



Effectiveness of Urate-Lowering Therapy for Renal Function in Patients With Chronic Kidney Disease: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials

Xiuping Liang^{1,2†}, Xiang Liu^{3,2†}, Duohui Li², Wei Qin^{2*} and Yi Liu^{1,4*}

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Ayman M. Mahmoud, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

Reviewed by:

Ching-Wei Tsai, Ministry of Health and Welfare, Taiwan Shao-Yu Yang, National Taiwan University Hospital, Taiwan

*Correspondence:

Wei Qin ddqstrike@163.com Yi Liu yi2006liu@163.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Renal Pharmacology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

Received: 19 October 2021 Accepted: 24 February 2022 Published: 17 March 2022

Citation:

Liang X, Liu X, Li D, Qin W and Liu Y (2022) Effectiveness of Urate-Lowering Therapy for Renal Function in Patients With Chronic Kidney Disease: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials. Front. Pharmacol. 13:798150. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.798150 ¹Department of Rheumatology and Immunology, Department of Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, ²West China School of Medicine, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, ³Department of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, ⁴Rare Diseases Center, Institute of Immunology and Inflammation, Frontiers Science Center for Disease-related Molecular Network, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

Background and Objective: Hyperuricemia is closely related to chronic kidney disease (CKD). The effects of urate-lowering therapy (ULT) on renal outcomes are uncertain, and whether it is warranted in CKD patients is currently unclear. The aim of our meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials (RCTs) was to assess the effectiveness and safety of ULT for improving kidney function in patients with CKD.

Methods: RCTs were retrieved from the PubMed, Embase, MEDLINE and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials databases. The meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager and Stata/SE software. The outcomes were changes in renal function and serum uric acid (SUA), serum creatinine, and adverse events.

Results: Twelve RCTs with 1,469 participants were included in the meta-analysis. ULT was found to effectively lower SUA (standard mean difference (SMD): -2.70; 95% confidence interval (Cl): -3.71, -1.69) but the renoprotective effects were not superior to those of control therapy (placebo or usual therapy), which were stable in the subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses. Regarding adverse events, their risks did not increase in the ULT group compared with the control group and were stable in the sensitivity analyses.

Conclusion: The findings of our meta-analysis suggested that ULT can effectively lower SUA, but there is insufficient evidence to support the renoprotective effects of ULT in CKD patients. In addition, ULT is safe for patients with CKD.

Systematic Review Registration: https://clinicaltrials.gov/, identifier PROSPERO (CRD42020200550).

Keywords: ULT, chronic kidney disease, hyperuricemia, renal function, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is defined as abnormalities in kidney structure or function that are present for more than 3 months and have an impact on health. These abnormalities include a decreased glomerular filtration rate and increased urinary albumin-creatinine ratio (Stevens and Levin, 2013). CKD progression can lead to end-stage renal disease and other organ damage, such as cardiovascular events, which highlights the need to adopt more effective treatment strategies for CKD (2). Hyperuricemia is a condition commonly defined as a serum uric acid (USA) concentration over 5.7 mg/dl for women and 6.8 mg/ dl for men. This may be caused by excessive production of uric acid or its reduced excretion (Eleftheriadis et al., 2017; Dalbeth et al., 2019). The kidneys have a strong relationship with uric acid, as most daily uric acid excretion (65-75%) occurs by reabsorption and secretion in the proximal tubule (Cannella and Mikuls, 2005; Preitner et al., 2009; Wright et al., 2010; Bobulescu and Moe, 2012). Therefore, hyperuricemia is associated with impaired renal excretion of uric acid (Richette and Bardin, 2010).

Hyperuricemia is also closely related to CKD, but the causality is still not very clear (2). Previous studies suggested that SUA was likely a risk factor for CKD (Xiao et al., 2015; Crişan et al., 2016; Eleftheriadis et al., 2017). At present, there are many uratelowering drugs, including xanthine oxidase inhibitors (allopurinol and febuxostat), pegloticase, interleukin-1 (IL-1) blockers, and lesinurad (URAT1 inhibitor). However, whether the use of these drugs can postpone CKD progression and whether it is necessary for CKD patients to undergo ULT is still unclear (2). Further evidence is needed to define the efficacy and safety of ULT in CKD patients.

Thus, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs to evaluate the efficacy and safety of ULT in patients with CKD.

METHODS

Data Sources and Literature Search

This systematic review was performed according to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) statement (Moher et al., 2009). It was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42020200550). RCTs were retrieved from the PubMed, Embase, MEDLINE and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials databases up to 3 August 2020. The search strategy included the following key words: "renal insufficiency, chronic", "CKD", "hyperuricemia", "ULT", "febuxostat", "allopurinol", "probenecid", "rasburicase", "pegloticase", and "benzbromarone". In addition, systematic reviews, guidelines, and reference lists from all relevant articles were also manually searched to identify potential eligible studies. Ethical approval was not necessary because our study was a meta-analysis.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included in our meta-analysis if they met the following criteria: 1) RCTs involved patients with CKD; 2) the

dosage and duration of the intervention (ULT) and control groups (placebo or usual therapy) were adequately documented; and 3) changes in uric acid, estimated glomerular filtrate rate (eGFR), creatinine, or proteinuria were reported. Studies were excluded if they 1) lacked a control group (placebo or usual therapy), 2) were not published in English, 3) had a follow-up time <3 months. Study selection was performed independently by two authors (XPL and DL). Any disagreement was resolved by the third reviewer (XL).

Outcomes

Changes in the USA, eGFR, serum creatinine and adverse events including deterioration of kidney function, liver dysfunction, cardiovascular events, gastrointestinal symptoms, and hypersensitivity (such as rash) were assessed in our article.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Two researchers (XPL and DL) independently extracted the information, including title, first author, year of publication, study design, country of origin, inclusion and exclusion criteria, sample size, study population characteristics, drug type and dosage, intervention period and duration, outcomes, and adverse events. Outcomes including adverse events, changes in SUA, serum creatinine, and eGFR were used to evaluate the effects and safety of ULT. When the above data were unavailable, they were extracted from figures and/or tables as far as possible. Any inconsistency between the two researchers was resolved by the third researcher (XL) to reach an agreement.

The risk of bias of the included RCTs was assessed independently by two researchers (XPL and XL) according to the revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (Higgins et al., 2011). The risk-of-bias assessment consisted of random sequence generation, allocation concealment, participant blinding, investigator binding, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other bias. Judgment of the risk of bias arising from each domain was generated by an algorithm. The risk of bias was categorized as high, low, or unclear.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

We completed all statistical analyses by the statistical package Review Manager and Stata/SE software. All pooled data of eGFR, SUA, creatinine and blood pressure, as continuous variables, are shown with SMD and 95% CI. The pooled data of adverse events, as binary variables, were evaluated with risk ratios (RRs) and 95% CIs. We considered that p < 0.05 indicated a significant difference. We used the Q-test and I statistic to examine heterogeneity. If studies were heterogeneous (p < 0.1 or $I^2 >$ 50%), the random-effects model was used. Otherwise, the fixedeffects model was applied (Liu et al., 2021). We also used leaveone-out sensitivity analysis (Liu et al., 2018) and subgroup analyses to explore heterogeneity, including CKD stages, follow-up time and different uric acid-lowering agents. In addition, Egger's test of publication bias was performed with Stata/SE software, and p < 0.05 indicated the presence of publication bias.



TABLE 1 | study characteristics of included studies.

