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 progressionOptic 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 0.9912PM: WMD, 1.17; 95% CI, 0.68 to 1.664 PM: WMD, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.26 to 1.298 PM: WMD, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.02 to 1.32Bimatoprost 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 1.7212 PM: WMD, 0.86; 95% CI, 0.12 to 1.594PM: WMD, 0.52; 95% CI, -0.25 to 1.308PM: WMD, 0.80;95% CI,-0.06 to 1.66Travoprost 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 1.5412PM: WMD, 0.40; 95% CI, -0.49 to 1.294PM: WMD, -0.10; 95%CI, -0.98 to 0.788PM: WMD, 0.20; 95% CI-0.71 to 1.11 | NR | Bimatoprost versus LatanoprostConjuctival hyperemia (5 trials):  RR, 1.70; 95% CI 1.44 to 2.02Bimatoprost versus TravoprostConjuctival hyperemia (3 trials):  RR, 1.19; 95% CI, 1.00 to 1.42Travoprost versus LatanoprostConjuctival hyperemia (2 trials): RR,1.45; 95% CI, 1.22 to 1.72 |
| Burr 20042 | Y | Y | N | Initial medical treatment versus initial trabeculectomyVisual 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 trabeculectomyMean difference in visual field score at 1 year follow-up (1 trial): MD, -0.5; 95% CI, -1.10 to 0.10Visual 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-upMD, 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 trabeculectomyArgon 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 trabeculectomyMean 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 4.54Mean IOP difference from baseline to 24 months (3 trials): WMD, 3.42; 95% CI, 1.80 to 5.03 | NR | Viscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomyHypotony (9 trials): RR, 0.29; 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.58Hyphema (9 trials): RR, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.30 to 0.84Shallow anterior chamber (9 trials): RR, 0.19; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.45Cataract formation (8 trials): RR, 0.31; 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.64 |
| Cheng 20084 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Bimatoprost versus LatanoprostProportion of patients achieving IOP <= 17mmHg1 month (2 trials): RD, 5; 95% CI, -9 to 183 months (2 trials): RD, 12; 95%CI, 4 to 216 months (1 trial): RD, 11; 95% CI 0 to 23Percent reduction from baseline in diurnal IOP1 month (3 trials): WMD, 0.25; 95%CI, -5.07 to 5.573 months (3 trials): WMD, 2.10; 95%CI, -0.46 to 4.65Percent reduction from baseline in morning IOP1 month (9 trials): WMD, 2.59; 95% CI, 0.81 to 4.373 months (6 trials): WMD, 2.41; 95%CI, 0.58 to 4.256 months (4 trials): WMD, 5.60; 95%CI, 2.95 to 8.26 | NR | Bimatoprost versus LatanoprostConjunctival 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 2Visual disturbance (2 trials): RD, 0; 95% CI, -3 to 3Cystoid 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 IOP1 month (5 trials): WMD, -3.22; 95% CI, –6.85 to 0.402 months (5 trials): WMD, –1.88; 95% CI, –4.71 to 0.963 months (6 trials): WMD, 0.57; 95% CI, –2.46 to 3.596 months (2 trials): WMD, –5.14; 95% CI, –14.13 to 4.14Mean percent reduction in IOP at 10:001 month (6 trials): WMD, –2.47; 95% CI, –5.20 to 0.262 months (4 trials): WMD, 0.19; 95% CI, –4.81 to 5.193 months (5 trials): WMD, 1.03; 95% CI, –1.79 to 3.846 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 4.46Conjunctival hyperemia (8 trials): RR, 2.38; 95% CI, 1.47 to 3.83Taste perversion (8 trials): RR, 0.11; 95% CI, 0.04 to 0.26Keratitis (4 trials): RR, 0.80; 95% CI, 0.43 to 1.79Iris pigmentation (3 trials): RR, 8.11; 95% CI, 1.47 to 44.75Dry eye (4 trials): RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.27 to 3.43Visual 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 medicationafter at least one yearViscocanalostomy versus trabeculectomy (3 trials): RD, -0.16; 95% CI, -0.30 to -0.02Viscocanalostomy 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 0.00Deep 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 trabeculectomyHyphema (7 trials):RD, –0.08; 95% CI, –0.16 to 0.00Shallow/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 0.00Choroidal detachment (3 trials) RD, –0.15; 95% CI, –0.24 to –0.05Cataract (5 trials) RD, –0.09 95% CI, –0.16 to –0.03Deep sclerectomy versus trabeculectomyHyphema (7 trials) RD, –0.11; 95% CI, –0.20 to –0.02Shallow/flat anterior chamber (7 trials) RD, –0.22; 95% CI, –0.34 to –0.09Hypotony (6 trials) RD, –0.09; 95% CI, –0.16 to –0.01Choroidal detachment (4 trials) RD, –0.16; 95% CI, –0.25 to –0.07Inflammation (6 trials) RD, –0.05; 95% CI, –0.10 to –0.01Cataract (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 monthsNon-Fixed versus fixed combination medicationsPrior 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 monthsTravoprost 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 LatanoprostConjuctival hyperemia (6 trials): RR, 5.71; 95% CI, 1.81 to 18.02Bimatoprost versus TravoprostConjunctival hyperemia (1 trial): RR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.69 to 0.97Bimatoprost versus LatanoprostConjunctival hyperemia (5 trials): RR, 1.59; 95% CI, 1.02 to 2.48 |
