnik 2022 Xinabi 2023 Kinabife 2023 Kinabife 2024 Kinyiama 2024 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2020 Kinyiama 2022 Ki	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 8 9 120 5 173 3 27 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 123 5 5 173 3 27 0 7 0 7 0 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 5 5 173 27 5 27 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 17	191 90 234 60 74 100 885 37 78 885 37 78 1006 47 7 812 175 41 4122 = 96.5(27 100 20 23 191 90 90 49 90 32 234 460 74 47 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 76 885 50 77 812 875 80 50 76 812 80 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 77 812 815 815 815 815 815 815 815 815 815 815	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 900 433 50 167 74 1000 60 53 45 1006 812 1000 16 5 3926 (P < 0. (P < 0. 202 202 202 202 202 202 202 202 202 2	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 6.5% 4.8% 6.6% 4.3% 6.6% 4.4% 8.2% 4.4% 8.2% 4.4% 8.2% 4.4% 8.2% 4.4% 8.2% 9.00001): F 0.0% 100.0% 1.5% 1.0% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2	3.00 [1 55, 4.00] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14,5, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.14, 1.38] 4.30 [2.29, 8.07] 1.01 [0.42, 2.36] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.07 [0.38, 3.56] 1.08 [0.37, 1.12] 0.89 [0.77, 1.12] 0.88 [0.13, 0.14] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] 1.19 [0.86, 1.86] 2.81% Risk Ratio M.H.J. Fixed, 95% CI 0.31 [0.01, 7.26] 0.33 [0.00, 23, 4.37] 3.99 [0.33, 35.36] 2.00 [0.33, 10.65] 2.00 [0.33, 10.65] 2.00 [0.05, 5.34] 2.00 [0.05, 5.34] 2.00 [0.05, 5.34] 2.00 [0.05, 5.34] 2.00 [0.04, 3.11] 0.33 [0.04, 3, 11] 0.33 [0.04, 3, 11]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hajde 2022 Huijde 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2022 Xim 2023 Xinachfe 2023 Xinachfe 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Farah 2024 Kintyama Tosti (6% C1) Total events Heterogeneity. Tra'i Test for overall effer 2016 Goh 2018 Zhang 2020 Kiompmaker 2020 Golu 2021 Van 2022 Kiompmaker 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2022 Xim	39 7 0 3 42 5 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 8 5 8 173 27 0 8 5 8 7 7 7 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 5 173 27 0 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 9 120 0 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 8 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 9 120 0 0 1 7 7 0 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 120 0 0 1 17 3 2 7 1 2 1 10 3 2 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 2 1	191 900 234 60 74 1000 71 75 885 37 77 812 812 812 812 812 812 812 812 812 812	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 900 167 74 1000 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 53 455 53 53 455 53 53 53 53 53 53 53 53 53	7.4% 5.2% 5.2% 5.5% 6.6% 4.8% 6.6% 4.3% 6.6% 4.3% 6.6% 4.3% 6.6% 4.3% 6.6% 1.0% 100.0% 00001); F 100.0% 00001); F 100.0% 1.5% 0.4% 1.0% 1.5% 1.0%	- 3.09 [1:56, 4:00] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1.89] 2.72 [1:45, 6:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:17, 1:23] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.45 [0:18, 1:36] 1.70 [0:38, 3:56] 1.70 [0:38, 3:56] 1.70 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:32, 1:59] 1.71 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:02, 1:59] 0.73 [0:07, 2:26] 1.71 [0:02, 1:59] 1.71 [0:02, 1:59] 1.73 [0:03, 3:56] 1.25 [0:05, 5:34] 0.56 [0:10, 5:34] 0.56 [0:04, 5:11] 0.38 [0:04, 5:11] 0.38 [0:04, 5:11] 0.38 [0:04, 5:11] 0.30 [0:04, 5:	0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours (PPD) Favours (PD) M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2022 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Heijde 2022 Heijde 2022 Xina 2022 Xinabi 2022 Xinabi 2022 Xinabi 2022 Xinabi 2023 Xinabife 2023 Xinabife 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Kiméme 2024 Kiméme 2024 Kinémeter 2026 Kinémeter 2026 Viel 2026 Viel 2027 Viel 2026 Viel 2027 Viel 2026 Viel 2027 Viel 2027 Viel 2028 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Viel 2024 Viel 2024 Viel 2024 Viel 2024 Viel 2026 Viel 2026 Viel 2027	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 120 5 1773 27 0 5 1773 27 0 7 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 2 2 1173 27 0 27 0 27 0 27 0 27 0 27 0 27 0 27	191 90 234 60 74 100 71 71 71 78 885 885 885 885 885 885 885 885 885	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 900 409 900 167 74 1000 74 1000 108 399 655 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 53 455 54 8122 1006 (P < 0. 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	7.4% 5.2% 5.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 6.6% 5.5% 8.2% 4.4% 8.2% 4.3% 5.9% 8.2% 4.4% 8.2% 4.3% 5.9% 8.2% 4.3% 5.9% 8.1% 1.0% 0.00001); F 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 1.0% 0.0% 0	-3.09 [1:95, 4:09] -0.09 [1:95, 4:09] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1:38] 1.30 [2:28, 8:07] 1.01 [0:44, 2:28] 1.06 [0:05, 1:33] 0.46 [0:17, 1:23] 0.48 [0:17, 1:24] 0.89 [0:31, 2:49] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:34] 0.91 [0:07, 1:24] 0.31 [0:07, 1:24] 0.33 [0:04, 2:4, 37] 3.99 [0:33, 3:54] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 0.33 [0:04, 3:11] 0.04 [0:04, 3:11] 0.05 [0:05, 5:34]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oslen 2021 Park 2020 Oslen 2022 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Holjde 2022 Holjde 2022 Kim 2022 Trytyturnik 2022 Zytytyturnik 2022 Zytytyturnik 2023 Zhao 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Vlei 2023 Vlei 2024 Kurtyana Total (8% CI) Total events Heterogeneilty: Tau ¹ Test for overall offer 2016 Llu 2016 Chonpmaker 2020 Costen 2022 Heljde 2022 Chol 2022 Chol 2022 Chol 2022 Chol 2022 Chol 2022 Chol 2022 Zing 2022 Chol 2022 Zing 2022 Cong 2022 Zing 2022 Cong	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 201 2 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	191 90 49 50 234 60 74 100 71 1006 885 53 78 812 175 885 53 78 812 175 885 47 812 175 885 53 78 812 175 78 812 175 20 30 20 49 9 0 0 23 41 9 0 0 23 4 100 71 50 78 80 50 78 80 50 78 80 50 78 80 70 80 70 70 70 70 70 70 80 70 70 70 70 70 70 80 70 70 70 70 70 80 70 70 70 70 80 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 900 900 167 74 100 168 39 265 53 405 53 405 53 402 100 16 53 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 53 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 53 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 53 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 100 16 54 412 202 202 202 35 202 107 405 107 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 1.0% 100.0% 0.