Author/Year	Country	Study type	Samples (ULT/CTL)	Intervention (mg/d) controls	Follow up (months)	Inclusion criteria
Siu et.al., 2006	China	RCT	25	Allopurinol (100-200)	12	SUA≥7.60 mg/dl proteinuria>500 mg/d and/
	Orania	DOT	26	Usual therapy	004.70	or SCr>120 µmol/L
Goicoechea et.al.,	Spain	RCI	57	Allopurinoi (100)	23.4 ± 7.8	Mean SUA: 7.6 mg/dl eGFR <60 ml/mln
2010	D	DOT	56	Usual therapy		/1./3 m ²
Ali et.al 2010	British	RCI	20	Allopurinol (100) placebo	4	Mean SUA: 6.23 mg/dl
			20			Diabetic nephropathy
Kao et.al., 2011	British	RCT	27	Allopurinol (300)	9	Mean SUA: 7.23 mg/dl
			26	Usual therapy		CKD 3
Shi et.al., 2012	China	RCT	21	Allopurinol (100-300) placebo	6	SUA> 6 mg/dl (women), SUA> 7 mg/dl (men)
			19			IgA nephrology
Sircar et.al., 2015	India	RCT	45	Febuxostat (40) placebo	6	SUA >7 mg/dl
			48			CKD 3,4
Saag et.al., 2016	United States	RCT	32 32	Febuxostat (40-80) placebo	12	SUA >7.0 mg/dl eGFR 15–50 ml/min /1.73 m ²
Kimura et.al., 2018	Japan	RCT	219	Febuxostat (10-40) placebo	27	SUA: 7.0–10 mg/dl, CKD 3
	·		222			
Ghane et.al 2018	Iran	RCT	38	Allopurinol (5 mg/kg and <300 mg)	4	SUA> 5.5 ma/dl
			32	Usual therapy		CKD 1–3
Mukri et.al., 2018	Malavsia	RCT	47	Febuxostat (40)	6	SUA> 7.60 mg/dl
,			46	Usual therapy		CKD 3.4
Badve et.al., 2020	Australia	RCT	176	Allopurinol (100-300) placebo	26	CKD 3.4
,,			175			
Stack et.al., 2021	British	RCT	32	Febuxostat (80) and verinurad	6	SUA> 6.0 mg/dl
			28	placebo		Diabatic penbronathy
			20	placebo		Diabelic hephilopality

Abbreviations: RCT, randomized controlled trial; SUA, serum uric acid; CKD, chronic kidney disease; eGFR (ml/min/1.73 m²), estimated glomerular filtration rate; SCr, serum creatinine; ULT, urate-lowering therapy; CTL, control.

TABLE 2 | Baseline characteristics of included patients.

Author/Year	Participants	Participants (ULT/CTL)	Gender (% Male)	Mean age	Baseline SUA:(mg/dl)	Baseline kidney function
Siu et.al., 2006	51	25	16%	47.7 ± 12.9	9.75 ± 1.18	Proteinuria 2.39 ± 2.88 g/d
		26	57.7%	48.8 ± 16.8	9.92 ± 1.68	2.39 ± 2.2 g/d
Goicoechea et.al., 2010	113	57	_	72.1 ± 7.9	7.8 ± 2.1	eGFR 40.8 ± 11.2
		56		71.4 ± 9.5	7.3 ± 1.6	39.5 ± 12.4
Ali et.al 2010	40	20	45%	56.3 ± 10.6	5.96 ± 1.21	SCr 1.3 ± 0.45
		20	45%	59.1 ± 10.6	6.5 ± 2.2	1.5 ± 0.6
Kao et.al., 2011	53	27	59.3%	70.6 ± 6.9	7.39 ± 1.51	eGFR 44 ± 11
		26	46.2%	73.7 ± 5.3	7.06 ± 1.34	46 ± 9
Shi et.al., 2012	40	21	61.9%	39.7 ± 10	7.9 ± 1.1	eGFR 69.5 ± 26.5
		19	47.4%	40.1 ± 10.8	7.8 ± 1.1	63.6 ± 27.5
Sircar et.al., 2015	93	45	64.4%	56.22 ± 10.87	9 ± 2	eGFR 31.5 ± 13.6
		48	77.1%	58.42 ± 14.52	8.2 ± 1.1	32.6 ± 11.6
Saag et.al., 2016	64	32	79.7%	65.51 ± 9.84	10.36 ± 1.56	eGFR 34.1
		32	81.3%	66.3 ± 12.05	10.8 ± 1.96	29.31
Kimura et.al., 2018	441	219	77.6%	65.3 ± 11.8	7.8 ± 0.9	eGFR 45.2 ± 9.5
		222	77.0%	65.4 ± 12.3	7.8 ± 0.9	44.9 ± 9.7
Ghane et.al 2018	70	38	55.3%	6.3 ± 2.9	6.7 ± 1.2	eGFR 76.2 ± 12.7
		32	53.1%	6.2 ± 2.7	6.5 ± 1.3	79.2 ± 13.1
Mukri et.al., 2018	93	47	53.2%	64 (10)	9.07 ± 1.75	eGFR 26.2 ± 14.3
		46	54.3%	67 (6)	9.03 ± 1.19	28.2 ± 19.8
Badve et.al., 2020	351	182	61.5%	62.3 ± 12.6	8.2 ± 1.8	eGFR 31.6 ± 11.7
		181	64.1%	62.6 ± 12.9	8.2 ± 1.7	31.9 ± 12.4
Stack et.al., 2021	60	32	69%	-	7.5 ± 1.6	eGFR 59.2 ± 25.3
		28	71%		7.0 ± 0.8	68.1 ± 23.2

Abbreviations: eGFR (ml/min/1.73 m²), estimated glomerular filtration rate; SCr (mg/dl), serum creatinine; SUA, serum uric acid; ULT, urate lowering therapy; CTL, control.

RESULT

Search Results and Characteristics of the Studies

A total of 1,245 studies were identified during the initial search, and we eliminated 1,211 studies based on our screening of titles and abstracts. After reading the full texts of 34 studies in detail, 12 RCTs with 1,469 participants were included in this meta-analysis (**Figure 1**)

The essential information of the 12 RCTs is shown in **Table 1** and **Table 2**. All participants in the 12 RCTs (Siu et al., 2006; Goicoechea et al., 2010; Momeni et al., 2010; Kao et al., 2011; Shi et al., 2012; Sircar et al., 2015; Saag et al., 2016; GhaneSharbaf and Assadi, 2018; Kimura et al., 2018; Mukri et al., 2018; Badve et al., 2020; Stack et al., 2021)were CKD patients, 6 RCTs (15, 16, 19-21, 24) incorporated patients with hyperuricemia, while the level of SUA was not clearly reported in the other 6 studies (17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 26). The ULT drugs included febuxostat in seven studies (15-19, 22, 25) and allopurinol in five studies (20, 21, 23, 24, 26), while the control group was placebo or usual therapy. The follow-up period ranged from 4 to 27 months.

Effect of ULT on SUA

Twelve RCTs with 1,248 patients showed that ULT significantly decreased the level of SUA compared to the control group (SMD: -2.70; 95% CI: -3.71, -1.69) (**Figure 2A**). In the analysis of data with only patients with CKD and hyperuricemia or patients with eGFR<60 ml/min/1.73 m² and hyperuricemia included, the results were consistent. (**Figure 2B**).

