Table 5S: Results of retrospective studies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   | **Intervention** | **Control** |
| **Outome** | **Study** | **events (%)** | **total** | **events (%)** | **total** |
| **Ureteral fistula** | Ameer 2011 [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 0 (0) | 209 | 0 (0) | 163 |
|   | Moreira 2007 [[2](#_ENREF_2)] | 2 (3,3) | 60 | 6 (2,8) | 217 |
|   | Secin 2002 [[3](#_ENREF_3)] | 21 (13,2) | 159 | 41 (9,9) | 416 |
|   | Tzimas 2003 [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 0 (0) | 64 | 0 (0) | 148 |
| **Ureteral stricture** | Ameer 2011 [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 6 (2,9) | 209 | 7 (4,3) | 163 |
|   | Hakim 1994 [[5](#_ENREF_5)] | 21 (4,4) | 478 | 12 (4,1) | 295 |
|   | Lee 2007 [[6](#_ENREF_6)] | 3 (4,1) | 73 | 5 (2,1) | 238 |
|   | Moreira 2007 [[2](#_ENREF_2)] | 1 (1,7) | 60 | 4 (1,8) | 217 |
|   | Pan 2008/2014 [[7](#_ENREF_7), [8](#_ENREF_8)] | 4 (3,3) | 121 | 13 (4,0) | 324 |
|   | Secin 2002 [[3](#_ENREF_3)] | 11 (6,9) | 159 | 40 (9,6) | 416 |
|   | Tzimas 2003 [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 2 (3,1) | 64 | 11 (7,4) | 148 |
|   | Veale 2006 [[9](#_ENREF_9)] | 11 (3,1) | 353 | 1 (0,3) | 360 |
| ***Haematuria*** | Ameer 2011 [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 37 (17,7) | 209 | 18 (11,0) | 163 |
|   | Hakim 1994 [[5](#_ENREF_5)] | 6 (1,3) | 478 | 1 (0,3) | 295 |
|   | Lee 2007 [[6](#_ENREF_6)] | 6 (8,2) | 73 | 3 (1,3) | 238 |
|   | Pan 2008/2014 [[7](#_ENREF_7), [8](#_ENREF_8)] | 15 (12,4) | 121 | 12 (3,7) | 324 |
|   | Secin 2002 [[3](#_ENREF_3)] | 9 (5,7) | 159 | 8 (1,9) | 416 |
|   | Tzimas 2003 [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 22 (34,4) | 64 | 5 (3,4) | 148 |
|   | Veale 2006 [[9](#_ENREF_9)] | 21 (5,9) | 353 | 5 (1,4) | 360 |
| **Urinary leakage** | Ameer 2011 [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 5 (2,4) | 209 | 4 (2,5) | 163 |
|   | Hakim 1994 | 2 (0,4) | 478 | 4 (1,4) | 295 |
|   | Lee 2007 [[6](#_ENREF_6)] | 6 (8,2) | 73 | 6 (2,5) | 238 |
|   | Pan 2008/2014 [[7](#_ENREF_7), [8](#_ENREF_8)] | 5 (4,1) | 121 | 17 (5,2) | 324 |
|   | Tzimas 2003 [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 0 (0) | 64 | 5 (3,4) | 148 |
|   | Veale 2006 [[9](#_ENREF_9)] | 20 (5,7) | 353 | 8 (2,2) | 360 |
| **Ureteral reflux** | Ameer 2011 [[1](#_ENREF_1)] | 0 (0) | 209 | 0 (0) | 163 |
|   | Lee 2007 [[6](#_ENREF_6)] | 1 (1,4) | 73 | 2 (0,8) | 238 |
|   | Moreira 2007 [[2](#_ENREF_2)] | 0 (0) | 60 | 0 (0) | 217 |
|   | Pan 2008/2014 [[7](#_ENREF_7), [8](#_ENREF_8)] | 0 (0) | 121 | 6 (1,9) | 324 |
|   | Secin 2002 [[3](#_ENREF_3)] | 0 (0) | 159 | 16 (3,8) | 416 |
|   | Tzimas 2003 [[4](#_ENREF_4)] | 0 (0) | 64 | 0 (0) | 148 |
| **General ureteral complication** | Lee 2007 [[6](#_ENREF_6)] | 11 (15,1) | 73 | 14 (5,9) | 238 |
|   | Moreira 2007 [[2](#_ENREF_2)] | 3 (5) | 60 | 10 (4,6) | 217 |
|   | Pan 2008/2014 [[7](#_ENREF_7), [8](#_ENREF_8)] | 24 (19,8) | 121 | 51 (15,7) | 324 |
|   | Veale 2006 [[9](#_ENREF_9)] | 50 (14,2) | 353 | 14 (3,9) | 360 |

Intervention: Taguchi ureteroneocystostomy; Control: Lich-Gregoir ureteroneocystostomy
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