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.5% 0.0.8% 1.0% 1.5% 1.0% 1.2% 1.0% 1.2% 1.5% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2	3.00 [1 55 4.60] 0.70 [0.28,1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14.5, 6.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.38,3.66] 1.07 [0.38,3.66] 1.07 [0.38,3.66] 1.08 [0.37, 2.44] 0.89 [0.37, 1.24] 0.89 [0.37, 1.24] 0.80 [0.37, 2.84] 0.31 [0.01, 7.26] 0.33 [0.06, 2.34] 1.25 [0.76, 2.06] 2.00 [0.23, 4.37] 3.39 [0.23, 4.36] 1.26 [0.76, 2.06] 2.00 [0.23, 4.04] 1.25 [0.76, 2.06] 2.00 [0.03, 10.66] 0.31 [0.01, 7.26] 0.33 [0.04, 1.11] 1.00 [0.14, 0.38] 0.52 [0.03, 2.84] 0.52 [0.10, 2.34] 0.53 [0.44, 1.11] 1.00 [0.14, 0.38] 0.52 [0.03, 2.84] 0.52 [0.10, 2.84] 0.53 [0.10, 2.84] 0.54 [0.10, 2.84] 0.55 [0.10, 2.84] 0	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) Risk Ratio MH. Fixed. 95% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Holjde 2022 Holjde 2022 Holjde 2022 Kinabite 2022 Kinabite 2022 Kinabite 2023 Kinabite 2024 Kiniyama Total (95% GU) 2016 Liu 2016 Liu 2016 Liu 2016 Liu 2016 Coh 2010 Zhang 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Chali 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Cohi 2020 Chali 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Chali 2020 Chali 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Chali 2020 Ch	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 9 120 5 5 7 7 0 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 7 7 0 5 5 7 27 0 5 5 5 5 7 27 0 5 5 5 7 7 0 5 5 5 7 7 0 5 5 7 7 0 7 10 5 5 7 7 0 7 10 5 5 7 7 0 7 10 5 5 7 7 0 7 0 10 5 5 5 7 7 0 10 5 5 7 7 0 10 5 5 7 7 0 10 10 5 5 17 3 27 0 10 10 5 5 17 3 27 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 1911\\ 90\\ 49\\ 50\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 100\\ 71\\ 100\\ 78\\ 885\\ 37\\ 78\\ 812\\ 175\\ 885\\ 47\\ 812\\ 175\\ 812\\ 175\\ 41\\ 4122\\ 296.5(2)\\ 78\\ 100\\ 0\\ 20\\ 23\\ 390\\ 49\\ 50\\ 0\\ 74\\ 71\\ 15\\ 1006\\ 74\\ 75\\ 1006\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75\\ 75$	- 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7	200 409 900 167 74 167 60 740 1008 39 655 53 39 45 1006 54 812 1000 65 5 33926 (P < 0. 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 5.5% 8.2% 5.5% 8.2% 8.4% 8.4% 8.4% 8.4% 8.4% 8.1% 7.0% 9.0% 9.0% 9.0% 9.0% 1.5% 1.0% 1.5% 1.0% 1.1% 1.0% 1.1% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0	-3.09 [1:55, 4:30] -3.09 [1:56, 4:30] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1:38] 1.30 [2:28, 8:07] 1.10 [0:43, 2:36] 1.10 [0:43, 2:36] 1.06 [0:51, 1:33] 0.46 [0:17, 1:23] 0.46 [0:17, 1:23] 0.46 [0:17, 1:24] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.81 [0:17, 1:21] 0.86 [0:17, 1:21] 0.86 [0:10, 1:17] 1.96 [0:62, 1:36] 0.31 [0:01, 1:51] 1.19 [0:86, 1:86] = 811% Rink Ratio M:H. Fixed, 98% CI 0.31 [0:01, 2:26] 0.36 [0:02, 2:37] 1.26 [0:76, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34] 0.26 [0:06, 5:34]	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours [RPD] Favours [LPD]
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2022 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2023 Khachfe 2023 Kinachfe 2023 Kimachfe 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Wei 2023 Kimachfe 2024 Kim/ama Total (6% CI) Total events Heterogenetik: Tau'i Test for overall offer 2016 Llu 2016 Chang 2020 Costen 2022 Hoijde 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 202	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 120 0 5 173 3 27 0 7 0 7 0 7 0 120 0 5 173 27 0 2 175 2 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 0 7 0 120 0 5 175 2 7 7 0 7 0 120 0 121 0 122 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 0 0 120 12	1911 90 49 50 74 100 71 107 78 885 37 78 812 27 175 41 4122 27 175 41 4122 27 175 27 175 27 175 27 175 27 20 20 20 32 20 40 90 00 23 40 90 00 20 32 23 40 90 00 23 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 20 40 90 00 74 100 77 175 77 88 50 77 8 175 77 88 50 77 80 175 77 175 77 80 175 77 175 77 175 77 175 77 175 77 175 77 175 77 175 77 175 175	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	200 409 90 403 50 167 60 100 108 39 45 53 39 45 1006 54 51 1006 54 812 100 167 52 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 5.2% 3.6% 4.8% 4.8% 4.3% 6.6% 5.5% 4.4% 5.5% 8.2% 1.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 1.5% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5% 0.4% 1.2% 0.4% 1.5%	- 3.09 [15,6,4.09] 0.79 [0.28,1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14,5, 5.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.46 [0.45, 1.33] 1.79 [0.38, 3.66] 1.06 [0.31, 2.44] 0.89 [0.71, 1.12] 0.89 [0.71, 1.12] 0.80 [0.31, 2.44] 1.19 [0.86, 1.66] 1.19 [0.86, 1.66] 1.25 [0.75, 2.08] 2.00 [0.23, 4.37] 3.39 [0.03, 3.03, 6] 0.29 [0.04, 3.11] 1.00 [0.24, 4.37] 1.25 [0.75, 2.08] 2.00 [0.04, 3.11] 1.00 [0.14, 6.84] 1.52 [0.10, 2.393] 0.52 [0.03, 0.06] 0.54 [0.43, 1.11] 1.00 [0.14, 6.84] 0.55 [0.33] 0.46 [0.51, 3.3] 3.44 [0.14, 8.242] 1.00 [0.75, 1.31] 3.44 [0.14, 8.242] 1.00 [0.75, 1.31] 3.44 [0.14, 8.242] 1.00 [0.75, 1.31] 3.44 [0.14, 8.242] 3.44 [0.14, 8.242]	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2022 Kina 2023 Kina 2024 Kiniyama 2024 Kiniyama 2024 Kiniyama 2026 Kiniya 2026 Kiniya 2020 Kiniy	39 7 0 3 42 5 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 8 5 173 27 0 8 5 173 27 0 8 5 1752 27 0 8 1752 1752 1753 27 0 8 1752 1753 27 0 1200 0 8 1752 1753 27 0 1200 15 1753 27 0 1753 27 0 1753 27 0 1753 27 0 1753 27 0 1753 27 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 1752 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 27 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	191 90 49 50 60 71 1006 47 885 87 78 1006 47 812 27 105 41 4122 27 105 20 20 23 3191 20 20 23 3191 105 20 20 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	27 10 0 6 6 11 11 11 9 10 6 14 14 5 135 13	209 209 900 900 167 60 167 60 167 60 167 60 167 60 167 60 167 60 167 60 53 392 655 53 392 655 53 455 53 392 6 (P < 0. 