Quality accomment							No of motions		F#			
Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Overlites	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	5 x 4 Gy in 1 week	15 x 2.5 Gy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Mobility- I	Regain walking a	ability							·			
1	observational studies	very serious <sup>1,2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>3</sup>	none	27/104 (26%)	22/90 (24.4%)	RR 1.06 (0.65 to 1.73)	1.52 more per 100 (from 10.72 fewer to 13.76 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								0%		-		
Respons	duration- in field	recurrence	e	1	T	1	ı	ı	1		ı	ı
1	observational studies	very serious <sup>1,2</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>3</sup>	none	33/92 (35.9%)	10/90 (11.1%) 0%	RR 2.86 (1.49 to 5.46)	20.62 more per 100 (from 9.56 more to 31.67 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Pain	L			L	I		L					
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Toxicity			!	<b>'</b>	ļ.	<del>'</del>	<b>!</b>		·		·	
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		CRITICAL
Progressi	on free survival								•			
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		IMPORTANT
Bladder fu	unction											
0	No evidence available					none	-	- 0%	-	-		IMPORTANT

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

<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