Evidence Table 2. Systematic review evidence II

| **Study** | **Types of studies included** | | **Summary Outcomes** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RCT** | **Quasi RCT** | **Obs** | **Visual impairment** | **Patient Reported** | **IOP** | **Visual field progression Optic nerve damage** | **Harms** |
| Aptel 20081 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Bimatoprost versus Latanoprost (5 trials) IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (range 1 to 6 months) 8 AM: WMD, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.01 to 0.99 12PM: WMD, 1.17; 95% CI, 0.68 to 1.66 4 PM: WMD, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.26 to 1.29 8 PM: WMD, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.02 to 1.32  Bimatoprost versus Travoprost (3 trials) IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (range 1 to 6 months) 8 AM: WMD, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.32 to 1.72 12 PM: WMD, 0.86; 95% CI, 0.12 to 1.59 4PM: WMD, 0.52; 95% CI, -0.25 to 1.30 8PM: WMD, 0.80;95% CI,-0.06 to 1.66  Travoprost versus Latanoprost  (2 trials) IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (range 1 to 6 months) 8AM: WMD, 0.70; 95%CI, -0.14 to 1.54 12PM: WMD, 0.40; 95% CI, -0.49 to 1.29 4PM: WMD, -0.10; 95%CI, -0.98 to 0.78 8PM: WMD, 0.20; 95% CI-0.71 to 1.11 | NR | Bimatoprost versus Latanoprost Conjuctival hyperemia (5 trials):   RR, 1.70; 95% CI 1.44 to 2.02  Bimatoprost versus Travoprost Conjuctival hyperemia (3 trials):   RR, 1.19; 95% CI, 1.00 to 1.42  Travoprost versus Latanoprost Conjuctival hyperemia (2 trials): RR,1.45; 95% CI, 1.22 to 1.72 |
| Burr 20042 | Y | Y | N | Initial medical treatment versus initial trabeculectomy  Visual acuity loss of 2 or more Snellen lines  OR 1.48; 95%CI, 0.58 to 3.81  (1 study)  OR 0.5; 95% CI, 0.33 to 0.75  (1 study) | Covered with primary study discussion (KQ 2) | Initial medical treatment versus initial trabeculectomy   Mean change in IOP at 1 year (2 trials): WMD, 6.14; 95% CI, 4.25 to 8.02  Mean IOP difference from baseline to 1 year (1 trial): MD, 3.60; 95% CI, 2.78 to 4.42 | Initial medical treatment versus initial trabeculectomy  Mean difference in visual field score at 1 year follow-up (1 trial):  MD, -0.5; 95% CI, -1.10 to 0.10  Visual field progression by at least one stage of visual field severity at a mean of 4.6 years follow-up (1 trial):  OR, 2.56; 95% CI, 1.12 to 5.83  Mean difference in visual field score at 5 year follow-up MD, 3.92; 95% CI, 2.02 to 5.82 (1 trial) MD, 0.30; 95% CI, -0.45 to 1.05 (1 trial)  Visual field progression at 5 year follow-up (1 trial): OR, 0.69; 95% CI, 0.29 to 1.67 | Initial medical treatment versus initial trabeculectomy Argon laser trabeculoplasty required as additional treatment at 1 year follow-up (1 trial): OR, 2.36; 95% CI, 1.52 to 3.67 |
| Chai 20103 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy Mean IOP difference from baseline to 6 months (8 trials): WMD, 2.25; 95% CI, 1.38 to 3.1WMD, 3.82; 95% CI, 2.27 to 5.37 (POAG participants only - 3 trials)  Mean IOP difference from baseline to 12 months (6 trials): WMD, 3.64; 95% CI, 2.75 to 4.54  Mean IOP difference from baseline to 24 months (3 trials): WMD, 3.42; 95% CI, 1.80 to 5.03 | NR | Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy  Hypotony (9 trials): RR, 0.29; 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.58  Hyphema (9 trials): RR, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.30 to 0.84  Shallow anterior chamber (9 trials): RR, 0.19; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.45  Cataract formation (8 trials): RR, 0.31; 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.64 |