74 4 812 1000 108 54 812 1000 108 54 812 1000 108 54 812 1000 108 54 812 1000 108 54 812 1000 108 54 812 1000 108 54 54 812 1000 108 54 54 54 54 812 1000 108 54 54 812 255 200 202 202 202 202 202 20	7.4% 5.2% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6	- 3.09 [1:56, 4:00] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1.89] 2.72 [1:45, 6:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:17, 1:23] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.45 [0:38, 3:56] 1.70 [0:38, 3:56] 1.70 [0:38, 3:56] 1.70 [0:38, 3:56] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.71 [0:28, 1:76] 1.72 [0:28, 1:	0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Favours (PPD) Favours (PD) M-H. Fixed, 85% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2022 Choli 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Kim 2022 Tydyurnik 2022 Zydyurnik 2022 Zydyurnik 2022 Xihachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Klnachfe 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Kim/smn Total (95% CI) Total 495% CI)	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 8 8 9 120 0 5 173 27 0 7 0 7 0 120 0 5 173 27 0 7 0 120 0 5 173 27 0 7 0 120 0 120 0 120 0 120 122 122 122 122	191 90 950 74 100 71 75 885 37 78 885 37 78 885 47 41 4122 27 41 4122 29 60 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	27 10 0 6 11 11 19 9 10 12 4 4 135 5 135 5 135 5 135 135 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 14	200 409 90 409 90 409 409 409 409	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 4.4% 4.4% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9	-3.09 [1:55, 4:60] -0.09 [1:56, 4:60] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not cestimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1:38] 1.30 [2:28, 0:77] 1.01 [0:44, 2:28] 1.01 [0:44, 2:26] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.46 [0:71, 1:21] 0.56 [0:31, 2:49] 0.80 [0:71, 1:21] 0.58 [0:37, 1:42] 0.58 [0:37, 2:49] 0.45 [0:47, 1:42] 0.58 [0:37, 2:49] 0.58 [0:67, 2:48] 0.58 [0:67, 2:48] 0.51 [0:00, 2:3, 4:37] 3.99 [0:03, 3:63] 0.06 [0:01, 7:26] 0.28 [0:03, 7:26] 0.28 [0:04, 7:28] 0.29 [0:01, 7:26] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 1.26 [0:75, 2:08] 2.00 [0:28, 4:07] 0.29 [0:01, 7:26] 0.29 [0:01, 7:26] 0.29 [0:01, 7:26] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 0.20 [0:05, 5:34] 0.33 [0:04, 3:11] 1.00 [0:28, 1:33] 0.29 [0:01, 7:26] <td></td>	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxlem 2021 Park 2020 Oxlem 2022 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Holjde 2022 Holjde 2022 Kim 2022 Trytyumik 2022 Zyutyumik 2023 Zhao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Kuriyama Total (95% CI) Total 400 Oxlem 2026 Chol 2020 Costen 2027 Heljde 2022 Chol 2022 Zing 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2024 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2024 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2024 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2024 Chang 2024 Chang 2022 Chang 2022 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2024 Chang 2024 Chang 2022 Chang 2022 Chang 2022 Chang 2023 Chang 2023 Chang 2024 Chang 2024 Chang 2024 Chang 2024 Chang 2025 Chang 2025 Chang 2025 Chang 2026 Chang 2027 Ch	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 152 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 0 5 173 27 0 2 21 2 175 175 175 175 2 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	$\begin{array}{c} 191\\ 90\\ 90\\ 49\\ 50\\ 74\\ 80\\ 74\\ 100\\ 71\\ 75\\ 885\\ 87\\ 71\\ 78\\ 885\\ 77\\ 78\\ 885\\ 77\\ 708\\ 41\\ 212\\ 175\\ 7108\\ 4122\\ 27\\ 100\\ 233\\ 191\\ 90\\ 49\\ 90\\ 32\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 75\\ 75\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 234\\ 60\\ 74\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 812\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 71\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 8$	27 10 0 6 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1 1 1 1 1 1	200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 4.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5	3.00 [1 55, 4.00] 0.70 [0.28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0.13, 1.89] 2.72 [14,5, 6.13] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.44 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.17, 1.23] 0.45 [0.38], 3.66] 1.07 [0.38, 3.66] 1.07 [0.38, 3.66] 1.08 [0.37, 2.44] 0.89 [0.71, 1.22] 0.89 [0.71, 1.22] 0.89 [0.71, 1.22] 0.89 [0.71, 1.24] 0.89 [0.71, 1.24] 0.80 [0.24, 3.27] 3.39 [0.23, 4.37] 3.39 [0.23, 4.37] 3.49 [0.14, 5.44] 1.26 [0.75, 2.08] 0.26 [0.10, 2.34] 0.66 [0.10, 2.34] 0.66 [0.10, 2.34] 0.66 [0.10, 4.34] 0.66 [0.10, 4.34] 0.66 [0.10, 4.34] 0.52 [0.03, 6.00] 0.80 [0.25, 1.33] 0.52 [0.03, 6.00] 0.84 [0.24, 6.24] 1.00 [0.25, 0.40] 0.34 [0.04, 6.24] 1.01 [0.07, 1.15] 0.96 [0.79, 1.16]	0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) Risk Ratio MH. Fixed. 35% Cl
