**Supplementary Table 5a Evidence maps of overview by interventions.**

No difference

Favors intervention

Not reported

Favors comparator

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mortality** | **ICU Los** | **Hospital Los** |
| **NE vs. DA** | | | |
| De Backer 2012 | 6 studies, n=1408, RR 1.12 (1.01,1.20), P=0.035, I2=0%, REM •• | 2 studies, n=1296, RR=-0.3 (-1.5,1.0), P=0.67, I2=NA, REM •• | 2 studies, n=1296, RR=0. (-2.8,2.6), P=0.95, I2=NA, REM •• |
| Jia 2023 | 10 studies, n=1598, RR=0.89 (0.80,0.98), P=0.02, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Lu 2021 | 11 studies, n=1708, RR=0.89 (0.81,0.98), P=0.02, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Nagendran 2016 | 2 studies, n=1296, OR=0.83 (0.67,1.03) P=0.10, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Oba 2014 | 6 studies, n=1408, OR=0.81 (0.65,0.99) P<0.05, I2<50%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Vasu 2012 | 6 studies, n=2043, RR=0.91 (0.83,0.99) P=0.03, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Yin 2018 | 5 studies, n=2022, RR=1.07 (0.96,1.18) P>0.05, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Zhao 2012 | 9 studies, n=3179, RR=1.12 (1.04,1.21) P=0.002, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Zhou 2013 | 11 studies, n=1718, RR=0.89 (0.81,0.98) P=0.02, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Zhou 2015 | 6 studies, n=1408, OR=1.24 (1.01,1.53), P<0.05, I2=NA •• |  |  |
| **NE vs. PE** | | | |
| Jia 2023 | 2 studies, n=86, RR=1.08 (0.76,1.55), P=0.66, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Zhou 2015 | 2 studies, n=86, OR=1.21 (0.51,2.86), P>0.05, I2=NA • |  |  |
| **NE vs. EP** | | | |
| Zhou 2015 | 2 studies, n=218, OR=0.70 (0.34,1.43), P>0.05, I2=NA •• |  |  |
| **NE vs. other vasopressors** | | | |
| Ruslan 2021 | 7 studies, n=4139, RR 0.95 (0.89 to 1.02), P = 0.16; I2= 0%, REM ••• |  |  |
| **Catecholamines vs. non-catecholamines** | | | |
| Belletti 2015b | 10 studies, n=1052, RR=0.87 (0.77,0.98), P=0.02, I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |
| Jiang 2019 | 20 studies, n=3217, RR=0.92 (0.84,0.99), P=0.03, I2=0%, FEM •• | 10 studies, n=2334, MD=-0.08 (-0.68,0.52), P=0.79, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |
| McIntyre 2018 | 16 studies, n=2604, RR=0.89 (0.82,0.97), P=0.008, I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |
| Polito 2012 | 5 studies, n=925, RR=0.90 (0.77,1.04), P=0.17, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Yao 2020 | 23 studies, n=4225, RR=0.94 (0.87,1.01), P=0.08, I2=0%, FEM ••• | 12 studies, n=3203, SMD=-0.21 (-0.75,0.33), P=0.44, I2=0%, FEM ••• | 6 studies, n=2188, SMD=0.15 (-1.39,1.70), P=0.85, I2=0%, FEM ••• |
| **Catecholamines vs. VP** | | | |
| Jiang 2019 | 9 studies, n=2019, RR=0.94 (0.84,1.05), P=0.27, I2=0%, FEM •• | 4 studies, n=1466, MD=-0.17 (-0.98,0.63), P=0.67, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |
| Yao 2020 | 10 studies, n=2256, RR=0.96 (0.87,1.06), P=0.40, I2=0%, FEM ••• |  |  |
| **Catecholamines vs. TP** | | | |
| Huang 2020 | 9 studies, n=850, RR=0.85 (0.70,1.03), P=0.09, I2=44%, REM •• | 6 studies, n=783, MD=-0.28 (-1.25,0.69), P=0.58, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |
| Jia 2023 | 2 studies, n=54, RR=0.86 (0.66,1.11), P=0.25, I2=58%, FEM • |  |  |
| Li 2020 | 8 studies, n=811, OR=0.89 (0.67,1.19), P=0.45, I2=20%, FEM ••• |  |  |
| Yao 2020 | 11 studies, n=1093, RR=0.87 (0.77,0.98), P=0.02, I2=12%, FEM ••• |  |  |
| Zhu 2019 | 9 studies, n=870, RR=0.95 (0.85,1.05), P=0.31, I2=0%, REM ••• |  | 3 studies, n=173, MD=1.27 (-1.70,4.25), P=0.40, I2=43%, REM ••• |
| **NE vs. non-catecholamines** | | | |
| Nagendran 2016 | 3 studies, n=915, OR=1.13 (0.86,1.48), P=0.37, I2=38%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Tan 2016 | 10 studies, n=1296, RR=0.87 (0.78,0.97), P=0.01, I2=0%, FEM ••• | 5 studies, n=268, MD=-3.40 (-1.62,8.43), P=0.18, I2=0%, FEM ••• |  |
| Zhong 2020 | 18 studies, n=4217, RR=0.92 (0.86,0.99), P=0.02, I2=0%, REM •• | 12 studies, n=3253, SMD=-0.05 (-0.23,0.13), P>0.05, I2=79.2%, REM •• | 8 studies, n=2519, SMD=-0.14 (-0.34,0.05), P>0.05, I2=75.9%, REM •• |
| **NE vs. VP** | | | |
| Chidambaram 2019 | 4 studies, n=1038, RR=0.92 (0.78,1.08), P=0.32, I2=0%, FEM •• | 3 studies, n=1015, MD=0.14 (-1.37,1.65), P=0.86, I2=46%, FEM •• |  |
| Jia 2023 | 6 studies, n=1675, RR=1.11 (1.01,1.23), P=0.04, I2=0%, FEM ••• | 5 studies, n=1652, MD=0.03 (-0.84,0.89), P=0.95, I2=69%, FEM ••• |  |
| Nagendran 2019 | 4 studies, n=1451, RR=0.98 (0.86,1.12), P=0.791, I2=0%, FEM ••• | 3 studies, n=672, MD=-0.037 (-3.115,3.041), P=0.98, I2=NA, FEM •• | 2 studies, n=655, MD=0.07 (-4.98,5.12), P=0.98, I2=NA, FEM ••• |
| Neto 2012 | 4 studies, n=842, RR=0.87 (0.75,1.00), P=0.05, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Tan 2016 | 7 studies, n=1934, RR=0.87 (0.78,0.97), P=0.02, I2=0%, FEM ••• |  |  |
| Yin 2018 | 3 studies, n=832, RR=0.96 (0.84,1.10), P>0.05, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Zhong 2020 | 8 studies, n=1982, RR=0.95 (0.85,1.06), P=0.33, I2=0%, REM •• |  |  |
| Zhou 2014 | 6 studies, n=2193, RR=1.07 (0.96,1.20), P=0.22, I2=5%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Zhou 2015 | 5 studies, n>200, OR=0.91 (0.75,1.11), P>0.05 •• |  |  |
| **NE vs. TP** | | | |
| Huang 2019 | 6 studies, n=756, RR=0.99 (0.85,1.15), P=0.85, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| Jia 2023 | 6 studies, n=756, RR=1.06 (0.89,1.27), P=0.52, I2=36%, FEM ••• | 4 studies, n=210, MD=-0.04 (-2,1.92), P=0.97, I2=0%, FEM ••• |  |
| Neto 2012 | 3 studies, n=89, RR=0.88 (0.62,1.25), P=0.47, I2=0%, FEM • |  |  |
| Tan 2016 | 3 studies, n=89, RR=0.88 (0.62,1.25), P=0.47, I2=0%, FEM • |  |  |
| Zhu 2019 | 8 studies, n=838, RR=0.95 (0.85,1.06), P=0.33, I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |
| **NE vs. AT-II** | | | |
| Zhong 2020 | 2 studies, n=341, RR=0.85 (0.69,1.06), P=0.14, I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |
| **Placebo vs. MtB** | | | |
| Belletti 2015b | 2 studies, n=50, RR=0.78 (0.42,1.47), P=0.45, I2=0%, REM •• |  |  |
| Pruna 2024 | 5 studies, n=262, RR=0.63 (0.44,0.90), P=0.01, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |
| **Placebo vs. vasopressors** | | | |
| Belletti 2015a | 5 studies, n=132, RR=0.81 (0.62–1.05), P=0.11, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |

**Supplementary Table 5b Evidence maps of overview by interventions.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DO2** | **VO2** | **Lac** | **HR** | **CI** | **SVRI** | **MAP** |
| **NE vs. DA** | | | | | | | |
| Lu 2021 | 5 studies, n=162, SMD=-0.65 (-1.37,0.07), P=0.08, I2=75%, REM •• | 4 studies, n=112, SMD=-0.48 (-1.47,0.52), P=0.35, I2=82%, REM • | 4 studies, n=112, SMD=-0.21 (-0.90,047), P=0.54, I2=64%, REM •• | 7 studies, n=274, SMD=-1.84 (-2.86, -0.81), P<0.01, I2=90%, REM •• | 7 studies, n=274, SMD=-0.74 (-1.01, -0.48), P<0.01, I2=13%, REM •• | 6 studies, n=242, SMD=1.33 (0.62,2.04), P<0.01, I2=81%, REM •• | 4 studies, n=94 • SMD=0.39 (-0.85,1.63), P>0.05, I2=86%, REM |
| Yin 2018 | 3 studies, n=91, WMD=-86.0 (-142.45,-29.54), P<0.05, I2=0%, FEM • | 3 studies, n=91, WMD=-10.90 (-23.12,1.33), P>0.05, I2=0%, FEM • |  | 3 studies, n=91 WMD=-16.34 (-19.96,-12.72), P<0.05, I2=14.3 %, FEM • | 3 studies, n=91, WMD=-0.63 (-1.01, -0.26), P<0.05, I2=0%, FEM • | 3 studies, n=91, WMD=-119.43 (-192.88, -45.99), P<0.05, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=41, WMD=-1.03 (-14.42,12.37), P>0.05, I2=0%, FEM • |
| Zhao 2012 |  |  |  | 4 studies, n=112, MD=17.05 (-0.71,34.81), P=0.06, I2=97%, REM • | 4 studies, n=112, MD=0.42 (0.21,0.63), P<0.001, I2=0%, REM •• |  | 3 studies, n=62, MD=-0.87 (-24.97,7.62), P=0.30, I2=96%, REM • |
| Zhou 2013 | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-0.54 (-1.50,0.42), P=0.27, I2=79%, REM • | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-0.49 (-1.37,0.39), P=0.27, I2=75%, REM •• | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-0.24 (-0.90,0.42), P=0.48, I2=59%, REM •• | 5 studies, n=195, SMD=-2.23 (-3.76,-0.71), P=0.004, I2=92%, REM • | 5 studies, n=195, SMD=-0.71 (-1.07,-0.35), P=0.0001, I2=24%, REM •• | 5 studies, n=195, SMD=1.39 (0.54,2.23), P=0.001, I2=82%, REM • | 3 studies, n=55, SMD=0.64 (-1.09,2.38), P=0.47, I2=87%, REM • |
| Zhou 2015 | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-0.54 (-1.50,0.42), P=0.27, I2=79%, REM • | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-0.49 (-1.37,0.39), P=0.27, I2=75%, REM •• | 3 studies, n=55, SMD=0.01 (-0.53,0.56), P=0.96, I2=23%, FEM • | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-2.10 (-3.95,-0.25), P<0.001, I2=91%, REM • | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=-0.73 (-1.14,-0.03), P=0.004, I2=43%, FEM •• | 4 studies, n=105, SMD=1.03 (0.61,1.45), P<0.0001, I2=26%, FEM •• | 3 studies, n=55, SMD=0.64 (-1.09,2.38), P=0.47, I2=87%, REM • |
| **Catecholamines vs. TP** | | | | | | | |
| Huang 2020 | 2 studies, n=50, SMD=-0.58 (-1.15, -0.02), P=0.04, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=69, SMD=-0.32 (-0.79,0.16), P=0.20, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=62, SMD=-0.20 (-0.70,0.30), P=0.43, I2=0%, FEM • | 4 studies, n=137, SMD=-0.39 (-0.73, -0.04), P=0.03, I2=44%, FEM •• | 3 studies, n=107, SMD=-0.19 (-0.58,0.19), P=0.32, I2=18%, FEM •• |  | 5 studies, n=176, SMD=0.07 (-0.51,0.66), P=0.80, I2=72%, REM •• |
| **NE vs. non-catecholamines** | | | | | | | |