| Cheng 20084 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Bimatoprost versus Latanoprost  Proportion of patients achieving IOP <= 17mmHg 1 month (2 trials): RD, 5; 95% CI, -9 to 18 3 months (2 trials): RD, 12; 95%CI, 4 to 21 6 months (1 trial): RD, 11; 95% CI 0 to 23  Percent reduction from baseline in diurnal IOP 1 month (3 trials): WMD, 0.25; 95%CI, -5.07 to 5.57 3 months (3 trials): WMD, 2.10; 95%CI, -0.46 to 4.65  Percent reduction from baseline in morning IOP 1 month (9 trials): WMD, 2.59; 95% CI, 0.81 to 4.37 3 months (6 trials): WMD, 2.41; 95%CI, 0.58 to 4.25 6 months (4 trials): WMD, 5.60; 95%CI, 2.95 to 8.26 | NR | Bimatoprost versus Latanoprost  Conjunctival hyperemia (9 trials): RD, 20; 95%CI, 15 to 24    Eye irritation (5 trials):   RD, 1; 95% CI, -3 to 4   Pruritus (5 trials):   RD, 4; 95% CI, -5 to 12   Dry eye (3 trials):  RD, 0; 95% CI, -3 to 3   Ocular inflammation (4 trials):  RD, -1; 95% CI, -2 to 1    Eye pain (2 trials):  RD, -1; 95% CI, -3 to 2  Visual disturbance (2 trials):  RD, 0; 95% CI, -3 to 3  Cystoid macular edema (4 trials): RD, 0; 95% CI, -2 to 2   Iris pigmentation (2 trials):  RD, 0; 95% CI, -1 to 2 |
| Cheng 20095 | Y | Y | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus Dorzolamide and Timolol (fixed combination and concomitant administration)  Diurnal mean percent reduction in IOP 1 month (5 trials):  WMD, -3.22; 95% CI, –6.85 to 0.40  2 months (5 trials):  WMD, –1.88; 95% CI, –4.71 to 0.96  3 months (6 trials):  WMD, 0.57; 95% CI, –2.46 to 3.59  6 months (2 trials):  WMD, –5.14; 95% CI, –14.13 to 4.14  Mean percent reduction in IOP at 10:00 1 month (6 trials):  WMD, –2.47; 95% CI, –5.20 to 0.26  2 months (4 trials):  WMD, 0.19; 95% CI, –4.81 to 5.19  3 months (5 trials):  WMD, 1.03; 95% CI, –1.79 to 3.84  6 months (2 trials):  WMD, –1.47; 95% CI–4.00 to 1.05 | NR | Latanoprost versus Dorzolamide and Timolol (fixed combination and concomitant administration)  Ocular adverse events (3 trials):  RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.21 to 4.46  Conjunctival hyperemia (8 trials): RR, 2.38; 95% CI, 1.47 to 3.83  Taste perversion (8 trials):  RR, 0.11; 95% CI, 0.04 to 0.26  Keratitis (4 trials):  RR, 0.80; 95% CI, 0.43 to 1.79   Iris pigmentation (3 trials):  RR, 8.11; 95% CI, 1.47 to 44.75  Dry eye (4 trials):  RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.27 to 3.43  Visual disturbance (6 trials):  RR, 1.22; 95% CI, 0.53 to 2.82 |
| Cheng 20106 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Proportion of patients with normal endpoint IOP without antiglaucoma surgery or medication after at least one year Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy (3 trials):  RD, -0.16; 95% CI, -0.30 to -0.02  Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy plus antimetabolites (3 trials):  RD, -0.39; 95% CI, -0.53 to -0.24  Deep sclerectomy versus trabeculectomy (5 trials):  RD, -0.10; 95% CI, -0.19 to 0.00  Deep sclerectomy plus Mitomycin C versus trabeculectomy plus Mitomycin C (2 trials): RD, -0.16, 95% CI, -0.32 to -0.01 (2 trials) | NR | Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy  Hyphema (7 trials): RD, –0.08; 95% CI, –0.16 to 0.00  Shallow/flat anterior chamber (5 trials):  RD, –0.16; 95% CI, –0.23 to –0.09  Hypotony (7 trials) :  RD, –0.12; 95% CI, –0.24 to 0.00  Choroidal detachment (3 trials)  RD, –0.15; 95% CI, –0.24 to –0.05  Cataract (5 trials) RD, –0.09 95% CI, –0.16 to –0.03  Deep sclerectomy versus trabeculectomy  Hyphema (7 trials) RD, –0.11; 95% CI, –0.20 to –0.02  Shallow/flat anterior chamber (7 trials) RD, –0.22; 95% CI, –0.34 to –0.09  Hypotony (6 trials) RD, –0.09; 95% CI, –0.16 to –0.01  Choroidal detachment (4 trials) RD, –0.16; 95% CI, –0.25 to –0.07  Inflammation (6 trials) RD, –0.05; 95% CI, –0.10 to –0.01  Cataract (4 trials) RD, –0.23; 95% CI, –0.50 to 0.04 |