We performed subgroup analysis according to the treatment duration (6 months) and the ULT drugs, including febuxostat and allopurinol. The analysis of studies with treatment durations of 6 months or more showed the consistent results above (**Figure 2C**), as did the analysis of studies including only febuxostat or allopurinol (**Figure 2D**).

Effect of ULT on Kidney Outcomes

Renal function was evaluated by the changes in eGFR and serum creatinine. In terms of the change in the level of eGFR, 10 RCTs with 1,157 patients showed no statistically significant differences between the ULT and control groups (SMD: 0.43; 95% CI: 0.10, 0.96) (**Figure 3A**). When only patients with CKD and hyperuricemia or patients with eGFR<60 ml/min/1.73 m² and hyperuricemia were included, the changes were still not statistically significant (**Figure 3B**). The subgroup analysis including nine studies with treatment durations of 6 months or more and the subgroup according to ULT drugs (febuxostat or allopurinol) also demonstrated that there were no differences (**Figures 3C,D**). Regarding serum creatinine, four studies with 208 patients revealed consistent results with eGFR (**Figure 4**).

Safety of ULT

The major concern about febuxostat is its cardiovascular side effect supported by the RCT performed by White et al., which demonstrated that febuxostat had higher all-cause mortality and cardiovascular mortality than allopurinol (White et al., 2018), and this was noticed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Therefore, we directly performed a subgroup analysis according to febuxostat and allopurinol. Three studies with 501

