

Supplementary Table 1: Risk of bias assessment.*

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other sources of bias	Overall
Pan et al ^[25] 2004	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Unclear	Low	High
Colombo et al ^[21] 2004	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Unclear	Low	High
DK-Crush I ^[26] 2008	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
CACTUS ^[27] 2009	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Ye et al ^[28] 2010	Unclear	Low	High	High	Low	Unclear	Low	High
Lin et al ^[30] 2010	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Hildick-Smith et al ^[29] 2010	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High
Ye et al ^[31] 2012	Unclear	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	High

NSTS ^[12] 2013	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
NBS ^[11] 2013	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Ruiz-Salmerón et al ^[13] 2013	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	High
Dk-Crush III ^[14] 2015	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High
BBK I ^[15] 2015	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
PERFECT ^[16] 2015	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High
Zhang et al ^[20] 2016	Low	Unclear	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Hildick-Smith et al ^[17] 2016	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High
BBK II ^[19] 2016	Low	Unclear	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Zheng et al ^[18] 2016	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High

DK-Crush II ^[22] 2017	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Dk-Crush V ^[23] 2019	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
NBBSIV ^[24] 2020	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	High
DEFINITION II ^[6] 2020	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
EBC Main ^[5] 2021	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High

*The risk of bias is assessed based on the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials.^[32]

Study	One-Stent		Two-Stents	
	Events	Total	Events	Total

DES = First

Pan et al ^[25] 2004	6	47	5	44
Colombo et al ^[21] 2004	3	23	12	63
CACTUS ^[27] 2009	26	173	28	177
Ye et al ^[28] 2010	1	26	0	25
Lin et al ^[30] 2010	21	54	6	54
Hildick-Smith et al ^[29] 2010	20	250	38	250
Ye et al ^[31] 2012	5	30	1	38
NBS ^[11] 2013	40	202	61	202
BBK I ^[15] 2015	23	101	23	101
DK-Crush II ^[22] 2017	44	183	29	183
Random effects model	1089		1137	

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 68\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2368$, $P < 0.01$

DES = Second

Ruiz-Salmerón et al ^[13] 2013	4	33	2	36
Hildick-Smith et al ^[17] 2016	8	103	10	97
DK-Crush V ^[23] 2019	41	242	20	240
EBC Main ^[5] 2021	34	230	42	237
Random effects model	608		610	

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 65\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1939$, $P = 0.03$

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 66\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1971$, $P < 0.01$

Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_1^2 = 0.08$, $df = 1$ ($P = 0.77$)

Risk Ratio

RR

95%CI











