Supplementary Table 2. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias of 8 randomized clinical trials in meta-analysis

Study	Domain	Support for judgment & review authors' judgment
Findlay et al.[8] (1995)	Random sequence generation	Unclear risk of bias. Randomized allocation was performed, but sufficient information about the sequence generation process was not identified.
	Allocation concealment	Unclear risk of bias. The specific information about concealment was not described.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. The blinding of participants and personnel was not performed, however the intervention was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. All endpoints were objective findings, judgment of outcomes was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.
	Incomplete outcome data	Low risk of bias. Nine missing patients were identified in both group. Missing outcome balanced in numbers across intervention groups, with similar reasons for missing data across groups
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. The study protocol was available and all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that were of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specific way.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Hamada et al.[14] (2003)	Random sequence generation	Unclear risk of bias. Randomized allocation was performed, but sufficient information about the sequence generation process was not identified.
	Allocation concealment	Low risk of bias. Each patient was randomly designated in a double-blind manner (using sealed envelopes) to receive or not receive ITUKI therapy.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. This study was double-blind study. The blinding could have not been broken.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. The committee determined any possible violations of the eligibility requirements or study protocol, cause of any neurological deficits. These data were analyzed by blinded evaluators.
	Incomplete outcome data	Low risk of bias. No missing data.
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. The study protocol was available and all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that were of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specific way.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Li et al.[18] (2005)	Random sequence generation	Unclear risk of bias. The author performed this study through randomized manner, however the method of allocation was not identified.
	Allocation concealment	Unclear risk of bias. The specific method of concealment was not described.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. The blinding of participants and personnel was not performed, however the intervention was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. Clinical outcomes, which are of interest in this review, were pre-specified and all endpoints were objective findings.
	Incomplete outcome data	Unclear risk of bias. This study did not address this outcome.
	Selective reporting	High risk of bias. One of the primary outcomes was not pre-specified.
	Other sources of bias	Unclear risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Yamamoto et al.[31] (2010)	Random sequence generation	High risk of bias. Patients were randomized by the stratified block randomization method, including non-random component in the sequence generation process
	Allocation concealment	Unclear risk of bias. The specific method of concealment was not described.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. The blinding of participants and personnel was not performed, however the intervention was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Study	Domain	Support for judgment & review authors' judgment
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. Clinical outcomes, which are of interest in this review, were pre-specified and all endpoints were objective findings.
	Incomplete outcome data	Low risk of bias. No missing data.
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. The study protocol was available and all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that were of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specific way.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Eicker et al.[6] (2012)	Random sequence generation	Unclear risk of bias. Although authors stated that patients were randomly allocated two groups, the concrete method of randomization was not described.
	Allocation concealment	Unclear risk of bias. The specific information about concealment was not described.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. The blinding of participants and personnel was not performed, however the intervention is not likely to be influenced by the blinding.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. All endpoints were objective findings, judgment of outcomes was not likely to be influenced by the blinding.
	Incomplete outcome data	Low risk of bias. No missing outcome data.
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. The study protocol was available and all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that were of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specific way.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Litrico et al.[19] (2013)	Random sequence generation	Low risk of bias. The random allocation sequence was generated with EDGAR 2.1 software.
	Allocation concealment	Low risk of bias. Assignation was made by the sealed-envelope method.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. The blinding of participants and personnel was not performed, however the intervention was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. Clinical outcomes, which are of interest in this review, were pre-specified and all endpoints were objective findings.
	Incomplete outcome data	Low risk of bias. No missing outcome data.
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. The study protocol was available and all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that were of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specific way.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.
Etminan et al.[7] (2013)	Random sequence generation	Low risk of bias. Randomization sequence was generated using the PROC plan software.
	Allocation concealment	Unclear risk of bias. The process was kept sealed until after patient screening and inclusion. But, the specific method of concealment is not described.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. The blinding of participants and personnel was not performed. But, the intervention was not conducted by the subjective decision. Thus the reviewers judged that it was not likely to be influenced by the blinding.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. All endpoints were objective findings, judgment of outcomes was not likely to be influenced by the blinding.
	Incomplete outcome data	Low risk of bias. No missing outcome data.
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. Clinical outcomes, which are of interest in this review, were pre-specified and all endpoints were objective findings.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.

https://doi.org/10.3340/jkns.2020.0154

Supplementary Table 2. Continued

Study	Domain	Support for judgment & review authors' judgment
Kramer et al.[17] (2014)	Random sequence generation	Unclear risk of bias. Randomized allocation was performed, but sufficient information about the sequence generation process was not identified.
	Allocation concealment	Unclear risk of bias. The specific information about concealment was not described.
	Blinding of participants and personnel	Low risk of bias. This study was double-blind study. The blinding could have not been broken.
	Blinding of outcome assessment	Low risk of bias. Clinical outcomes, which are of interest in this review, were pre-specified and all endpoints were objective findings.
	Incomplete outcome data	High risk of bias. The proportion of missing outcomes compared with observed event risk enough to induce clinically relevant bias in intervention effect estimate.
	Selective reporting	Low risk of bias. The study protocol was available and all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that were of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specific way.
	Other sources of bias	Low risk of bias. The study appears to be free of other sources of bias.

ITUKI : intrathecal urokinase infusion