Α				
~	ULT Control	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total	Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV. Random, 95% Cl	
Siu et.al 2006	-3.87 1.1 25 0.16 1.68 26	8.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006	÷	
Goicoechea et.al 2010	-0.65 1.06 20 -0.06 2.09 20 -1.8 1.82 51 0.2 1.65 47	8.4% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 8.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010	-	
Kao et.al 2011	-3.02 1.34 27 0.34 1 26	8.2% -2.79 [-3.56, -2.02] 2011	-	
Shi et.al 2012	-2.2 0.96 21 -0.4 1.35 19	8.3% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.81] 2012		
Sircar et.al 2015	-3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48	8.4% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015		
Ghane et.al 2018	-1.5 1.44 38 0.1 1.84 32	8.5% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018	-	
Mukri et.al 2018	-3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46	8.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018		
Kimura et.al 2018	-3.6 1.15 161 -0.06 1.16 164	8.6% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018	-	
Badve et.al 2020	-2.9 0.35 129 0 0.25 139	8.1% -9.57 [-10.42, -8.72] 2020		
Stack et.al 2021	-3.4 1.5 32 0.3 0.4 28	8.2% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021	-	
Total (95% CI)	638 610	100.0% -2.70 [-3.71, -1.69]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3	.08; Chi ² = 417.31, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² =	= 97%		-
Test for overall effect: 2	. = 5.24 (P < 0.00001)		ULT Control	
B	ULT Control	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total	Neight IV. Random, 95% CI Year	IV. Random, 95% CI	
1.2.1 Patients with hy	peruricemia and CKD			
Siu et.al 2006	-3.87 1.1 25 0.16 1.68 26	14.9% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006		
Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et al 2015	-2.2 0.96 21 -0.4 1.35 19	15.7% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.81] 2012 17.6% -2.31 [-2.84 -1.78] 2015		
Saag et.al 2016	-4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15	14.3% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016	+	
Kimura et.al 2018	-3.6 1.15 161 -0.06 1.16 164	19.4% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018	•	
Mukri et.al 2018	-3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46	18.1% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018	.	
Subtotal (95% CI)	341 318 1 10 10: 05:2 - 21 22 45 - 5 (D 1 0 00001): 12 -	100.0% -2.43 [-3.00, -1.85]	•	
Test for overall effect:	J.42; Chi ^e = 31.82, df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l ^e = Z = 8.24 (P < 0.00001)	84%		
rescion overall effect.	0.24 (1 < 0.00001)			
1.2.2 Patients with hy	peruricemia and eGFR < 60			
Sircar et.al 2015	-3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48	25.4% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015		
Saag et.al 2016	-4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15	20.6% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016	T	
Mukri et.al 2018		26.0% -1.75 [-2.23 -1.27] 2018 26.0% -1.75 [-2.23 -1.27] 2018		
Subtotal (95% CI)	295 273 1	100.0% -2.56 [-3.25, -1.86]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.42; Chi ² = 23.01, df = 3 (P < 0.0001); l ² = 8	37%		
Test for overall effect:	2 = 7.19 (P < 0.00001)			
		-		-
			-10 -5 0 5 10	
Test for subaroup diffe	rences: Chi ² = 0.08. df = 1 (P = 0.78). l ² = 0%	%	ULT Control	
-				
С	ULT Control	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Total Mean SD Total	Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Siu et.al 2006	-3.87 1.1 25 0.16 1.68 26	9.9% • -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006	-	
Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et al 2011	-1.8 1.82 51 0.2 1.65 47	10.2% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 9.9% -2.79 [-3.56 -2.02] 2011		
Shi et.al 2012	-2.2 0.96 21 -0.4 1.35 19	10.0% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.81] 2012	-	
Sircar et.al 2015	-3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48	10.1% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015	-	
Saag et.al 2016	-4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15	9.8% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016		
Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et al 2018	-3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46	10.2% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018		
Badve et.al 2020	-2.9 0.35 129 0 0.25 139	9.8% -9.57 [-10.42, -8.72] 2020	-	
Stock at al 2021	24 15 22 02 04 29	9.9% -3.23 [-4.02 -2.45] 2021	-	
Stack et.al 2021	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20			
Stack et.al 2021	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 28		•	
Total (95% CI)	-3.4 1.5 32 0.5 0.4 20 580 558 11: Chi ² = 336 92 df = 9 (P < 0.00004): P =	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00]	• •	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect ² 7	-5.4 1.5 52 0.3 0.4 28 580 558 :11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 5.48 (P < 0.00001)	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] - 97% -	-10 -5 0 5 10	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 .11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); i ² = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001)	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] 97% —	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 .11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); l ² = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001)	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] 97%	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 .11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); I ² = := 5.48 (P < 0.00001)	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] 97% -	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 ∴11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001) ULT Control Mean SD Total Mean SD Total	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] 97% - Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI	_
Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 .11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001) ULT Control Mean SD Total Mean SD Total	100.0% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] 97% - Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random, 95% CI Year	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	-
Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 .11; Ch ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001) ULT Control <u>Mean SD Total Mean SD Total</u> -3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [2.84, -1.78] 2015	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogenei(): Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mutrig et 2019	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 581;11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); i ² = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001) ULT Control 	Std. Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 1.11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001) ULT Control <u>Mean SD Total Mean SD Total</u> -3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48 -4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15 -3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46 -3.6 1.15 161 -0.06 1.16 164	Std. Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 558 558 558 558 1.11; ChiP = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.33, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -4.25] 2016	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup 14.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 580 50 580 500 580 500 580	Std. Mean Difference Viant Control Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year - 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.21 [-4.245] 2021 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] -2.45]	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for uccell effect	-3.4 1.3 32 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 580 50 580 500 580 500 580 500 580 500 580 500 580 500	Std. Mean Difference Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% Cl Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.9% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07]	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 558 L11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.48 (P < 0.00001) 20 70 70 </td <td>Std. Mean Difference Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.76] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.2, 3, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.26 [-3.28, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07]</td> <td>-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control</td> <td>-</td>	Std. Mean Difference Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.76] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.2, 3, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.26 [-3.28, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07]	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 558 558 558 558 1.11; ChF = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random, 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.26 [-3.26] 2016 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 108	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup. 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2006	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ^p = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2018 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 006	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2006 Ali et.al 2010	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ^p = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% Cl Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 10.26] 2010	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2016 Ali et.al 2016 Ali et.al 2016 Ali et.al 2016 Ali et.al 2011	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.9% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 10% 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.2% -2.79 [-3.562021 2011	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	-
Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% Ci) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Ci) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2010 Goicoechea et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 20 580 558 558 558 558 558 L11; ChF = 338.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 2 580 558 558 L11; ChF = 338.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 2 580 558 581 591 Mean SD Total Mean SD Total 301 301 301 -3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48 -4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15 -3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46 -3.6 1.15 161 -0.66 1.16 164 -3.4 1.5 327 301 301 327 301 305 301 305 305 1.08 26 -0.65 1.06 2.06 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.01 1.26 2.1 0.4 1.26 2.2 0.34 1.26 -2.2	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random, 95% CI Year 20.9% -3.11 [-4.23, -2.00] - 97% - - Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random, 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 7.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] % -1.44 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.2% -2.79 [-3.56, -2.02] 2011 14.3% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.81] 2012	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2015 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect Siu et.al 2006 Ali et.al 2006 Ali et.al 2010 Siu et.al 2006 Ali et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2018	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.37 [-3.28, -2.07] 106 14.2% -2.76 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.36 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.45% -1.74 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.45% -2.79 [-3.56, -2.02] 2011 14.3% -0.37 [-0.97, 0.121] 2012 14.43% -0.75 [-4.74, 71] 2011	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2006 All et.al 2011 Goicoechea et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2011 Sha et.al 2011 Sha et.al 2011 Sha et.al 2011 Sha et.al 2018	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 2.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 .11; Chi ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001) Control	Std. Mean Difference Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.9% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.3% -0.37 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2010 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Tost for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2010 Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 L11; Ch ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 2.5 580 558 L11; Ch ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001) P 2.5 581 581 Mean SD Total Mean SD Total -3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48 -4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15 -3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46 -3.4 1.5 32 0.3 0.4 28 .3.6 1.15 161 0.06 1.16 164 -3.4 1.5 327 301 327 301 :3.87 1.1 25 0.16 1.68 26 -0.65 1.06 20 -0.06 2.09 20 -3.87 1.1 25 0.16 1.86 47	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random, 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16,7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2015 16,7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -6.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 10% 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.5% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.81] 2012 14.3% -0.57 [-1.0.24, -8.72] 2010 14.4% -0.57 [-1.0.47, -8.72] 2011 14.4% -0.57 [-1.0.47, -8.72] 2012 14.4% -0.57 [-1.0.47, -8.72] 2012 14.4% -0.57 [-1.0.47, -8.72] 2018 14.4% -0.57 [-1.0.47, -8.72] 2018 20.0% -2.72 [-4.58	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup 14.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z 14.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2010 Aii et.al 2010 Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: Z	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ^p = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P =	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.0% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 100 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.4% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2011 14.2% -2.79 [-3.56, -2.02] 2011 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2011 14.4% -0.37 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.3% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.01] 2012 14.4% -0.37 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.37 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.37 [-1.42, -8.72] 2020 100.0% -2.72 [-4.58, -0.85] 98%	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control	_
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2006 Ali et.al 2010 Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2012 Shabe et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2012 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ^p = 336;92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.0 558 .11; Chi ^p = 336;92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = = 5.1 7.0 7.0 .13 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48 -3.6 1.1 47.00 1.8 4.4 9.1.46 42 -0.16 0.87 15 -3.5 2.1.1 47.00 1.8 4.8 -0.06 1.16 164 -3.4 1.5 161 -0.06 1.16 164 -3.4 1.5 3.27 301 .38 Chi 1.5 1.61 -0.06 1.61 1.64 2.7 301 .38 1.1 25 0.16 1.68 26 -0.02 1.84 32 -3.2 1.9 -3.2 1.9 -1.5 1.44 38 0.1 1.84 32 -2.9 0.35 1.3 1.32	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.34, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -2.37 [-4.32, -2.07] 2016 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.45% -1.74 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.5% -1.74 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.45% -0.77 [-2.36, 62.02] 2011 14.43% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.43% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.43% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.43% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.43% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.43% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2012 14.43% -0.57 [-10.42, -8.72] 2020 100.0% -2.72 [-4.58, -0.85]	-10 -5 ULT Control	-
Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2010 Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2013 Badve et.al 2014 Biototal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = (Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 1.11; Chi ^p = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 1.11; Chi ^p = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 1.11; Chi ^p = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = -3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48 -4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15 -3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46 -3.6 1.15 161 -0.06 1.16 164 -3.4 1.5 32 0.3 0.4 28 303; Chi ^p = 25.11, df = 4 (P < 0.0001); P = 84	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 23.3% -3.66 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.9% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.71] 2010 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.71] 2010 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.71] 2010 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.71] 2012 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.71] 2018 14.1% -9.57 [-10.42, -8.72] 2020 100.0% -2.72 [-4.58, -0.85]	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 D Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 1.4.2 Allopurinol Siu et.al 2006 Ali et.al 2010 Golcoechea et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = C Test for overall effect: 2 Test for overall effect: 2 Test for overall effect: 2	-3.4 1.3 3.2 0.3 0.4 2.0 580 558 558 558 558 L11; Ch ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 2.5 580 558 L11; Ch ² = 336.92, df = 9 (P < 0.00001); P = 3.6 1.6 1.6 -3.8 1.8 45 -0.4 1.05 48 -4.49 1.46 42 -0.15 0.87 15 -3.5 2.11 47 0.02 1.88 46 -3.6 1.15 161 -0.06 1.16 1.44 -3.6 1.15 161 -0.06 1.16 1.44 -3.6 1.15 125 0.16 1.68 26 -3.6 1.12 25 0.16 1.68 26 -0.65 1.06 20 -0.0001); P = 84 8 8 -3.87 1.1 25 0.16 1.68 26 -3.02 1.34 27 0.34 1 26	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.23 [-4.02, -2.45] 2021 100.9% -2.67 [-3.28, -2.07] 1% 14.2% -2.78 [-3.57, -2.00] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.4% -0.71 [-2010 14.4% 14.2% -2.79 [-3.56, -2.02] 2011 14.3% -1.52 [-2.23, -0.27] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.1% -0.55 [-1.0.42, -8.72] 2020 100.9% -2.72 [-4.58, -0.85] 98%	-10 -5 0 5 10 ULT Control Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	-
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 5 Test for overall effect: 2 Study or Subgroup. 1.4.1 Febuxostat Sicrar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Ximura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 6 Test for overall effect: 2 Ghane et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 6 Test for overall effect: 2	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Std. Mean Difference Weight IV. Random. 95% CI Year 20.9% -2.31 [-2.84, -1.78] 2015 16.7% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 21.5% -1.75 [-2.23, -1.27] 2018 23.3% -3.06 [-3.38, -2.74] 2018 17.6% -3.21 [-4.06, -2.36] 2016 100.0% -2.37 [-3.28, -2.07] 100.0% -2.36 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.5% -1.14 [-1.57, -0.01] 2006 14.3% -0.35 [-0.97, 0.28] 2010 14.4% -0.97 [-1.36, -2.02] 2011 14.4% -0.97 [-1.44, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.47, -0.47] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.42, -8.72] 2021 10.00% -2.77 [-3.56, -2.00] 2006 14.4% -0.97 [-1.42, -8.72] 2018 14.4% -0.97 [-1.42, -8.72] 2020 100.0% -2.72 [-4.58, -0.85] 98%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	-

FIGURE 2 | The effect of ULT compared with the control on SUA. (A) All patients. (B) Subgroup analysis of patients with hyperuricemia and CKD or patients with hyperuricemia and eGFR <60 ml/min/1.73 m². (C) Subgroup analysis including patients with a treatment duration of 6 months or over. (D) Subgroup analysis for ULT drugs including febuxostat and allopurinol. Abbreviations: SMD, standard mean difference; CI, confidence interval; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate.

