Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	5 x 4 Gy in 1 week	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Mobility- I	Regain walking a	bility										
1	observational	very	no serious	no serious	serious <sup>3</sup>	none	27/104	23/76	RR 0.85 (0.53	4.3 fewer per 100 (from		CRITICAL
	studies	serious <sup>1,2</sup>	inconsistency	indirectness			(26%)	(30.3%)	to 1.37)	17.63 fewer to 9.03 more)	VERY	
								0%		-	LOW	
Respons duration- in field recurrence												
1	observational	very	no serious	no serious	serious <sup>3</sup>	none	33/104	12/76	RR 2.01 (1.11	15.94 more per 100 (from		CRITICAL
	studies	serious <sup>1,2</sup>	inconsistency	indirectness			(31.7%)	(15.8%)	to 3.63)	3.81 more to 28.07 more)	VERY	
								0%		-	LOW	
Pain			<u>,                                      </u>			<u>,                                      </u>						
0	No evidence					none	-	-	-	-		CRITICAL
	available							0%		-		
Toxicity												
0	No evidence					none	-	-	_	-		CRITICAL
	available							0%		-		
Progressi	on free survival											
0	No evidence					none	-	-	-	-		IMPORTANT
	available							0%	1	-		
Bladder fu	ınction	•										
0	No evidence					none	-	-	-	-		IMPORTANT
	available							0%		-		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> retrospective data dollection

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> no blinding reported

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> low number of patients and the confidence interval crossed the clinical decision threshold between the two courses radiotherapy