| Cox 20087 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Mean differences in IOP from baseline to 3 months Non-Fixed versus fixed combination medications  Prior to instillation of morning dose: MD, 0.20; 95% CI, -0.11 to 0.51 (6 trials)  2 hours after dose: MD, 0.39; 95% CI, 0.04 to 0.75 (6 trials)  8 hours after dose: MD, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.16 to 0.85 (4 trials) | NR | Narrative summary only |
| Eyawo 20098 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Mean IOP reduction from baseline to > = 3 months  Travoprost versus Latanoprost (9 trials): WMD, –0.24; 95% CI, –0.87 to 0.38 (9 trials)  Travoprost versus Bimatoprost (8 trials): WMD, 0.88, 95% CI, 0.13 to 1.63  Latanoprost versus Bimatoprost (8 trials): WMD, 0.73, 95% CI, 0.10 to 1.37 | NR | Travoprost versus Latanoprost Conjuctival hyperemia (6 trials): RR, 5.71; 95% CI, 1.81 to 18.02  Bimatoprost versus Travoprost Conjunctival hyperemia (1 trial): RR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.69 to 0.97  Bimatoprost versus Latanoprost Conjunctival hyperemia (5 trials): RR, 1.59; 95% CI, 1.02 to 2.48 |
| Hodge 200810 | Y | Y | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus Brimonidine Mean IOP reduction from baseline to < 6 months (10 trials): WMD, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.12 to 1.39  Mean IOP reduction from baseline to > = 8 months (4 trials): WMD, 1.64; 95% CI, 0.92 to 2.36  Mean IOP reduction from baseline (all endpoints above - 14 trials): WMD, 1.10; 95% CI, 0.57 to 1.63 | NR | Latanoprost versus Brimonidine Itch/discomfort (8 trials): RR, 0.81; 95% CI, 0.40 to 1.61  Hyperemia (8 trials): RR, 1.37; 95% CI, 0.84 to 2.25  Eyelid disorder (5 trials): RR, 1.61; 95% CI, 0.47 to 5.48  Visual disturbance (8 trials): RR, 1.19; 95% CI, 0.88 to 1.61  Conjunctival disorder (2 trials): RR, 0.16; 95% CI, 0.01 to 5.09  Keratopathy (3 trials): RR, 0.69; 95% CI, 0.24 to 1.96  Dry eye (4 trials): RR, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.26 to 2.27  Hypertrichosis (1 trial): RR, 10.37; 95% CI, 0.59 to 182.60  Increased iris pigmentation (2 trials): RR, 5.48; 95% CI, 0.65 to 46.50  Fatigue (3 trials): RR, 0.27; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.88  Headache (4 trials): RR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.17 to 1.1 |
| Fung 20079 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus brimonidine Mean IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (3 trials): WMD, -1.04; 95% CI, -3.01 to 0.93  Latanoprost versus dorzolamide Mean IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (3 trials): WMD, -2.64; 95% CI, -3.25 to -2.04 | NR | Latanoprost versus brimonidine Ocular hyperaemia (2 trials): RR, 1.22, 95% CI, 0.63 to 2.37  Latanoprost versus dorzolamide Ocular hyperaemia (4 trials): RR, 1.18; 95% CI, 0.59 to 2.37 |
| Honrubia 200911 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Not reported | NR | Latanoprost versus Travoprost: Conjunctival hyperemia (6 trials): OR, 0.512; 95% CI, 0.390 to 0.674  Latanoprost versus Bimatoprost Conjunctival hyperemia (8 trials): OR, 0.32; 95% CI, 0.24 to 0.42 |
| Jampel 200312 | Y | Y | Y | NR | NR | Narrative summary only | Narrative summary only | Narrative summary only |