A		ULT		c	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference			Std. Mean D	Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year		IV, Randor	n, 95% Cl	
Goicoechea et.al 2010	1.3	1.3	51	-3.3	1.2	47	9.4%	3.64 [2.99, 4.30]	2010				
Kao et.al 2011	0.2	6.9	27	0.2	5.5	26	9.8%	0.00 [-0.54, 0.54]	2011		-	_	
Shi et.al 2012	3.7	31.48	21	5.3	33	19	9.5%	-0.05 [-0.67, 0.57]	2012		-	_	
Sircar et.al 2015	3.2	16.32	45	-4.4	11.55	48	10.2%	0.54 [0.12, 0.95]	2015			_	
Saag et.al 2016	-0.38	14.78	42	-2.05	8.83	15	9.6%	0.12 [-0.47, 0.71]	2016		_	_	
Mukri et.al 2018	0.1	14.77	47	-0.6	19.9	46	10.3%	0.04 [-0.37, 0.45]	2018			_	
Ghane et.al 2018	16.3	11.39	38	-2.2	16.92	32	9.9%	1.29 [0.77, 1.81]	2018				
Kimura et.al 2018	-0.1	9.45	161	-0.6	9.59	164	10.7%	0.05 [-0.17, 0.27]	2018		I	-	
Badve et.al 2020	-3.33	4.59	129	-3.23	4.69	139	10.7%	-0.02 [-0.26, 0.22]	2020		T		
Stack et.al 2021	-5.5	5.8	32	-0.7	1.1	28	9.8%	-1.10 [-1.65, -0.55]	2021				
T-4-1 (05% OI)			500				400.00/	0 40 5 0 40 0 001					
10tal (95% CI)	0.00.01.2	454.4	593	0 (0 . 0	00004	504	100.0%	0.43 [-0.10, 0.96]				-	
Heterogeneity: I au ² =	0.68; Chi* =	= 154.4	3, df = 9	9 (P < 0	0.00001)	; $1^2 = 9^4$	4%			-4	-2 0	2	4
lest for overall effect:	Z = 1.59 (P	= 0.11))								ULT	Control	
В	31	υт			ontrol			Std. Moon Difforonco			Std Moon F	lifforonoo	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	Total I	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV Fixed 95% CI	Vear		IV Fixed	95% CI	
2 2 1 Patiente with h	vperuricen	nia and	ICKD	lean	30	Total	weight	IV, FIXEU, 35 /6 CI	Tear		TV, FIXED	35/6 01	
2.2.1 Fallents with h	yperuncen		OI	5.0	22	40	0.70/	0.0510.07.0.57	0040				
Shi et.al 2012	3.7 3	01.48	21	5.3	33	19	0.7%	-0.05 [-0.67, 0.57]	2012				
Sircar et.al 2015	3.2 1	6.32	45	-4.4	11.55	48	15.1%	0.54 [0.12, 0.95]	2015				
Saag et.al 2016	-0.38 1	4.78	42	-2.05	8.83	15	1.5%	0.12 [-0.47, 0.71]	2016		_		
Mukri et.al 2018	0.1 1	4.//	47	-0.6	19.9	46	15.7%	0.04 [-0.37, 0.45]	2018			_	
Nimura et.al 2018	-0.1	9.45	101	-0.6	9.59	164	54.9%	0.05 [-0.17, 0.27]	2018				
Subtotal (95% CI)			316			292	100.0%	0.12 [-0.04, 0.28]			T	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.68, df = 4	4 (P = 0).32); l ²	= 15%									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.48 (F	P = 0.14	4)										
0 0 0 D-4													
2.2.2 Patients with h	yperuricen	nia and	eGFR	< 60		5 ×	12.000						
Sircar et.al 2015	3.2 1	6.32	45	-4.4	11.55	48	16.2%	0.54 [0.12, 0.95]	2015				
Saag et.al 2016	-0.38 1	4.78	42	-2.05	8.83	15	8.0%	0.12 [-0.47, 0.71]	2016				
Mukri et.al 2018	0.1 1	4.77	47	-0.6	19.9	46	16.9%	0.04 [-0.37, 0.45]	2018				
Kimura et.al 2018	-0.1	9.45	161	-0.6	9.59	164	58.9%	0.05 [-0.17, 0.27]	2018		-		
Subtotal (95% CI)			295			273	100.0%	0.13 [-0.03, 0.30]			1		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.37, df = 3	3 (P = 0).22); l ²	= 31%									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.58 (F	P = 0.11	1)										
										<i></i>			
										2	1 0	3	1 2
С		ULT		c	Control			Std. Mean Difference			Std. Mean D	Difference	
C Study or Subgroup	Mean	ULT SD	Total	C Mean	Control SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	l Year		Std. Mean I IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl	
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Goicoechea et.al 2010	Mean) 1.3	ULT SD 1.3	Total 51	C <u>Mean</u> -3.3	Control SD 1.2	<u>Total</u> 47	Weight 10.4%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random. 95% Cl</u> 3.64 [2.99, 4.30]	<u>Year</u> 2010		Std. Mean I IV, Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011	<u>Mean</u>) 1.3 0.2	ULT SD 1.3 6.9	Total 51 27	C <u>Mean</u> -3.3 0.2	Control SD 1.2 5.5	Total 47 26	Weight 10.4% 10.9%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% Cl</u> 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54]	Year 2010 2011		Std. Mean I IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7	ULT 5D 1.3 6.9 31.48	Total 51 27 21	0 <u>Mean</u> -3.3 0.2 5.3	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33	Total 47 26 19	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% Cl</u> 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57]	2010 2011 2012		Std. Mean I IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015	Mean 0 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2	ULT 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32	Total 51 27 21 45	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55	Total 47 26 19 48	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random. 95% Cl</u> 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95]	2010 2011 2012 2015		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016	Mean 0 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38	ULT 5D 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78	Total 51 27 21 45 42	0.2 -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83	Total 47 26 19 48 15	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% Cl</u> 3.64 (2.99, 4.30) 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 (0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.012 0.72 0.72	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1	ULT 5D 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47	Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6	Sontrol 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018		Std. Mean D	Difference n. <u>95% Cl</u> 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9%	Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Random. 95% Cl</u> 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020		Std. Mean I	Difference n <u>, 95% Cl</u> 	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Difference n <u>, 95% Cl</u> 	-
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Tacht (055) Cit	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5	ULT 5D 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl	_ _
C Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021	Mean 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.665; Chi ²	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df =	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < 0	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; l ² = 9	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9% 4%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021	-4	Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	Mean) 1.3 0.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chi ² : Z = 1.20 (P	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 P = 0.23	Total 51 27 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < 0	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; ² = 9	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9% 4%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] -0.05 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chi ² : Z = 1.20 (P	ULT 5D 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 2 = 0.23 	Total 51 27 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < 0	Sontrol SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; ² = 9	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Control	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Siroar et.al 2012 Siroar et.al 2018 Saag et.al 2018 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chl ² Z = 1.20 (P	ULT 5D 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 P = 0.23 ULT	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1)	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < 0 8 (P < 0	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; ² = 9	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.96] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.05 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference M. Dard C. 201 [0.21]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Control	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 24.4 Enterpretion	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chi ² : Z = 1.20 (P Mean	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u>	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1) Total	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < 0 C Mean	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; l ² = 9 ;	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9% 4% Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 -0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chi² 2 2 = 1.20 (P Mean -0.1	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 > = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u>	Total 51 27 21 45 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1) Total	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C Mean	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; ² = 9; Total	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Siroar et.al 2012 