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oxslem 2021 Park 2020 Oxslem 2022 Park 2022 Chol 2022 Hojdé 2022 Hojdé 2022 Hojdé 2022 Kima 2022 Tytýurnik 2022 Zytýurnik 2022 Zytýurnik 2022 Kima 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2023 Kinaché 2024 Kinyáma Total (49% CI) Total 49% CI) Total 49% CI) 2016 Lú 2016 Lú 2017 Línar 2020 Coslen 2021 Hojdé 2022 Hojdé 2022 Chol 2022	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 9 120 0 5 177 3 27 0 0 177 3 27 0 0 5 5 177 3 27 0 0 2 5 177 3 27 0 0 2 5 177 3 27 0 2 7 0 120 0 9 9 120 0 5 5 177 3 27 0 27 0 120 0 2 5 175 2 7 0 2 7 0 120 0 2 5 5 175 2 7 0 0 2 2 7 0 0 2 2 7 0 0 2 2 7 0 0 2 2 7 0 2 7 0 0 2 2 7 0 2 2 7 0 2 2 7 0 0 2 2 2 2	1911 90 95 95 95 96 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97	27 10 0 6 11 11 11 11 11 19 9 10 12 12 4 4 6 60 0 17 1 1 2 3 3 6 60 0 17 1 1 2 2 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 18 18 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200	7.4% 5.2% 6.5% 6.5% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6	-3.09 [1:55, 4:60] -0.79 [1:56, 4:60] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1.68] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1.38] 4.30 [2:29, 8:07] 1.17 [0:38, 3:66] 1.06 [0:85, 1:33] 0.46 [0:17, 1:23] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.87 [0:31, 1:12] 0.86 [0:31, 2:49] 0.81 [0:31, 1:49] 0.82 [0:31, 1:49] 0.83 [0:01, 1:24] 0.83 [0:01, 1:24] 0.83 [0:01, 1:24] 0.84 [0:02, 1:28] 1.26 [0:76, 2:08] 0.33 [0:04, 2:4; 3:7] 3.99 [0:33, 3:54] 0.29 [0:01, 7:22] 0.20 [0:03, 3:44] 1.26 [0:76, 2:08] 2.00 [0:28, 1:08] 0.28 [0:026, 5:1, 33] 3.94 [0:14, 6:24; 4:51] 0.38 [0:04, 5:1, 13] 0.48 [0:05; 1:33] 0.48 [0:0	
2020 Klompmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2020 Oosten 2022 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hujde 2022 Hujde 2022 Kim 2022 Kim 2023 Chao 2023 Khachfe 2023 Viel 2023 Viel 2024 Kim/ama 2024 Kim/ama 2026 Gall 2020 Costen 2022 Viel 2022 Choi 2022 Viel 2022 Choi 2022 Viel 2022 Choi 2022 Viel 2022 Choi 2022 Choi 2024	39 7 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	$\begin{array}{c} 191\\ 90\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 98\\ 97\\ 97\\ 98\\ 97\\ 97\\ 98\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97\\ 97$	27 10 0 6 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	200 409 900 167 60 167 60 108 3926 53 45 53 54 54 55 55 54 55 55 55 55 55	7.4% 52% 36% 36% 36% 36% 36% 36% 36% 36% 36% 36	-3.09 [1:56, 4:09] -3.09 [1:57, 4:09] 0.70 [0:28, 1:76] Not estimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 2.72 [1:45, 5:13] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1:38] 1.30 [0:08, 3:66] 1.07 [0:08, 3:66] 1.07 [0:08, 3:66] 1.08 [0:71, 1:21] 0.69 [0:31, 2:44] 0.89 [0:37, 2:44] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.69 [0:37, 2:44] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.89 [0:37, 1:24] 0.80 [0:37, 2:44] 0.81 [0:07, 1:31] 0.80 [0:07, 2:41] 0.81 [0:07, 2:61] 0.31 [0:07, 3:76] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.30 [0:05, 5:41] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 2.00 [0:05, 5:41] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.31 [0:07, 5:20] 0.31 [0:07, 5:31]	
2020 Kiompmaker 2020 Oxelan 2021 Park 2020 Oxelan 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Hoijde 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2022 Xina 2023 Xina 2024 Kiniyama 2024 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Kiniyama 2020 Xiniyama 2020 X	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 3 9 120 5 8 9 120 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 9 120 5 5 8 173 27 0 8 8 9 120 5 5 8 173 27 0 8 8 9 120 0 5 5 8 173 27 0 8 8 9 120 0 173 27 0 175 175 177 0 175 177 0 177 0 177 0 177 0 177 0 177 0 177 0 177 177	1911 90 90 9234 60 74 1000 71 75 885 37 78 812 1775 812 1755 1006 47 812 1755 1006 20 23 191 20 233 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90	27 10 0 6 11 11 11 11 11 11 12 14 448 6 60 17 1 1 2 3 3 1 2 2 2 18 3 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 2 2 18 3 18 2 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	200 409 90 409 90 167 60 167 74 100 168 3926 3926 (P < 0. 100 16 3926 (P < 0. 100 16 3026 225 202 202 202 202 202 202 202	7.4% 5.2% 6.5% 6.5% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8		0.01 0.1 10 100 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD) 0.01 0.1 1 0 100 Favours (RPD) Favours (LPD)
2020 (Nonpmaker 2020 Oosten 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Choi 2022 Heijde 2022 Kim 2022 Tyttyunnik 2022 Tyttyunnik 2022 Tyttyunnik 2022 Tyttyunnik 2022 Tyttyunnik 2022 Tyttyunnik 2023 Zhang 2023 Zhang 2023 Zhang 2024 Emmen 2024 Emmen 2024 Emmen 2024 Emmen 2024 Kim 2016 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2010 Costen 2021 Park 2022 Choi 2022 Cho	39 7 0 3 42 5 4 4 4 3 8 9 120 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 173 27 0 5 175 27 0 5 175 27 0 5 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 27 0 120 175 175 27 0 120 175 175 175 175 177 0 170 175 177 0 170 177 0 177 0 177 177	1911 90 90 950 234 60 74 1000 71 775 885 37 78 812 27 1006 47 812 27 100 233 31 1911 27 100 233 31 1911 27 100 233 234 41 27 100 233 234 100 20 234 41 27 100 20 234 41 27 100 20 234 41 27 100 20 234 41 27 100 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	27 70 00 66 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 10 10 10 10 10 10	200 409 90 409 90 409 90 167 60 74 100 108 53 455 54 412 1006 107 60 0 74 412 1006 107 60 0 54 412 1006 54 412 1006 55 54 412 1006 54 412 202 202 202 202 202 202 202 2	7.4% 5.2% 3.6% 6.5% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 4.8% 5.5% 4.8% 5.5% 4.4% 8.3% 5.5% 4.4% 6.9% 100.0% 100.0% 1.5% 1.5% 0.8% 1.5% 0.8% 1.5% 0.8% 1.5% 0.8% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5	-3.09 [1:55, 4:60] -0.70 [1:55, 4:60] 0.70 [0:28, 1.76] Not cestimable 0.50 [0:13, 1:89] 0.51 [0:13, 1:89] 0.45 [0:17, 1:23] 0.44 [0:14, 1:38] 1.30 [2:28, 0.77] 1.01 [0:42, 2:26] 1.01 [0:42, 2:36] 1.02 [0:05, 1:33] 0.45 [0:17, 1:22] 0.69 [0:31, 2:44] 0.89 [0:71, 1:12] 0.96 [0:31, 2:44] 1.98 [0:67, 1:15] 1.19 [0.86, 1:66] = B1% Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% C1 0.31 [0:01, 7:26] 0.33 [0:02, 2:43] 3.99 [0:23, 4:37] 3.90 [0:23, 4:37] 3.90 [0:23, 4:37] 3.90 [0:23, 4:37] 3.90 [0:05, 5:43] 3.90 [0:05, 5:43] 3.90 [0:05, 5:1, 33] 3.94 [0:01, 2:28] 0.92 [0:01, 0:23, 9:3] 0.93 [0:01, 1, 2:29] 0.93 [0:02, 5:1, 33] 3.94 [0:01, 2:3, 1:5] 0.96 [0:75, 5:1, 33] 0.96 [0:75, 1:33] 0.96 [0:75	A Constraints of the second se