| Tan 2016 | 5 studies, n=151, MD=3.78 (-53.23,60.78), P=0.90, I2=5%, FEM •• | 5 studies, n=170, MD=7.55 (-13.71,28.82), P=0.49, I2=58%, REM •• | 4 studies, n=324, MD=-0.22 (-1.20,0.76), P=0.66, I2=0%, FEM •• | 7 studies, n=416, MD=-3.91 (-7.83,0.02), P=0.05, I2=0%, FEM •• | 7 studies, n=416, MD=-0.23 (-0.48,0.02), P=0.08, I2=24%, FEM •• | 5 studies, n=151, MD=32.78 (-112.64,178.20), P=0.66, I2=0%, FEM •• | 8 studies, n=455, MD=1.92 (-0.95,4.78), P=0.19, I2=78%, REM •• |
| Zhong 2020 | 3 studies, n=83, SMD=-0.16 (-0.62,0.31), P>0.05, I2=11.9%, REM • | 3 studies, n=83, SMD=-0.12 (-0.55,0.32), P>0.05, I2=0%, REM • | 6 studies, n=772, SMD=-0.07 (-0.22,0.07), P>0.05, I2=0%, REM •• | 10 studies, n=889, SMD=-0.43 (-0.66, -0.19), P<0.05, I2=67.1%, REM •• | 6 studies, n=579, SMD=-0.14 (-0.36,0.09), P>0.05, I2=12%, REM •• | 4 studies, n=113, SMD=0.17 (-0.33,0.67), P>0.05, I2=43.9%, REM •• | 9 studies, n>200, SMD=-0.01 (-0.21,0.19), P>0.05, I2=37.3%, REM •• |
| **NE vs. VP** | | | | | | | |
| Neto 2012 | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=-0.06 (-0.61,0.48), P=0.82, I2<75%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=-0.09 (-0.63,0.45), P=0.75, I2<50%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=-0.22 (-0.77,0.32), P=0.42, I2<50%, FEM • |  | 4 studies, n=87, SMD=0.44 (-0.00,0.88), P=0.05, I2<50%, FEM • |  |  |
| Tan 2016 |  | 3 studies, n=101, MD=1.73 (-29.18,32.65), P=0.91, I2=57%, REM •• |  |  |  |  | 5 studies, n=366, MD=-0.01 (-2.24,5.99), P=0.37, I2=80%, REM •• |
| Yin 2018 |  |  |  | 1 study, n=23, WMD=13.00 (-20.16,46.16), P>0.05, I2=NA, FEM • | 1 study, n=23, WMD=0.80 (0.05,1.55), P<0.05, I2=NA, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, WMD=14.75 (-211.25,240.74), P>0.05, I2=12.5%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, WMD=-0.49 (-11.06,10.08), P>0.05, I2=0%, FEM • |
| Zhou 2015 | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=-0.06 (-0.62,0.49), P=0.82, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=0.03 (-0.52,0.59), P=0.91, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=0.25 (-0.31,0.80), P=0.38, I2=0%, FEM • | 3 studies, n=831, SMD=0.21 (0.07,0.34), P=0.003, I2=0%, FEM •• | 3 studies, n=294, SMD=-0.04 (-0.26, 0.19), P=0.76, I2=0%, FEM •• | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=0.15 (-0.39, 0.70), P=0.58, I2=0%, FEM • | 3 studies, n=831, SMD=-0.07 (-0.21, 0.07), P=0.76, I2=0%, FEM •• |
| Zhou 2014 | 2 studies, n=50, SMD=-0.06 (-0.62,0.49), P=0.82, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=50, SMD=0.03 (-0.52,0.59), P=0.91, I2=0%, FEM • |  |  | 2studies, n=53, SMD=-0.10 (-0.64,0.44), P=0.73, I2=0%, FEM • | 2 studies, n=53, SMD=0.15 (-0.39,0.70), P=0.58, I2=0%, FEM • |  |
| **NE vs. TP** | | | | | | | |
| Huang 2019 | 2 studies, n=87, SMD=0.00 (-0.24,0.25), P=0.97, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  | 2 studies, n=87, SMD=-0.59 (-0.84, -0.34), P=0.000, I2=11.8%, FEM •• |  |  | 2 studies, n=87, SMD=-0.10 (-0.35,0.14), P=0.41, I2=32.3%, FEM •• |
| Neto 2012 | 3 studies, n=89, SMD=-0.79 (-1.23, -0.36), P=0.0004, I2=0%, FEM • | 3 studies, n=89, SMD=-0.34 (-0.76,0.08), P=0.11, I2=0%, FEM • | 3 studies, n=89, SMD=-0.32 (-0.75,0.10), P=0.13, I2=35%, FEM • |  | 3 studies, n=89, SMD=-0.44 (-0.87, -0.02), P=0.04, I2=0%, FEM • |  |  |
| Tan 2016 |  | 2 studies, n=69, MD=14.82 (-26.27,55.92), P=0.48, I2=78%, REM • |  |  |  |  | 3 studies, n=89, MD=2.36 (-2.53,7.26), P=0.34, I2=81%, REM • |