Siroar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Mean} \\ \text{)} & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -3.33 \\ -5.5 \\ 0.65; \text{Chi}^2 : \\ \text{Z} = 1.20 (\text{P} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \text{Mean} \\ 3.2 \\ -3$	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32	Total 51 27 21 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1) Total	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < 0 C Mean -4.4	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD	Total 47 26 19 48 15 5 48 164 139 28 532 ; ² = 9. Total 48	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4% Weight 20.5%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015		Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016	Mean) 1.3 0.2 3.7 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chi ² ≥ Z = 1.20 (P Mean 3.2 -0.38	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 555 1, df = :) Total 45 42	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.2 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; ² = 9. Total 48 15	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 11.4% 10.7% 11.4% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4% Weight 20.5% 17.1%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2016 2018 2018 2020 2021 Year 2021 Year 2015 2016	i 4	Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2016 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{0} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 2 \\ \mbox{3} & 7 \\ \mbox{3} & 3.2 \\ \mbox{0} & -0.38 \\ \mbox{0} & -0.11 \\ \mbox{0} & -0.33 \\ \mbox{0} & -0.55 \\ \mbox{0} & -5.5 \\ \mbox$	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 14.77 136.62 14.78 14.79 14.59 14.59 14.59 15.8 14.59 14.59 14.59 15.8 14.59 14.59 14.59 15.8 14.59 14.77 14.77 14.78 14.77 14.79	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = :) Total 45 42 45 42 47	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.2 -0.7	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 532 ; ² = 9; 7 Total 48 15 46	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018		Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018	Mean 0 1.3 0.2 3.7 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.1 -3.33 -5.5 0.65; Chi² : Z Z = 1.20 (P Mean 3.2 -0.38 0.1 -0.38 0.1	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.77 9.45	Total 51 27 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 555 1, df = :) Total 45 42 45 42 47 7 161	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -2.05 -2.05 -2.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 1.15 1.15 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 10.7% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9% 20.5% 17.1% 20.5% 23.8%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.06 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27]	Vear 2010 2011 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 2021 Vear 2015 2016 2015 2016 2018 2018		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ Mea$	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.77 9.45 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 14.77 <u>SD</u> 5.8	Total 51 27 45 42 47 11 129 32 555 555 555 1, df = :) Total 42 47 7 161 322	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7	Control <u>SD</u> 1.2 5.5 3.3 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) <u>SD</u> 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.5% 11.4% 11.7% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55]	Year 2010 2011 2015 2016 2018 2018 2018 2010 2021 Year 2015 2016 2017 Year 2015 2015 2016 2017		Std. Mean I IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subgroup Stack et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{)} & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -3.33 \\ -5.5 \\ \hline \textbf{0.65; Chl^2 :} \\ \textbf{Z} = 1.20 (P \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -5.5 \\ \hline \textbf{0.65; Chl^2 :} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \hline \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Man} \\ $	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.66 = 0.23] ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 555 1, df = -) Total 45 42 47 161 32 327	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C C C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6	Control SD 1.2 5.5 3.3 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.000001 SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.55 8.83 19.9 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 139 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.05 [-0.7, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 2021 2021 2025 2016 2018 2018 2018 2028		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Mean \\ 0 & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -3.33 \\ -5.5 \\ 0.65; Chi^2 : \\ Z = 1.20 (P \\ \hline Mean \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -5.5 \\ 0.19; Chi^2 : \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ = 0.23 ULT SD 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ = 0.23 14.78 14.78 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ = 0.23 14.78 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ = 0.23 5.8 = 136.8 ⁶ = 0.23 5.8 = 136.8 ⁶ = 0.23 5.8 = 136.8 ⁶ = 0.23 5.8 = 14.78 5.8 = 12.8 ⁶ = 14.78 5.8 = 12.8 ⁶ = 14.78 5.8 = 12.8 ⁶ = 14.78 5.8 = 12.8 ⁶ = 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78 5.8 = 22.30 14.78	Total 51 27 21 45 42 42 32 555 555 1, df = 1) Total 45 42 47 161 12 2 47 161 12 9 32 7 45 55 55 55 1, df = 2 12 12 9 22 14 5 55 55 12 7 7 161 12 9 22 14 5 55 55 7 7 7 161 12 9 22 14 5 55 55 7 7 7 7 161 12 7 7 7 161 12 9 22 1 7 7 7 161 12 9 22 1 1 7 7 7 161 12 9 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 1 29 22 1 20 22 1 20 22 1 1 20 22 1 1 20 22 1 1 20 22 1 20 22 1 20 22 1 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 (P < 0.7 (P = 0.1) (P = 0.1)	Control SD 1.2 5.5 3.3 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 1.2 Control SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD	Total 47 26 19 48 15 54 6 164 139 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% 4% Weight 20.6% 23.8% 17.1% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stadve et.al 2020 Stadve et.al 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2018 Mukri et.al 2018 Mukri et.al 2018 Mukri et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ Mea$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6.6 = 0.23; ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 5.8 = 2.230, 0,23 ULT SD = 0,23; ULT SD = 0,23; SD = 0,25; SD = 0,25;	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 55 55 1, df = 1) Total 45 42 47 45 42 47 161 32 327 161 1 32 7 161	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 (P = 0.1) (P = 0.1)	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001; Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001; 11.55 8.83 19.9 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 (; ² = 9.) Total 48 164 28 532 (; ² = 9.) Total 48 164 28 301 = 82%	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 17.9% 17.9% 10.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 2021 2021 2021 2015 2016 2018 2018 2018 2019 2019 2019		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sira et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 = 0.23; ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.455 5.8 = 2.230, 9.455 5.8	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 555 555 1, df = :) Total 45 42 47 161 32 2327 , df = 4)	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.1)	Control SD 1,2 5,5 3,3 1,5 5,5 3,3 1,5 1,5 2,5 1,5 1,5 1,5 2,5 1,5 1,5 1,5 1,5 1,5 1,5 1,5 1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 20.5% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9% 17.9% 10.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 3.64 (2.99, 4.30) 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 (0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.54 (0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.47, 0.38]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2018 2021		Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference n. 95% Cl 	