FIGURE 5

Comparison of secondary outcomes between the two groups. (A) Conversion rate, (B) blood transfusion, (C) delayed gastric emptying, and (D) reoperation.

reduce postoperative complications. Compared with previous studies, our meta-analysis has the following innovations. On the one hand, the number of studies and sample sizes included in the previously published meta-analyses were limited, which affected the statistical power and failed to draw convincing conclusions. In contrast, we included a larger number of studies (29 studies) and a larger sample size (15137 subjects), making our results more

reliable. On the other hand, the population we included was broader, including patients with non-ampullary tumors, which made our conclusion more universal. In addition, Conversion to open is associated with an increased risk of postoperative complications (39). Our summarized results suggest that the conversion rates in the RPD group is significantly lower than that in the LPD group. Similarly, several previously published studies



have observed the benefit of robotic surgery in reducing conversion rates in a variety of procedures (46–48). POPF is the most common and destructive complication after PD surgery, with an incidence of up to 20% (49). POPF is classified by the International Pancreatic Surgery Research Group (ISGPS) into clinically relevant POPF (Grade B and C) and biochemical POPF (Grade A) (50). Our study showed no significant difference between RPD and LPD in the incidence of clinically relevant POPF. This is consistent with the results of two previous meta-analyses (39, 40).

Increased intraoperative blood loss is significantly associated with poor prognosis in PD, and reducing intraoperative blood loss is helpful to improve perioperative outcomes (51). One of the advantages of minimally invasive surgery is that it is less invasive and less bleeding during the operation (52). Compared to LPD, RPD has a wider field of view, fewer tremors, and can perform detailed anatomy with less surgical trauma (40, 52). These advantages may lead to benefits in reducing intraoperative blood loss. Our findings showed that RPD significantly reduced the blood transfusion rate.

Some researchers are concerned that robotic surgery may prolong the operation time because of the additional time required to assemble the equipment (52, 53). However, a recent study (3) found that when the surgical team goes beyond the learning curve and gains enough experience, the surgical time for RPD is significantly reduced. A previous meta-analysis by Kamarajah et al. (39) found that RPD did not extend surgery time compared to LPD. The results of this study also indicated that the operation time was comparable between the RPD group and the LPD group. In addition, previous evidence has shown that robot-assisted gastrointestinal surgery can improve gastrointestinal function recovery and shorten hospital stays compared to laparoscopic surgery (54). In PD surgery, we also demonstrated the benefit of RPD in reducing the length of hospital stay.

Complete tumor resection and appropriate lymph node dissection are the keys of PD. R0 resection is an important predictor of long-term survival (49). A previous meta-analysis (49) showed no significant difference in R0 resection rates between different surgical approaches (open PD, LPD, and RPD). This is similar to the results of this study. Obtaining a sufficient number of lymph nodes is critical for accurate assessment of lymph node status, and the number of lymph nodes obtained is significantly associated with accurate staging and long-term patient survival (55). Our study showed that RPD significantly increased the number of lymph nodes acquired compared with LPD. This may be due to the robotic platform's ability to provide enlarged 3D images that eliminate arm tremors and aid in precise lymph node dissection (40).