| Hodge 200810 | Y | Y | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus BrimonidineMean 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 2.36Mean IOP reduction from baseline (all endpoints above - 14 trials): WMD, 1.10; 95% CI, 0.57 to 1.63 | NR | Latanoprost versus BrimonidineItch/discomfort (8 trials): RR, 0.81; 95% CI, 0.40 to 1.61Hyperemia (8 trials): RR, 1.37; 95% CI, 0.84 to 2.25Eyelid disorder (5 trials): RR, 1.61; 95% CI, 0.47 to 5.48Visual disturbance (8 trials): RR, 1.19; 95% CI, 0.88 to 1.61Conjunctival disorder (2 trials): RR, 0.16; 95% CI, 0.01 to 5.09Keratopathy (3 trials): RR, 0.69; 95% CI, 0.24 to 1.96Dry eye (4 trials): RR, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.26 to 2.27Hypertrichosis (1 trial): RR, 10.37; 95% CI, 0.59 to 182.60Increased iris pigmentation (2 trials): RR, 5.48; 95% CI, 0.65 to 46.50Fatigue (3 trials): RR, 0.27; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.88Headache (4 trials): RR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.17 to 1.1 |
| Fung 20079 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus brimonidineMean IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (3 trials): WMD, -1.04; 95% CI, -3.01 to 0.93 Latanoprost versus dorzolamideMean IOP reduction from baseline to 3 months (3 trials): WMD, -2.64; 95% CI, -3.25 to -2.04  | NR | Latanoprost versus brimonidineOcular hyperaemia (2 trials): RR, 1.22, 95% CI, 0.63 to 2.37Latanoprost versus dorzolamideOcular 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 0.674Latanoprost versus BimatoprostConjunctival 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 onlyMean 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 placeboCataract (2 trials): RR, 2.89; 95% CI, 1.39 to 6.00Hypotony (3 trials): RR, 1.79; 95% CI, 0.62 to 5.14Bleb leak (2 trials): RR, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.12 to 2.38 |
| Li 200614 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Travoprost versus TimololMean reduction IOP after 3 or more months (range 3 to 12 months - 4 trials)WMD, −0.81; 95% CI,−1.16 to −0.45Travoprost versus BimatoprostMean reduction IOP after 3 or more months (range 3 to 6 months - 5 trials)WMD, 0.08; 95% CI, −0.62 to 0.79Travoprost versus LatanoprostMean reduction IOP after 2 or more weeks (range 2 weeks to 12 months - 6 trials)WMD, −0.57; 95% CI, −1.18 to 0.04Travoprost 0.004 versus Travoprost 0.0015Mean 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 TimololConjunctival hyperemia (4 trials): OR, 6.76; 95% CI, 4.93 to 9.25Iris pigmentation (3 trials): OR, 11.6; 95% CI 2.07 to 59.08Travoprost versus BimatoprostConjunctival hyperemia (4 trials): OR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.42 to 1.00Travoprost 0.004 versus LatanoprostConjunctival hyperemia (3 trials): OR, 2.03; 95% CI, 1.49 to 2.75Travoprost 0.004 versus Travoprost 0.0015Conjunctival hyperemia (4 trials): OR, 1.64; 95% CI, 1.32 to 2.04Iris pigmentation (4 trials): OR, 0.74; 95% CI, 0.38 to 1.46 |
| Liu 201015 | Y | N | N | 2-site versus 1-site phacotrabeculectomyPercent of participants with best corrected visual acuity of > = 0.5RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.74 to 1.12 (2 trials) | NR | 2-site versus 1-site phacotrabeculectomyMean 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 phacotrabeculectomyHyphema (4 trials): RR, 0.88; 95% CI, 0.42 to 1.82Choroidal detachment (3 trials): RR, 0.79; 95% CI, 0.31 to 2.02Hypotony (3 trials): RR, 1.74; 95% CI, 0.84 to 3.60 |
| Loon 200816  | Y | Y | N | NR | NR | Timolol versus BrimonidineMean IOP reduction (trials of less than 6 months - 3 trials): WMD, 0.16; 95% CI, -0.93 to 1.25Mean IOP reduction (trials of more than 6 months - 5 trials): WMD, 0.22; 95% CI, -0.81 to 1.26Mean IOP reduction (all timepoints - 8 trials): WMD, 0.24; 95% CI, -0.57 to 1.04 | NR | Timolol versus BrimonidineBurning and stinging (8 trials): RR, 1.14; 95% CI, 0.61 to 2.14Allergy (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 treatmentVisual 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 implantMean logMAR visual acuity at 24 months follow-upMD, 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 baselineRR, 1.22; 95% CI, 0.93 to 1.61 (1 trial) Loss of 2 or more lines from