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{0} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 2.3 \\ \mbox{-} & 3.2 \\ \mbox{-} & -0.38 \\ \mbox{0} & -0.1 \\ \mbox{-} & -3.33 \\ \mbox{-} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{0} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{0} & -6.5 \\ \mbox{0} & -6.5 \\ \mbox{0} & -6.5 \\ \mbox{0} & -0.38 \\ \mbox{0} & -1 \\ \mbox{-} & -0.38 \\ \mbox{0} & -1 \\ \mbox{-} & -0.38 \\ \mbox{0} & -1 \\ \mbox{-} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{-} & -1 \\ \$	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 5.8 = 2.230, = 0.83;	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Total} \\ 51 \\ 27 \\ 21 \\ 45 \\ 52 \\ 42 \\ 47 \\ 161 \\ 129 \\ 32 \\ 555 \\ 1, df = 1 \\) \end{array}$	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.0	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 Control 10.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 Control 1.2 Control Cont	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 532 532 546 164 15 46 164 15 46 164 15 46 15 46 15 19 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.5% 17.1% 20.6%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2018 2018 2020 2021 2021 2021	-4	Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% CI 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stadve et.al 2020 Stadve et.al 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{)} & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ $	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 9.45 5.8 = 136.6' 5.8 = 0.23; ULT 5.8 = 0.23; ULT 5.8 = 22.30,0 = 0.83; 1.3	Total 51 27 45 42 42 47 161 129 32 555 51 1, df =) Total 45 42 45 42 45 42 45 327 (, df = 4))	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.1 (P = 0.1)	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 11.55 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 2 0.00001) Control SD 1.2 5.5 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 1.2 5.5 8.83 1.2 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.00001) Control 0.00001) Control 0.000001) Control 0.00001) Control 0.00001) Control 0.00001) Control 0.00001) Control 0.000010 Control 0.0000000000 Control 0.0000000 Control 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 17.9% 10.0% 19.6%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2016 2018 2010 2011 Year 2015 2016 2018 2018 2019 Year 2015 2016 2018 2018 2019 2010		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Siroar et.al 2012 Siroar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Mean \\ \hline 0 & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -3.33 \\ -5.5 \\ \hline 0.65; Chl2 : \\ Z = 1.20 (P \\ \hline Mean \\ -0.1 \\ -5.5 \\ 0.19; Chl2 : \\ 0.10; Chl2 :$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.66 = 0.233 ULT SD 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 14.77 9.45 5.8 14.77 9.45 5.8 14.78 14.78 14.78 14.79 14.59 5.8 14.78 14.78 14.79 14.59 5.8 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.79 14.78 14.78 14.78 14.79 14.78	Total 51 27 21 14 42 47 161 129 32 555 555 555 1, df = ;)) Total 327 161 129 32 7, df = 4)	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.1 (P = 0.1) -3.3 0.2	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001 SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001 SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.5 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.5 5.5 8.83 1.5 5.5 8.83 1.5 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.69 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 5.5 1.1 5.5 5.5 1.1 5.5 5.5	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 28 532 (; $ ^2 = 9$) Total 48 15 46 164 28 301 2 = 82%	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 23.8% 17.9% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9% 20.6% 20.6% 23.8% 20.6%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 (2.99, 4.30) 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 (0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 (0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.05 [-0.47, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54]	2010 2011 2012 2015 2018 2020 2021 2021 2021 2021 2021 2018 2018		Std. Mean D IV. Randor -2 0 ULT Std. Mean D IV. Randor	Difference 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2011	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{J} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{J} & 0.2 \\ \mbox{J} & 3.7 \\ \mbox{J} & -0.38 \\ \mbox{J} & -0.1 \\ \mbox{J} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{J} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{J} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{J} & -0.1 \\ \mbox{J} & -0.1$	ULT <u>SD</u> 31.48 16.32 14.78 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ P = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 14.77 5.8 = 2.23 0.45 5.8 = 2.35 0.45 5.8 = 2.35 0.45 5.8 5.8 5.8 5.8 5.8 5.8 5.8 5.	Total 51 27 45 42 42 47 129 32 555 555 1, df = 1) Total 45 42 47 7 161 32 7 7 161 32 7 21	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 (P = 0.1 (P = 0.1) (P = 0.1) -3.3 0.2 5.3	Control SD 1.2 5.5 3 3 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) 11.55 8.83 19.59 1.1 0.00001) 1.2 1.2 5.5 5.3 10.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 19.6% 20.0% 19.7%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2016 2018 2018 2018 2018 2010 2021 Year 2015 2015 2015 2015 2018 2018 2021		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% CI 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Goicoechea et.al 2021 Shi et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{\mathbf{M}} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 0.2 \\ \mbox{3} & 7 \\ \mbox{3} & 7 \\ \mbox{0} & 1 \\ \$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.6; = 0.23; ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 0.23; ULT 5.8 = 22.30, 6.9 1.3 6.9 31.48 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3	Total 51 27 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1) Total 45 42 47 161 327 , df = 4) 511 277 21 38	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.1 (P = 0.1) -3.3 0.2 2 5.3 -0.7	Control SD 1.2 5.5 3.3 1.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001 SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001 SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 139 28 532 (;) ² = 9. Total 48 154 46 164 28 301 = 82% 47 26 19 47 26 19 32	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 20.6% 23.8% 100.0% 19.6% 20.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 1.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81]	Year 2010 2011 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 2021 2021 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012 2010 2010 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Kimura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Wukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2021 Badve et.al 2021	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Mean \\ \hline 0 & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -3.33 \\ -5.5 \\ \hline 0.65; Chl2 : \\ Z = 1.20 (P \\ \hline Mean \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -5.5 \\ 0.19; Chl2 : \\ -5.5 \\ 0.19; Chl2 : \\ -5.5 \\ 0.19; Chl2 : \\ -3.7 \\ 32 \\ 3.7 \\ 16.3 \\ -3.33 \\ -3.33 \end{tabular}$	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 5.8 = 22.30, 0.45 9.45 5.8 = 22.30, 0.45 9.45 5.8 = 2.23 0.45 1.3 6.9 31.48 1.39 1.39 1.39 1.39 1.59	Total 51 27 21 45 42 45 42 47 161 129 555 555 555 555 42 47 101 327 327 327 327 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.7 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C C C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.0 (P = 0.0 -3.3 0.2 5.3 0.2 5.3 -2.2 -3.23	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001; Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 00002); F 1.2 5.5 33 3 1.2 5.5 3.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 5.5 1.2 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 532 532 () ¹² = 9 Total 48 15 46 164 164 8 301 = 82% 47 26 19 9 301 28 301 39	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 100.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9% 100.0% 19.6% 20.