The high cost may be a factor limiting the further adoption of RPD. Due to the lack of data related to hospitalization costs in the included studies, we did not assess the difference in total costs between RPD and LPD. In fact, the increase in the cost of robotic surgery is mainly due to the installation and maintenance of the equipment (30). For example, in other areas such as hepatectomy and distal pancreatectomy, some studies have found that the surgical cost of robotic surgery is higher than laparoscopic surgery, while the hospital cost of robotic surgery is lower than laparoscopic surgery (56, 57). With the development of technology and the popularity of robotic surgery, the equipment cost of RPD is expected to decrease. In addition, the benefits of robotic surgery (lower postoperative complications and shorter hospital stays) may further reduce hospital costs. Therefore, the economic benefits of RPD deserve further evaluation in future studies.

This study has the following strengths. On the one hand, we conducted an extensive literature search, incorporating all the evidence currently available. On the other hand, we confirmed the robustness of the main results through sensitivity analysis.

There are some limitations to this study. First, most of the studies included in this meta-analysis are retrospective studies and lack RCTs. Second, high heterogeneity was found in some outcome measures (length of hospital stay, number of lymph nodes harvested, and operation time), which hindered accurate estimation of outcomes. The included studies originate from different countries, which may introduce variability in surgical standards, healthcare infrastructure, and patient management protocols. These differences may be the sources of heterogeneity. However, the sensitivity analysis still confirmed the stability of our main results. Furthermore, most of the included studies originated from high-volume centers. The availability of robotic surgery is limited in some developing countries. Considering the differences among regions, the conclusions of our research may not be directly generalized to some low-volume units. These low-volume centers need to undergo further training with RPD and go through the learning curve in order to bring out the true benefits of RPD. Among the 29 studies we included, 9 studies adopted the PSM design, while the remaining studies did not. The failure to adopt the PSM design may lead to differences in some preoperative basic characteristics (such as age, gender and weight), and these factors may have an impact on the results of the study. In the future, welldesigned RCTs are needed to further balance the differences between the experimental group and the control group to verify the benefits of RPD. Finally, although our meta-analysis suggests that RPD is no less safe and effective than LPD in the perioperative period, few studies have evaluated the difference in long-term oncology outcomes between RPD and LPD. Given the potential benefits of RPD, future well-designed studies investigating the longterm oncology prognosis of RPD are warranted.

In conclusion, this meta-analysis suggests that compared with LPD, RPD can significantly reduce postoperative complications, blood transfusion, conversion, and hospital stay, and increase the number of lymph nodes harvested. In addition, there were no significant differences in mortality, reoperation rates and R0 resection rates between the two procedures.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

Author contributions

FL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. YZ: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. QC: Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. TC: Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Software, Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. HX: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Software, Validation, Writing – original

References

1. Zhang XP, Xu S, Zhao ZM, Yu GS, Han B, Chen X, et al. Outcomes of robotic versus laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy following learning curves of surgeons: A multicenter study on 2255 patients. *Ann Surg.* (2023) 111:1214–30. doi: 10.1097/sla.000000000006167

2. Peng L, Lin S, Li Y, Xiao W. Systematic review and meta-analysis of robotic versus open pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Surg Endosc.* (2017) 31:3085–97. doi: 10.1007/s00464-016-5371-2

3. Tang G, Zhang L, Xia L, Zhang J, Chen R, Zhou R. Comparison of short-term outcomes of robotic versus open Pancreaticoduodenectomy: A Meta-Analysis of

draft, Writing – review & editing. TX: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. LZ: Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. QR: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. WL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Formal Analysis.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

randomized controlled trials and Propensity-Score-Matched studies. Int J Surg. (2024) 111:1214–123. doi: 10.1097/js9.00000000001871

4. Farah E, Al Abbas A, Abreu AA, Cheng M, Yopp A, Wang S, et al. Minimally invasive pancreaticoduodenectomy: A favorable approach for frail patients with pancreatic cancer. *Surgery*. (2024) 175:1168–75. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2023.12.022

5. Uijterwijk BA, Wei K, Kasai M, Ielpo B, Hilst JV, Chinnusamy P, et al. Minimally invasive versus open pancreatoduodenectomy for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: Individual patient data meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* (2023) 49:1351–61. doi: 10.1016/j.ejso.2023.03.227

6. Yan JF, Pan Y, Chen K, Zhu HP, Chen QL. Minimally invasive pancreatoduodenectomy is associated with lower morbidity compared to open pancreatoduodenectomy: An updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and high-quality nonrandomized studies. *Med (Baltimore).* (2019) 98:e16730. doi: 10.1097/md.000000000016730

7. Gagner M, Pomp A. Laparoscopic pylorus-preserving pancreatoduodenectomy. Surg Endosc. (1994) 8:408–10. doi: 10.1007/bf00642443

8. Wang K, Dong SS, Zhang W, Ni YY, Xie F, Wang JC, et al. Surgical methods influence on the risk of anastomotic fistula after pancreaticoduodenectomy: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* (2023) 37:3380–97. doi: 10.1007/s00464-022-09832-4

9. Emmen A, Zwart MJW, Khatkov IE, Boggi U, Groot Koerkamp B, Busch OR, et al. Robot-assisted versus laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy: a pan-European multicenter propensity-matched study. *Surgery*. (2024) 175:1587–94. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2024.02.015

10. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Int J Surg.* (2021) 88:105906. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2021.105906

11. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj.* (2019) 366:14898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.14898

12. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med.* (2002) 21:1539–58. doi: 10.1002/sim.1186

13. Liu R, Zhang T, Zhao ZM, Tan XL, Zhao GD, Zhang X, et al. The surgical outcomes of robot-assisted laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy versus laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy for periampullary neoplasms: a comparative study of a single center. *Surg Endosc.* (2017) 31:2380–6. doi: 10.1007/s00464-016-5238-6

14. Goh BKP, Low TY, Kam JH, Lee SY, Chan CY. Initial experience with laparoscopic and robotic surgery for the treatment of periampullary tumours: single institution experience with the first 30 consecutive cases. *ANZ J Surg.* (2019) 89:E137–e41. doi: 10.1111/ans.15033

15. Zhang Y, Hong D, Zhang C, Hu Z. Total laparoscopic versus robot-assisted laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Biosci Trends*. (2018) 12:484–90. doi: 10.5582/ bst.2018.01236

16. Klompmaker S, van Hilst J, Wellner UF, Busch OR, Coratti A, D'Hondt M, et al. Outcomes after minimally-invasive versus open pancreatoduodenectomy: A pan-European propensity score matched study. *Ann Surg.* (2020) 271:356-63. doi: 10.1097/sla.00000000002850

