Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	10 x 3 Gy	20 x 2 Gy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Mobility- I	Regain walking a	bility										
1	observational studies	very serious ^{1,2}	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³	none	31/118 (26.3%)	23/76 (30.3%)	RR 0.87 (0.55 to 1.37)	3.99 fewer per 100 (from 17.02 fewer to 9.04 more)	VERY	CRITICAL
								0%		-	LOW	
Respons duration- in field recurrence												
1	observational studies	very serious ^{1,2}	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³	none	12/118 (10.2%)	12/76 (15.8%) 0%	RR 0.64 (0.31 to 1.34)	5.62 fewer per 100 (from 15.47 fewer to 4.23 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Pain												
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Toxicity												
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Progressi	on free survival											
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		IMPORTANT
Bladder fu	ınction	•		•								
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		IMPORTANT

¹ retrospective data collection

² no blinding reported

³ low number of patients and the confidence interval crossed the clinical decision threshold between the two courses radiotherapy