| Kirwan 200913 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Trabeculectomy with beta radiation versus trabeculectomy only  Mean reduction IOP 12 or more months after surgery (2 trials): WMD, -0.97; 95% CI, -2.56 to 0.62 | NR | Trabeculectomy with beta radiation versus trabeculectomy only or placebo  Cataract (2 trials): RR, 2.89; 95% CI, 1.39 to 6.00  Hypotony (3 trials): RR, 1.79; 95% CI, 0.62 to 5.14  Bleb leak (2 trials): RR, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.12 to 2.38 |
| Li 200614 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Travoprost versus Timolol Mean reduction IOP after 3 or more months (range 3 to 12 months - 4 trials) WMD, −0.81; 95% CI,−1.16 to −0.45  Travoprost versus Bimatoprost Mean reduction IOP after 3 or more months (range 3 to 6 months - 5 trials) WMD, 0.08; 95% CI, −0.62 to 0.79  Travoprost versus Latanoprost Mean reduction IOP after 2 or more weeks (range 2 weeks to 12 months - 6 trials) WMD, −0.57; 95% CI, −1.18 to 0.04  Travoprost 0.004 versus Travoprost 0.0015 Mean reduction IOP after 6 or more months (range 6 to 12 months - 4 trials) WMD, −0.32; 95% CI, −0.62 to −0.02 | NR | Travoprost versus Timolol Conjunctival hyperemia (4 trials): OR, 6.76; 95% CI, 4.93 to 9.25 Iris pigmentation (3 trials): OR, 11.6; 95% CI 2.07 to 59.08  Travoprost versus Bimatoprost Conjunctival hyperemia (4 trials): OR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.42 to 1.00  Travoprost 0.004 versus Latanoprost Conjunctival hyperemia (3 trials): OR, 2.03; 95% CI, 1.49 to 2.75  Travoprost 0.004 versus Travoprost 0.0015 Conjunctival hyperemia (4 trials): OR, 1.64; 95% CI, 1.32 to 2.04 Iris pigmentation (4 trials): OR, 0.74; 95% CI, 0.38 to 1.46 |
| Liu 201015 | Y | N | N | 2-site versus 1-site phacotrabeculectomy Percent of participants with best corrected visual acuity of > = 0.5 RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.74 to 1.12 (2 trials) | NR | 2-site versus 1-site phacotrabeculectomy Mean IOP reduction from baseline to > = 12 months (range 12 - 24 months - 5 trials): WMD, –5.99; 95% CI, –10.74 to -1.24 | NR | 2-site versus 1-site phacotrabeculectomy Hyphema (4 trials): RR, 0.88; 95% CI, 0.42 to 1.82  Choroidal detachment (3 trials): RR, 0.79; 95% CI, 0.31 to 2.02  Hypotony (3 trials): RR, 1.74; 95% CI, 0.84 to 3.60 |
| Loon 200816 | Y | Y | N | NR | NR | Timolol versus Brimonidine Mean IOP reduction (trials of less than 6 months - 3 trials): WMD, 0.16; 95% CI, -0.93 to 1.25  Mean IOP reduction (trials of more than 6 months - 5 trials): WMD, 0.22; 95% CI, -0.81 to 1.26  Mean IOP reduction (all timepoints - 8 trials): WMD, 0.24; 95% CI, -0.57 to 1.04 | NR | Timolol versus Brimonidine  Burning and stinging (8 trials): RR, 1.14; 95% CI, 0.61 to 2.14  Allergy (8 trials): RR, 0.08; 95% CI, 0.01 to 0.47 |
| Maier 200517 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | NR | Medical and/or surgical interventions versus no treatment  Visual field loss or deterioration of optic disc, or both  (OHT - 5 trials): HR, 0.56; 95% CI, 0.39 to 0.81  (POAG - 2 trials): HR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.87 (2 trials)  (NTG - 2 trials): HR 0.70; 95% CI, 0.48 to 1.02 | NR |
| Minckler 200618 | Y | Y | N | Endocyclophotocoagulation versus Ahmed implant Mean logMAR visual acuity at 24 months follow-up MD, 0.24; 95% CI, -0.04 to 0.52 (1 trial)  Single-plate Molteno implant with oral corticosteroids versus single-plate Molteno implant alone  Visual acuity unchanged or within one line from baseline RR, 1.22; 95% CI, 0.93 to 1.61 (1 trial)  Loss of 2 or more lines from baseline RR, 0.22; 95% CI, 0.01 to 4.06 (1 trial)  Double-plate Molteno implant + MMC versus Molteno implant + balanced salt solution Mean logMAR visual acuity at 12 months follow up MD, -0.60; 95% CI, -1.85 to 0.65 (1 trial) | NR | Trabeculectomy