17. van Oosten AF, Ding D, Habib JR, Irfan A, Schmocker RK, Sereni E, et al. Perioperative outcomes of robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy: a propensity-matched analysis to open and laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy. *J Gastrointest Surg.* (2021) 25:1795–804. doi: 10.1007/s11605-020-04869-z

18. Park SE, Choi HJ, You YK, Hong TH. Effectiveness and stability of robot-assisted anastomosis in minimally invasive pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Ann Surg Treat Res.* (2021) 100:329–37. doi: 10.4174/astr.2021.100.6.329

19. Choi M, Rho SY, Kim SH, Hwang HK, Lee WJ, Kang CM. Total laparoscopic versus robotic-assisted laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy: which one is better? *Surg Endosc.* (2022) 36:8959–66. doi: 10.1007/s00464-022-09347-y

20. Guo W, Ye X, Li J, Lu S, Wang M, Wang Z, et al. Comparison of surgical outcomes among open, laparoscopic, and robotic pancreatoduodenectomy: a single-center retrospective study. *BMC Surg.* (2022) 22:348. doi: 10.1186/s12893-022-01797-4

21. van der Heijde N, Vissers FL, Manzoni A, Zimmitti G, Balsells J, Berrevoet F, et al. Use and outcome of minimally invasive pancreatic surgery in the European E-MIPS registry. *HPB (Oxford)*. (2023) 25:400–8. doi: 10.1016/j.hpb.2022.07.015

22. Jang JY, Kang CM, Kim H, Choi M, Lee JH, Choi SH. Which one is better? Laparoscopic versus robotic reconstruction in the remnant soft pancreas with a small pancreatic duct following pancreaticoduodenectomy: a multicenter study with propensity score matching analysis. *Surg Endosc.* (2023) 37:4028–39. doi: 10.1007/ s00464-022-09602-2

23. Kim H, Choi SH, Jang JY, Choi M, Lee JH, Kang CM. Multicenter comparison of totally laparoscopic and totally robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy: Propensity score and learning curve-matching analyses. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci.* (2022) 29:311–21. doi: 10.1002/jhbp.1078

24. Naffouje SA, Kamarajah SK, Denbo JW, Salti GI, Dahdaleh FS. Surgical Approach does not Affect Return to Intended Oncologic Therapy Following Pancreaticoduodenectomy for Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma: A Propensity-Matched Study. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2022) 29:7793–803. doi: 10.1245/s10434-022-12347-w

25. Tyutyunnik P, Klompmaker S, Lombardo C, Lapshyn H, Menonna F, Napoli N, et al. Learning curve of three European centers in laparoscopic, hybrid laparoscopic, and robotic pancreatoduodenectomy. *Surg Endosc.* (2022) 36:1515–26. doi: 10.1007/ s00464-021-08439-5

26. Wach MM, Myneni AA, Miller L, Boccardo J, Ibrahim-Zada I, Schwaitzberg SS, et al. An assessment of perioperative outcomes for open, laparoscopic, and robot-assisted pancreaticoduodenectomy in New York State. *J Surg Oncol.* (2022) 126:1434–41. doi: 10.1002/jso.27075

27. Zong K, Luo K, Chen K, Ye J, Liu W, Zhai W. A comparative study of robotics and laparoscopic in minimally invasive pancreatoduodenectomy: A single-center experience. *Front Oncol.* (2022) 12:960241. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.960241

28. Chao YJ, Lu WH, Liao TK, Su PJ, Wang CJ, Lai CH, et al. Feasibility of simultaneous development of laparoscopic and robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy. *Sci Rep.* (2023) 13:6190. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-33269-x

29. Kalabin A, Mani VR, Kruse RL, Schlesselman C, Li KY, Staveley-O'Carroll KF, et al. New perspectives on robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy: An analysis of the National Cancer Database. *World J Gastrointest Surg.* (2023) 15:60–71. doi: 10.4240/wjgs.v15.i1.60

30. Khachfe HH, Nassour I, Hammad AY, Hodges JC, AlMasri S, Liu H, et al. Robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy: increased adoption and improved outcomes: is laparoscopy still justified? *Ann Surg.* (2023) 278:e563-e9. doi: 10.1097/sla.000000000005687

31. Lee W, Song KB, Hong S, Park Y, Kwak BJ, Jun E, et al. Minimally invasive versus open pancreaticoduodenectomy for distal bile duct cancer: an inverse probability of treatment weighting analysis of outcomes. *Surg Endosc.* (2023) 37:881–90. doi: $10.1007/s00464-022-09533-\gamma$

32. Uijterwijk BA, Lemmers DHL, Bolm L, Luyer M, Koh YX, Mazzola M, et al. Long-term outcomes after laparoscopic, robotic, and open pancreatoduodenectomy for distal cholangiocarcinoma: an international propensity score-matched cohort study. *Ann Surg.* (2023) 278:e570–e9. doi: 10.1097/sla.00000000005743

33. Wei TH, Su PJ, Lu WH, Liao TK, Wang CJ, Lai CH, et al. Minimally invasive approaches increase postoperative complications in obese patients undergoing pancreaticoduodenectomy during the initial development period: a propensity score matching study. *Surg Endosc.* (2023) 37:2770–80. doi: 10.1007/s00464-022-09773-y

34. Wehrle CJ, Chang JH, Gross AR, Woo K, Naples R, Stackhouse KA, et al. Comparing oncologic and surgical outcomes of robotic and laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy in patients with pancreatic cancer: a propensity-matched analysis. *Surg Endosc.* (2024) 38:2602–10. doi: 10.1007/s00464-024-10783-1

35. Dai M, Chen L, Xu Q, Cui M, Li P, Liu W, et al. Robotic versus laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy for pancreatic cancer: evaluation and analysis of surgical efficacy. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2024) 31:7043–51. doi: 10.1245/s10434-024-15764-1

36. Kang JS, Lee M, Lee JS, Han Y, Sohn HJ, Lee B, et al. Perioperative outcomes of robot-assisted pancreatoduodenectomy (PD) and totally laparoscopic PD after overcoming learning curves with comparison of oncologic outcomes between open PD and minimally invasive PD. Ann Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg. (2024) 28:508–15. doi: 10.14701/ahbps.24-121