baselineRR, 0.22; 95% CI, 0.01 to 4.06 (1 trial)Double-plate Molteno implant + MMC versus Molteno implant + balanced saltsolutionMean logMAR visual acuity at 12 months follow upMD, -0.60; 95% CI, -1.85 to 0.65 (1 trial) | NR | Trabeculectomy versus Ahmed implantMean IOP at 11 to 13 months follow-up (2 trials): WMD, -3.81; 95% CI, -5.69 to -1.94Endocyclophotocoagulation versus Ahmed implantMean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, 1.14; 95% CI, -1.93 to 4.21Mean IOP at 24 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, 0.66; 95% CI, -2.98 to 4.30Ahmed implant with MMC versus Ahmed implant with balanced salt solutionMean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, -0.20; 95% CI, -2.82 to 2.42High-pressure Ahmed implant + MMC + partial Tenon capsule resection versus Standard Ahmed implant + MMCMean IOP at 12 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, -1.13; 95% CI, -4.69 to 2.43Double-plate Molteno implant versus Schocket shuntMean IOP at 6 months follow-upMD, 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-plateMolteno implant aloneMean IOP at 6 months follow-up (1 trial): MD, 0.00; 95% CI, -4.75 to 4.75Double-plate Molteno implant + MMC versus Molteno implant + balanced saltsolutionMean 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 0.91Argon 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 trabeculectomyFailure to control IOP at 24 months (2 trials: RR 2.03; 95%CI, 1.38 to 2.98Diode laser trabeculoplasty versus argonlaser trabeculoplastyFailure to control IOP at 12 months (1 trial): RR 3.0; 95%CI, 0.37 to 24.17Failure to control IOP at 24 months (1 trial): RR 0.50; 95% CI, 0.10 to 2.43Selective laser trabeculoplasty versus argon lasertrabeculoplastyFailure 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 1.28Visual 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 treatmentOcular adverse events (1 trial): RR, 1.52; 95% CI, 0.89 to 2.60Systemic 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 22.09Diode laser trabeculoplasty versus argonlaser trabeculoplastyPeripheral 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 progressionBeta blockers versus placebo or untreated (8 trials): OR, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.45 to 1.00Timolol versus placebo or untreated (7 trials): OR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.41 to 1.05Betaxolol versus placebo or untreated (1 trial):OR, 0.70; 95% CI, 0.32 to 1.51Timolol versus Carteolol (2 trials): OR 0.18; 95% CI, 0.05 to 0.62Timolol 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 sensitivityTimolol versus Betaxolol (6 trials):WMD, 0.07; 95% CI, -0.43 to 0.57 | Drop out due to drug-related adverse eventsTimolol versus placebo (3 trials): OR, 2.48; 95% CI, 0.61 to 10.10Betaxolol versus placebo (1 trial): OR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.40 to 2.26Timolol versus Levobunolol (2 trials): OR, 0.80; 95% CI, .034 to 1.87Timolol versus Betaxolol (5 trials): OR, 2.40; 95% CI, 1.04 to 5.53Timolol 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 treatmentMean IOP at 12 months (3 trials): WMD, -3.34; 95% CI,-4.16 to -2.51Primary trabeculectomy with MMC versus with Placebo or no treatmentMean 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 treatmentWound leak (3 trials): OR, 1.88; 95% CI, 0.68 to 5.16Hypotony (3 trials): OR, 1.65; 95% CI, 0.34 to 7.94Endophthalmitis (1 trial): OR, 3.44; 95% CI, 0.16 to 91.79Endophthalmitis (1 trial): OR, 1.14, 95% CI, 0.04 to 29.12Primary trabeculectomy with MMC versus with Placebo or no treatmentWould leak (2 trials): OR, 1.65; 95% CI, 0.16 to 17.47Hypotony (3 trials): OR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.23 to 4.68Cataract (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 treatmentMean IOP at 12 months (2 trials): WMD, -1.02; 95% CI, -2.40 to 0.37Primary trabeculectomy with 5-FU versus with Placebo or no treatmentMean 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 treatmentWound leak (2 trials): RR, 0.83; 95% CI, 0.15 to 4.56Epithelial toxicity (2 trials): RR, 3.04; 95% CI, 1.56 to 5.92Primary trabeculectomy with 5-FU versus with Placebo or no treatmentWound leak (2 trials): RR, 0.47; 95% CI, 0.04 to 4.91Epithelial toxicity (2 trials): RR. 5.85; 95% CI, 2.04 to 16.83 |
| Zhang 200123 | Y | N | N | NR | NR | Latanoprost versus timololDifference 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 7.3Difference 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 timololConjunctival hyperemia (6 trials): RR, 2.20; 95% CI, 1.33 to 3.65Conjunctivitis (3 trials): RR, 0.80; 95% CI, 0.25 to 2.53Increased 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