versus Ahmed implant Mean IOP at 11 to 13 months follow-up (2 trials): WMD, -3.81; 95% CI, -5.69 to -1.94 Endocyclophotocoagulation versus Ahmed implant Mean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, 1.14; 95% CI, -1.93 to 4.21 Mean IOP at 24 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, 0.66; 95% CI, -2.98 to 4.30 Ahmed implant with MMC versus Ahmed implant with balanced salt solution Mean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, -0.20; 95% CI, -2.82 to 2.42  High-pressure Ahmed implant + MMC + partial Tenon capsule resection versus Standard Ahmed implant + MMC Mean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, -1.13; 95% CI, -4.69 to 2.43  Double-plate Molteno implant versus Schocket shunt Mean IOP at 6 months follow-up MD, 1.67; 95% CI, -1.37 to 4.71 (1 trial) MD, -2.50; 95% CI, -4.60 to -0.40 (1 trial)  Single-plate Molteno implant with oral corticosteroids versus single-plate Molteno implant alone Mean IOP at 6 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, 0.00; 95% CI, -4.75 to 4.75  Double-plate Molteno implant + MMC versus Molteno implant + balanced salt solution Mean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 asldjkasldkjalskdj  trial): MD, 0.30; 95% CI, -7.75 to 8.35 | NR | Narrative summary only |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Argon laser trabeculoplasty versus medical treatment (newly diagnosed patients) Failure to control IOP at 24 months (2 trials): RR, 0.80; 95% CI, 0.71 to 0.91  Argon laser trabeculoplasty versus medical treatment(maximum medical therapy patients) Failure to control IOP at 12 months |  |  |
| Rolim de Moura 200719 | Y | N | N | NR | Covered with primary study discussion (KQ 2) | RR, 0.08; 95% CI, 0.02 to 0.31 (1 trial) RR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.22 to 0.77 (1 trial)  Argon laser trabeculoplasty versus trabeculectomy Failure to control IOP at 24 months (2 trials: RR 2.03; 95%CI, 1.38 to 2.98  Diode laser trabeculoplasty versus argon laser trabeculoplasty Failure to control IOP at 12 months (1 trial): RR 3.0; 95%CI, 0.37 to 24.17 Failure to control IOP at 24 months (1 trial): RR 0.50; 95% CI, 0.10 to 2.43  Selective laser trabeculoplasty versus argon laser trabeculoplasty Failure to control IOP at 12 months (1 trial): RR 1.27; 95% CI, 0.84 to 1.90 | Argon laser trabeculoplasty versus medical treatment (newly diagnosed patients) Visual field progression at 1 year (2 trials): RR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.46 to 1.28  Visual field progression at 2 years (2 trials): RR, 0.70; 95% CI, 0.42 to 1.16 | Laser trabeculoplasty and topical medications (beta blockers) versus no treatment Ocular adverse events (1 trial): RR, 1.52; 95% CI, 0.89 to 2.60 Systemic adverse events (1 trial): RR, 4.88; 95% CI, 0.58 to 41.22   Argon laser trabeculoplasty versus medical treatment (newly diagnosed patients) Peripheral anterior synechiae formation (2 trials): RR, 11.15; 95% CI, 5.63 to 22.09  Diode laser trabeculoplasty versus argon laser trabeculoplasty Peripheral anterior synechiae formation (1 trial): RR 0.54; 95% CI, 0.17 to 1.76 (1 trial) Early IOP spikes (3 trials): RR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.21 to 2.14 |
