Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	30 Gy 10 x in 2 weeks RT	40 Gy 20 x in 4 weeks RT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Pain												
0	No evidence available			1		none	-	0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Mobility-	Ambulatory dire	ectly after	RT	•			•		•			
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	66/110 (60%)	67/104 (64.4%) 0%		4.42 fewer per 100 (from 1.74 fewer to 8.6 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Mobility -	Ambulatory 3 n	nonths aft	er RT				<u></u>		<u> </u>			
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	63/93 (67.7%)	65/91 (71.4%) 0%		3.69 fewer per 100 (from 16.9 fewer to 9.6 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Mobility -	Ambulatory 6 n	nonths aft	er RT							L		
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	57/76 (75%)	57/72 (79.2%) 0%		4.17 fewer per 100 (from 17.7 fewer to 9.3 more)	VERY	CRITICAL
Respons	duration						1	070	1			
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Toxicity							•					
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Progress	ion Free surviva	al										
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		IMPORTANT
Bladder f	unction					I	1	T	1	T		
0	No evidence					none	-	-	-	-		IMPORTANT

	available							0%		-		
Motor fu	nction- directly a	fter RT im	provement									
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	47/110 (42.7%)	43/104 (41.3%)	RR 1.03 (0.75 to 1.42)	1.38 fewer per 100 (from 11.85 fewer to 14.6	VERY	CRITICAL
	otaaloo		in concidently				(12.170)		-	more)	LOW	
Matau fu	nation dinastly s	ften DT m						0%		-		
wotor tu	nction- directly a				. 2		22/112	2=4424	22.00			OD ITION
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	33/110 (30%)	37/104 (35.6%)	RR 0.84 (0.57 to 1.24)	5.58 fewer per 100 (from 18.15 fewer to 6.99 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								0%	1	-		
Motor function- 3 months after RT improvement												
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	46/93 (49.5%)	42/91 (46.2%)	RR 1.07 (0.79 to 1.45)	3.31 more per 100 (from 11.12 fewer to 17.74	VERY	CRITICAL
								0%	  - 	more)	LOW	
Motor fu	Motor function- 3 months after RT no change											
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	26/93 (28%)	33/91 (36.3%)	RR 0.77 (0.5 to 1.18)	8.31 fewer per 100 (from 21.75 fewer to 5.14 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								0%		-		
motor fu	nction- 6 months	s after RT	improvement									
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	42/76 (55.3%)	37/72 (51.4%)	RR 1.08 (0.79 to 1.46)	3.87 more per 100 (from 121.19 fewer to 19.94 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								0%		-		
Motor fu	nction- 6 months	after RT	no change			_						
1	observational studies	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	24/76 (31.6%)	26/72 (36.1%)	RR 0.87 (0.56 to 1.37)	4.53 fewer per 100 (from 19.77 fewer to 10.71 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
			L					U /0		_		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> No blinding reported

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> low number of patients and the confidence interval crossed the clinical decision threshold between the two courses of radiotherapy