

WEB TABLE

Table W1 Proportion of statistically significant meta-analyses where both the 95% confidence and prediction intervals excluded the null by estimated I^2
Separately for dichotomous and continuous outcomes and 2-6 vs. >6 studies

From:

IntHout, J., Ioannidis, J., Rovers, M., & Goeman, J. 2016. BMJ Open. A plea for routinely presenting prediction intervals in meta-analysis.

Table W1: Proportion of statistically significant meta-analyses where both the 95% confidence and prediction intervals excluded the null by estimated I^2 Separately for dichotomous and continuous outcomes and 2-6 vs. >6 studies

Estimated heterogeneity I^2 (%)	Meta-analyses with 2-6 studies				Meta-analyses with >6 studies				All meta-analyses				$I^2 > 0$
	0	>0 and <30	30-60	>60	0	>0 and <30	30-60	>60	0	>0 and <30	30-60	>60	
All meta-analyses (N=3263)													
MA stat. significant (N)	322	44	59	59	119	79	91	147	441	123	150	206	479
Both 95% CI and 95% PI excluded the null ^{a)} (N (%))	74 (23.0)	32 (77.7)	17 (18.8)	1 (1.7)	38 (31.9)	56 (70.9)	22 (24.2)	4 (2.7)	112 (25.4)	88 (71.5)	39 (26.0)	5 (2.4)	132 (27.6)
Meta-analyses with a dichotomous outcome (N=2009)													
MA stat. significant (N)	210	32	30	20	102	56	66	56	312	88	96	76	260
Both 95% CI and 95% PI excluded the null ^{a)} (N (%))	50 (23.8)	24 (75.0)	7 (23.3)	1 (5.0)	29 (28.4)	37 (66.1)	16 (24.2)	4 (7.1)	79 (25.3)	61 (69.3)	23 (24.0)	5 (6.6)	89 (34.2)
Meta-analyses with a continuous outcome (N=1254)													
MA stat. significant (N)	112	12	29	39	17	23	25	91	129	35	54	130	219
Both 95% CI and 95% PI excluded the null ^{a)} (N (%))	24 (21.4)	8 (66.7)	10 (34.5)	0 (0.0)	9 (52.9)	19 (82.6)	6 (24.0)	0 (0.0)	33 (25.6)	27 (77.1)	16 (29.6)	0 (0.0)	43 (19.6)

MA: meta-analysis; CI= 95% confidence interval; PI= 95% prediction interval;

^{a)} When the estimated heterogeneity I^2 was equal to 0, $I^2=20\%$ was imputed for the calculation of the prediction interval.