

**S2 Table.** Pooled hazard ratios for subgroup analysis on progression-free survival compared chemotherapy maintenance and observation

Subgroup	No. of trials	No. of patients	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p-value	I <sup>2</sup>	GRADE
Time of random assignment						
Before first-line chemotherapy	4	1,195	0.68 (0.60-0.76)	0.000	4.8%	⊕⊕⊕⊕
After a fixed No. of cycles	9	1,465	0.60 (0.47-0.77)	0.000	77.9%	⊕⊕⊕O <sup>a)</sup>
Duration time						
Until PD	8	1,487	0.61 (0.50-0.74)	0.000	62.2%	⊕⊕⊕O <sup>a)</sup>
Additional a fixed No. of cycles	5	1,173	0.64 (0.49-0.85)	0.002	79.9%	⊕⊕⊕O <sup>a)</sup>
Regimen of duration therapy						
Combination agent	8	1,482	0.60 (0.51-0.71)	0.000	64.2%	⊕⊕⊕O <sup>a)</sup>
Single-agent therapy	5	778	0.70 (0.48-1.02)	0.062	80.8%	⊕⊕OO <sup>a),b)</sup>
Switch agent therapy						
No	8	1362	0.69 (0.63-0.76)	0.000	0.0%	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Yes	5	898	0.49 (0.32-0.74)	0.001	83.8%	⊕⊕⊕O <sup>a)</sup>

CI, confidence interval. GRADE Working Group grades of evidence. ⊕⊕⊕⊕ High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimated effect; ⊕⊕⊕O Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimated effect and may change the estimate; ⊕⊕OO Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimated effect and may change the estimate; ⊕OOO Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate, <sup>a)</sup>Downgraded (-1) for risk of bias: all trials were judged as lack of blinding of participants and lack of outcome assessor blinding, some trials were judged unclear risk of bias as selective outcome reporting or selection bias, one trials judged high risk of bias as a result of insufficient randomized sequence was generated, indicating potential publication bias, <sup>b)</sup>Downgraded (-1) for imprecision: small sample or small number of trials bias may exist.