**Supplementary Table 5c Evidence maps of overview by interventions.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AE** | **ARR** | **DI** | **MI** | **AKI incidence** | **Scr** | **RRT requirement** | **UO** | **RRT duration** |
| **NE vs. DA** | | | | | | | | | |
| De Backer 2012 |  | 2 studies, n=1296, RR=0.43 (0.26,0.72), P=0.001, I2=70%, REM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nagendran 2016 |  | 2 studies, n=1296, OR=2.69 (2.08,3.47), P<0.0001, I2=67%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vasu 2012 |  | 2 studies, n=1911, RR=0.43 (0.26,0.69), P<0.001, I2=65.4%, REM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zhao 2012 |  | 3studies, n=1997, RR=2.63 (1.51,4.55), P<0.001, I2=62%, REM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **NE vs. other vasopressors** | | | | | | | | | |
| Ruslan 2021 |  | 6 studies, n=3974, RR=0.64 (0.42,0.97), P=0.03, I2=64%, REM ••• |  | 3 studies, n=2983, RR=1.2 (0.79,2.09), I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Catecholamines vs. non-catecholamines** | | | | | | | | | |
| Jiang 2019 | 11 studies, n=2094, RR=1.28 (0.87,1.90), P=0.21, I2=57%, REM •• | 8 studies, n=2031, RR=0.77 (0.48,1.23), P=0.28, I2=23%, FEM •• | 8 studies, n=1964, RR=4.85 (2.81,8.39), P<0.001, I2=26%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| McIntyre 2018 |  | 12 studies, n=1143, RR=0.76 (0.55,1.05), P=0.09, I2=8%, REM ••• |  | 10 studies, n=1609, RR=0.94 (0.67,1.32), P=0.71, I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nedel 2019 |  |  |  |  | 7 studies, n=1366, OR=0.84 (0.67,1.05), P=0.12, I2=0%, REM ••• |  | 4 studies, n=1263, OR=0.75 (0.54,1.04), P=0.08, I2=27%, REM ••• |  |  |
| Yao 2020 | 14 studies, n=3206, RR=1.21 (0.88,1.68), P=0.24, I2=73%, REM ••• | 9 studies, n=2830, RR=1.05 (0.87,1.27), P=0.61, I2=25%, FEM ••• | 9 studies, n=2929, RR=2.65 (1.26,5.56), P<0.01, I2=48%, REM ••• | 7 studies, n=2642, RR=1.05 (0.72,1.54), P=0.79, I2=0%, FEM ••• |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Catecholamines vs. VP** | | | | | | | | | |
| Jiang 2019 | 7 studies, n=1382, RR=1.13 (0.83,1.53), P=0.43, I2=0%, FEM •• | 4 studies, n=1319, RR=0.99 (0.51,1.91), P=0.98, I2=15%, FEM •• | 4 studies, n=1267, RR=3.33 (1.39,7.95), P<0.001, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Catecholamines vs. TP** | | | | | | | | | |
| Huang 2020 | 4 studies, n=672, OR=1.48 (0.51,4.24), P=0.47, I2=74%, REM •• | 3 studies, n=640, OR=0.66 (0.21,2.05), P=0.47, I2=32%, REM •• | 2 studies, n=610, OR=8.65 (1.48,50.59), P=0.02, I2=71%, REM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Li 2020 | 4 studies, n=672, OR=1.48 (0.51,4.24), P=0.47, I2=74%, REM ••• |  | 2 studies, n=610, OR=10.81 (0.88,133.19), P=0.06, I2=78%, REM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zhu 2019 |  | 2 studies, n=610, RR=0.80 (0.34,1.91), P=0.62, I2=0%, REM ••• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **NE vs. non-catecholamines** | | | | | | | | | |
| Nagendran 2016 |  | 3 studies, n=846, OR=1.36 (0.56,3.31), P=0.50, I2=76%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tan 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 studies, n=122, MD=8.64 (-14.45,30.87), P=0.48, I2=6%, FEM •• |  |