37. Kuriyama N, Fujii T, Kaluba B, Sakamoto T, Komatsubara H, Noguchi D, et al. Short-term surgical outcomes of open, laparoscopic, and robot-assisted pancreatoduodenectomy: A comparative, single-center, retrospective study. *Asian J Endosc Surg.* (2025) 18:e13397. doi: 10.1111/ases.13397

38. Gall TM, Pencavel TD, Cunningham D, Nicol D, Jiao LR. Transition from open and laparoscopic to robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy in a UK tertiary referral hepatobiliary and pancreatic centre - Early experience of robotic pancreaticoduodenectomy. *HPB (Oxford)*. (2020) 22:1637-44. doi: 10.1016/j.hpb.2020.03.008

39. Kamarajah SK, Bundred J, Marc OS, Jiao LR, Manas D, Abu Hilal M, et al. Robotic versus conventional laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* (2020) 46:6–14. doi: 10.1016/ j.ejso.2019.08.007

40. Ouyang L, Zhang J, Feng Q, Zhang Z, Ma H, Zhang G. Robotic versus laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy: an up-to-date system review and meta-analysis. *Front Oncol.* (2022) 12:834382. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.834382

41. Cho JY, Han HS, Yoon YS, Hwang DW, Jung K, Kim YK. Postoperative complications influence prognosis and recurrence patterns in periampullary cancer. *World J Surg.* (2013) 37:2234–41. doi: 10.1007/s00268-013-2106-6

42. van Hilst J, de Rooij T, Bosscha K, Brinkman DJ, van Dieren S, Dijkgraaf MG, et al. Laparoscopic versus open pancreatoduodenectomy for pancreatic or periampullary tumours (LEOPARD-2): a multicentre, patient-blinded, randomised controlled phase 2/3 trial. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2019) 4:199–207. doi: 10.1016/s2468-1253(19)30004-4

43. Sattari SA, Sattari AR, Makary MA, Hu C, He J. Laparoscopic versus open pancreatoduodenectomy in patients with periampullary tumors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Surg.* (2023) 277:742–55. doi: 10.1097/sla.00000000005785

44. Armengol-García C, Blandin-Alvarez V, Sharma E, Salinas-Ruiz LE, González-Méndez ML, Monteiro Dos Santos M, et al. Perioperative outcomes of robotic vs laparoscopic pancreatoduodenectomy: a meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis. *Surg Endosc.* (2025) 39:1462–72. doi: 10.1007/s00464-024-11515-1

45. Tang G, Chen F, Chen R, Zhou R, Zhang J. Robotic versus laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy for pancreatic and periampullary tumors: a meta-analysis. *Front Oncol.* (2024) 14:1486504. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2024.1486504

46. Liang B, Peng Y, Yang W, Yang Y, Li B, Wei Y, et al. Robotic versus laparoscopic liver resection for posterosuperior segments: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *HPB (Oxford)*. (2024) 26:1089–102. doi: 10.1016/j.hpb.2024.06.003

47. Zhu XM, Bai X, Wang HQ, Dai DQ. Comparison of efficacy and safety between robotic-assisted versus laparoscopic surgery for locally advanced mid-low rectal cancer following neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg.* (2024) 111:54–1166. doi: 10.1097/js9.00000000001854

48. Li Z, Zhou W, Yang W, Miao Y, Zhang Y, Duan L, et al. Efficacy and safety of robotic vs. laparoscopic gastrectomy for patients with gastric cancer: systematic

review and meta-analysis. Int J Surg. (2024) 110:8054-6. doi: 10.1097/js9.00000000001826

49. Kamarajah SK, Bundred JR, Marc OS, Jiao LR, Hilal MA, Manas DM, et al. A systematic review and network meta-analysis of different surgical approaches for pancreaticoduodenectomy. *HPB (Oxford)*. (2020) 22:329–39. doi: 10.1016/j.hpb.2019.09.016

50. Bassi C, Marchegiani G, Dervenis C, Sarr M, Abu Hilal M, Adham M, et al. The 2016 update of the International Study Group (ISGPS) definition and grading of postoperative pancreatic fistula: 11 Years After. *Surgery.* (2017) 161:584–91. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2016.11.014

51. Seykora TF, Ecker BL, McMillan MT, Maggino L, Beane JD, Fong ZV, et al. The beneficial effects of minimizing blood loss in pancreatoduodenectomy. *Ann Surg.* (2019) 270:147–57. doi: 10.1097/sla.00000000002714

52. Kabir T, Tan HL, Syn NL, Wu EJ, Kam JH, Goh BKP. Outcomes of laparoscopic, robotic, and open pancreatoduodenectomy: A network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and propensity-score matched studies. *Surgery*. (2022) 171:476–89. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2021.07.020

53. Emmen A, de Graaf N, Khatkov IE, Busch OR, Dokmak S, Boggi U, et al. Implementation and outcome of minimally invasive pancreatoduodenectomy in

Europe: a registry-based retrospective study - a critical appraisal of the first 3 years of the E-MIPS registry. *Int J Surg.* (2024) 110:2226-33. doi: 10.1097/js9.00000000001121

54. Loureiro P, Barbosa JP, Vale JF, Barbosa J. Laparoscopic versus robotic gastric cancer surgery: short-term outcomes-systematic review and meta-analysis of 25,521 patients. J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A. (2023) 33:782–800. doi: 10.1089/ lap.2023.0136

55. Zhang X, Sun C, Zhao L, Niu P, Li Z, Fei H, et al. At least 16 lymph nodes are recommended to examine during pancreaticoduodenectomy in ampullary adenocarcinoma. *Am J Cancer Res.* (2023) 13:340–51.

56. Koh YX, Zhao Y, Tan IE, Tan HL, Chua DW, Loh WL, et al. Evaluating the economic efficiency of open, laparoscopic, and robotic distal pancreatectomy: an updated systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc.* (2024) 38:3035–51. doi: 10.1007/s00464-024-10889-6

57. Koh YX, Zhao Y, Tan IE, Tan HL, Chua DW, Loh WL, et al. Comparative costeffectiveness of open, laparoscopic, and robotic liver resection: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Surgery*. (2024) 176:11–23. doi: 10.1016/ j.surg.2024.04.015