**Appendix 2. PICO 2. Transanal endoscopic microsurgery vs. standard transanal excision of rectal neoplasm: systematic review and meta-analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, year** | **AMSTAR-2 rating** | **InterventionsTEM vs.TAE****(Enrolment****interval)** | **Quantitative synthesis** | **Postoperative complication rates****(TEM vs. TAE)**  | **Negative resection margins****(TEM vs. TAE)** | **Specimen fragmentation****(TEM vs TAE)** | **Lesion recurrence****(TEM vs TAE)** |
| **Clancy C et al.2015** | Moderate\* |  *TEM vs*. *TAE* 6 Obs. (1990-20109) | 6 pooled obs. Studies (6-7 Newcastle-Otawa score).Meta-analysis | *M-H, Random, 95%CI*OR: 1.0 (1 0.,65-1.57) *I2: 0%* | *M-H, Random, 95%CI*OR:5.28 (3,20-8.71)*I2: 13,2%* | *M-H, Random, 95%CI*OR:0.09 (0.04 - 0.20)*I2:0%* | *M-H, Random, 95%CI*OR: 0.24 (0,154-0.4019*I2: 10.9%* |

 \*:This systematic review has more than one weakness (e.g. no list of included and excluded studies provided, no appropriate methods for combine study findings), but no critical flaws. It may provide an accurate summary of the results of the that were included in the review.available studies