| Zhong 2020 | 14 studies, n>200, RR=1.12 (0.91,1.39), P>0.05, I2=72.3%, REM •• | 9 studies, n>200, RR=0.89 (0.62,1.28), P>0.05, I2=33%, REM •• | 11 studies, n>200, RR=2.43 (1.18,5.00), P=0.02, I2=46.4%, REM •• | 6 studies, n>200, RR=0.93 (0.56,1.53), P>0.05, I2=0%, REM •• | 4 studies, n>200, RR=0.91 (0.81,1.02), P>0.05, I2=0%, REM •• | 6 studies, n>200, SMD=-0.15 (-0.29, -0.01), P=0.04, I2=0%, REM •• | 8 studies, n>200, RR=0.71 (0.56,0.89), P<0.01, I2=0%, REM •• |  | 3 studies, n>200, SMD=0.08 (-0.16,0.33), P>0.05, I2=84.2%, REM •• |
| **NE vs. VP** | | | | | | | | | |
| Chidambaram 2019 | 3 studies, n=1008, RR=1.19 (0.83,1.70), P=0.35, I2=13%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nagendran 2019 | 4 studies, n=1453, RR=1.02 (0.82,1.26), P>0.05, I2=8%, FEM ••• | 4 studies, n=1453, ARD=-2.8 (-0.2, -5.3), P<0.05 ••• | 4 studies, n=1453, ARD=1.7 (0.3,3.2), P<0.05 ••• | 3 studies, n=1438, ARD=-0.6 (-2.1,0.9), P>0.05 ••• |  |  | 4 studies, n=1452, RR=0.86 (0.74,0.99), P<0.05, I2=27%, FEM •• \* |  | 2 studies, n=151 •• |
| Neto 2012 | 3 studies, n=812, RR=0.98 (0.65,1.47), P=0.92, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tan 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 studies, n=53, MD=-1.82 (-29.11,25.48), P=0.90, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |
| Zhou 2015 | 3 studies, n=831, OR=1.30 (0.73,2.32), P=0.38, I2=0%, FEM •• |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **NE vs. TP** | | | | | | | | | |
| Huang 2019 | 2 studies, n=546, RR=2.54 (0.58,11.08), P=0.21, I2=80.4%, REM •• | 2 studies, n=546, RR=0.92 (0.39,2.14), P=0.84, I2=0%, REM •• | 2 studies, n=546, RR=8.98 (0.59,137.83), P=0.12, I2=83.3%, REM •• |  |  | 2 studies, n=87, SMD=0.11 (-0.19,0.41), P=0.48, I2=0%, FEM•• |  | 4 studies, n=146, SMD=0.14 (-0.12,0.39), P=0.30, I2=24.4%, FEM •• |  |
| Huang 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 studies, n=87, SMD=-0.65 (-1.09,0.22), P=0.003, I2=0%, FEM • |  | Urinary Flow:4 studies, n=156, SMD=0.49 (-0.01,0.98), P=0.05, I2=55%, REM •• |  |
| Tan 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 studies, n=69, MD=30.41 (-10.21,71.04), P=0.14, I2=2%, FEM •• |  |

The following notes apply to Supplementary Tables 5a, 5b, and 5c.

GRADE rating: ••• moderate; •• low; • very low.

\* non-significant in random-effects specification, downgrade one level.

AE, adverse events; AKI, acute kidney injury; ARD, absolute risk difference; ARR, arrythmia; AT-II, angiotensin II; CI, cardiac index; DA, dopamine; DI, digital ischemia; DO2, oxygen delivery; EP, epinephrine; FEM, fixed effect mode; HR, heart rate; GRADE, grading of recommendations assessment, development and evaluation; ICU, intensive care unit; Lac, lactic acid; Los, length of stay; MAP, mean arterial pressure; MD, mean difference; MI, myocardial injury; MtB, methylene blue; NE, norepinephrine; OR, odds ratio; PE, phenylephrine; REM, random effect model; RR, relative risk; RRT, renal replacement therapy; Scr, serum creatinine; SMD, standardized mean difference; SVRI, systemic vascular resistance index; TP, terlipressin; UO, urinary output; VO2, oxygen consumption; VP, vasopressin; WMD, weighted mean difference.
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