| Vass 200720 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | NR | Incidence of visual field defect progression Beta blockers versus placebo or untreated (8 trials): OR, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.45 to 1.00  Timolol versus placebo or untreated (7 trials): OR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.41 to 1.05  Betaxolol versus placebo or untreated (1 trial): OR, 0.70; 95% CI, 0.32 to 1.51  Timolol versus Carteolol (2 trials):  OR 0.18; 95% CI, 0.05 to 0.62 Timolol versus Levobunolol (2 trials): OR, 2.20; 95% CI, 1.17 to 4.14Timolol versus brimonidine (3 trials): OR, 1.11; 95% CI, 0.60 to 2.04 (3 trials)  Any topical medical treatment versus placebo or untreated (10 trials): OR. 0.62; 95% CI, 0.47 to 0.81  Change of visual field mean sensitivity Timolol versus Betaxolol (6 trials): WMD, 0.07; 95% CI, -0.43 to 0.57 | Drop out due to drug-related adverse events  Timolol versus placebo (3 trials): OR, 2.48; 95% CI, 0.61 to 10.10  Betaxolol versus placebo (1 trial): OR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.40 to 2.26  Timolol versus Levobunolol (2 trials): OR, 0.80; 95% CI, .034 to 1.87  Timolol versus Betaxolol (5 trials): OR, 2.40; 95% CI, 1.04 to 5.53  Timolol versus Brimonidine (3 trials): OR, 0.21; 95% CI, 0.14 to 0.31 |
| Wilkins 200521 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Cataract extraction combined with trabeculectomy with MMC versus with Placebo or no treatment Mean IOP at 12 months (3 trials): WMD, -3.34; 95% CI,-4.16 to -2.51  Primary trabeculectomy with MMC versus with Placebo or no treatment Mean IOP at 12 months (2 trials): WMD, -5.41; 95% CI, -7.34 to -3.49 | NR | Cataract extraction combined with trabeculectomy with MMC versus with Placebo or no treatment Wound leak (3 trials): OR, 1.88; 95% CI, 0.68 to 5.16 Hypotony (3 trials): OR, 1.65; 95% CI, 0.34 to 7.94 Endophthalmitis (1 trial): OR, 3.44; 95% CI, 0.16 to 91.79 Endophthalmitis (1 trial): OR, 1.14, 95% CI, 0.04 to 29.12  Primary trabeculectomy with MMC versus with Placebo or no treatment Would leak (2 trials): OR, 1.65; 95% CI, 0.16 to 17.47 Hypotony (3 trials): OR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.23 to 4.68 Cataract (4 trials): RR, 1.93; 95% CI, 0.98 to 3.80 |
| Wormald 200122 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Cataract extraction combined with trabeculectomy with 5-FU versus with Placebo or no treatment Mean IOP at 12 months (2 trials): WMD, -1.02; 95% CI, -2.40 to 0.37  Primary trabeculectomy with 5-FU versus with Placebo or no treatment Mean IOP at 12 months (2 trials): WMD, -4.67; 95% CI, -6.60 to -2.74 | NR | Cataract extraction combined with trabeculectomy with 5-FU versus with Placebo or no treatment Wound leak (2 trials): RR, 0.83; 95% CI, 0.15 to 4.56 Epithelial toxicity (2 trials): RR, 3.04; 95% CI, 1.56 to 5.92  Primary trabeculectomy with 5-FU versus with Placebo or no treatment Wound leak (2 trials): RR, 0.47; 95% CI, 0.04 to 4.91 Epithelial toxicity (2 trials): RR. 5.85; 95% CI, 2.04 to 16.83 |
| Zhang 200123 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus timolol Difference in percent IOP reduction from baseline to 1 month (3 trials): MD, 3.8; 95% CI, 1.2 to 6.3 (3 trials) Difference in percent IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (5 trials): WMD, 5.0; 95% CI, 2.8 to 7.3 Difference in percent IOP reduction from baseline to 6 months (4 trials): WMD, 5.0; 95% CI, 2.8 to 7.3 (4 trials) | NR | Latanoprost versus timolol Conjunctival hyperemia (6 trials): RR, 2.20; 95% CI, 1.33 to 3.65 Conjunctivitis (3 trials): RR, 0.80; 95% CI, 0.25 to 2.53 Increased pigmentation (4 trials): RR, 8.01; 95% CI, 1.87 to 34.30 |

Abbreviations: Y = Yes; N = No; NR = Not reported; IOP = Intraocular pressure; OR = Odds ratio; MD = Mean difference, WMD = Weighted mean difference ; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; RR = relative risk; RD = risk difference; RCT = Randomized controlled trial; Quasi RCT = Quasi randomized controlled trial; Obs = Observational study; PRO = Patient reported outcome