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2018 2020 2021 Year 2010 2021 2018 2018 2018 2018 2021 2011 201		Std. Mean D	Difference 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2018 Mukri et.al 2018 Minura et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{J} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{J} & 0.2 \\ \mbox{J} & 3.2 \\ \mbox{J} & 0.38 \\ \mbox{J} & 0.1 \\ \mbox{J} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{J} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{J} & -5.5 \\ \mbox{J} & -0.1 \\$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ P = 0.23 ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ P = 0.23 ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 136.6 ⁶ P = 0.23 ULT SD 1.3 6.9 9.45	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 4) Total 45 42 47 7 161 32 327 161 32 327 161 32 327 161 132 45 42 47 47 555 55 55 1, df 54 42 42 47 555 555 1, df 54 42 42 47 555 555 1, df 54 42 42 47 555 555 1, df 154 42 42 47 555 555 1, df 154 42 42 47 47 42 42 47 47 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -0.6 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 8 (P < C (P = 0.1) (P = 0.1) (P = 0.1) (P = 0.2) -3.3 -3.2 -3.23	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) 1.1 50 50 1.2 50 50 1.2 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.3 1.2 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 139 28 532 512 70tal 48 15 46 164 28 301 2 47 2 47 2 139 2 139 2 301	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 17.1% 20.6% 19.6% 20.0% 20.0% 19.7% 20.0% 10.00%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] 0.96 [-0.21, 2.13]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2021 2011 2011 2012 2018 2020		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% CI 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Siraa et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2011 Shadve et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{\mathbf{M}} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0}.2 \\ \mbox{0}.7 \\ \mbox{3}.2 \\ \mbox{0}.6 \\ \mbox{0}.1 \\ \mbox{0}.6 \\ \mbox$	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 9.45 5.8 = 136.6; = 0.23; ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 0.23; ULT 5.8 = 22.30, 6.9 1.3 6.9 1.3 6.9 = 0.83; 1.3 6.9 = 1.3 6.9 = 1.3 6.9 8.3 7.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8	Total 51 27 21 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 51, df = :)) Total 45 42 47 7 161 32 327 , df = 4) 51 27 21 38 327 31 55 42 47 47 55 55 55 1, df = 2 55 55 55 56 42 55 55 55 55 56 57 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6	Control SD 1.2 5.5 3.3 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 5.5 8.83 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 1.1 5.5 8.5 3.3 1.6,9 2.4.69 1.1 5.5 8.3 3.3 1.6,92 4.69 1.1 5.5 8.5 3.3 1.6,92 4.69 1.1 5.5 5.5 3.3 1.6,92 4.69 0.00001)	Total 47 26 19 48 15 6 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.0% 100.0% Weight 20.5% 100.0% 19.6% 20.0% 19.7%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] 0.96 [-0.21, 2.13]	Year 2010 2011 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2018 2021 2021 2021 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012 2010		Std. Mean D	Difference a	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: C Sag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Cheterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 3.4.2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 3.4.2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 3.4.2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 3.4.2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{0} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 0.2 \\ \mbox{3} & 3.7 \\ \mbox{0} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 0.1 \\ \mbox{0} & -1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & -1.5 \\ $	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 = 0.23 ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 5.8 = 22.30, 0.459 5.8 = 22.30, 0.459 1.3 6.9 31.48 1.3 6.9 31.48 1.39 1.3 6.9 31.48 1.39	Total 51 27 21 45 42 45 55 555 555 555 555 55	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	Control SD 1.2 5.5 33 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001; Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 00002); F 1.2 5.5 33 16.92 4.69 0.00001)	Total 47 26 19 19 48 15 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 5	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% Weight 20.5% 17.1% Weight 20.5% 17.9% 20.6% 23.8% 17.9% 100.0% 19.6% 20.7% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] 0.96 [-0.21, 2.13]	Year 2010 2011 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 2021 2018 2021 2011 2011		Std. Mean D	Difference 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Ghane et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{0} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 0.2 \\ \mbox{3} & 7 \\ \mbox{3} & .2 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-0}$} & .33 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-0}$} & .55 \\ \mbox{0} & .65 \\ \mbox{0} & .65 \\ \mbox{0} & .61 \\ \m$	ULT SD SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 75.8 5.8 = 136.6^{\circ} 2 D 0.23 ULT SD 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 22.30 0.45 5.8 1.33 6.9 31.48 11.39 4.59 3.148 11.39 4.59 $212.5.5^{\circ}$ $21.5.12^{\circ}$	Total 51 27 21 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1) Total 45 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = 1) 555 51 42 42 47 7 161 129 32 555 51 1, df = 1 32 555 1, df = 1 32 327 161 109 109 109 109 109 109 109 10	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.1 (P = 0.1) (P = 0.1) -3.3 0.2 5.3 -2.2 -3.23 4 (P < C	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) 1.2 5.3 3 16.92 4.69 0.00001)	Total 47 26 19 48 15 46 164 139 28 532 ; $ ^2 = 9$. Total 48 15 46 164 28 301 = 82% 47 26 19 301 = 82% 47 28 301 = 82% 47 28 301 = 82% 47 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 301 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 17.1% 20.6% 20.0% 20.0% 20.0% 19.6% 7%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.6.4 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] 0.96 [-0.21, 2.13]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2021 2011 2011 2012 2018 2020		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Subto ar Subgroup 2.4.1 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2011 Shi et.al 2012 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\ \mbox{0} & 1.3 \\ \mbox{0} & 0.2 \\ \mbox{3} & 7 \\ \mbox{3} & .2 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-0}$} & .38 \\ \mbox{0} & .1 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-0}$} & .33 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-5}$} & .5 \\ \mbox{0} & .5 \\ \mbox{0} & .5 \\ \mbox{0} & .1 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-0}$} & .5 \\ \mbox{0} & .1 \\ \mbox{$\mathbf{-0}$} & .5 \\ \mbox{0} & .1 \\ \mbox{0} & .1 \\ \mbox{0} & .5 \\ \mbox{0} & .1 \\ \mbox{0} & .2 \\ \$	ULT <u>SD</u> 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 4.59 5.8 = 136.6 ² = 0.23; ULT <u>SD</u> 16.32 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 = 22.30,0 = 0.83; 1.3 6.9 31.48 11.39 4.59 = 121.5 ⁴ = 0.11;	Total 51 27 21 42 47 161 129 32 555 1, df = -)) Total 45 42 47 161 32 327 , df = 4) 51 277 21 38 327 327 , df = 4 32 327 40 32 327 161 10 129 32 555 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	C Mean -3.3 0.2 5.3 -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -3.23 -0.7 8 (P < C C Mean -4.4 -2.05 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.7 (P = 0.1 -3.3 0.2 5.3 5.3 -2.2 -3.23 4 (P < C	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001) 1.1.55 8.83 19.9 1.2 5.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 0.00001) 1.2 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 1.1 1.5 8.83 1.1 1.5 8.83 1.1 1.5 8.83 1.1 9.59 1.1 1.5 8.83 1.1 1.2 5.5 3.3 1.6 9.59 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 9.59 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.5 3.3 3.1 1.9 9.59 9.59 1.1 1.2 5.3 3.3 1.6 9.59 1.1 1.5 1.2 1.5 1.2 1.5 1.2 1.2 1.5 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2	Total 47 26 19 48 15 48 164 139 28 532 Total 48 164 28 301 2 47 26 139 263 263 263 263 263	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.9% 11.9% 10.9% 10.0% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 23.8% 17.1% 20.6% 20.0% 19.6% 20.0% 19.7% 20.0% 7%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] 0.96 [-0.21, 2.13]	Year 2010 2011 2015 2016 2018 2020 2021 Year 2015 2016 2018 2018 2021 2011 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4
C Study or Subgroup Goicoechea et.al 2010 Kao et.al 2011 Sircar et.al 2012 Sircar et.al 2013 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Badve et.al 2020 Stack et.al 2021 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: D Study or Subgroup 24.4 Febuxostat Sircar et.al 2015 Saag et.al 2016 Mukri et.al 2018 Stack et.al 2021 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Allopurinol Goicoechea et.al 2010 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mean} \\) & 1.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 3.2 \\ -0.38 \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -3.33 \\ -5.5 \\ z = 1.20 \ (P \\ \hline \mbox{Mean} \\ z = 1.20 \ (P \\ \hline \mbox{Mean} \\ 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ -5.5 \\ 0.19; \ Chi^2 : z \\ z = 0.21 \ (P \\ 0 \\ 3.7 \\ 16.3 \\ -3.33 \\ 1.71; \ Chi^2 : z \\ z = 1.61 \ (P \\ \hline \mbox{Mean} \\ z = 1.61 \ (P \\ z = $	ULT SD 1.3 6.9 31.48 16.32 14.78 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 9.45 5.8 14.77 9.45 5.8 14.77 9.45 5.8 14.78 14.77 9.45 5.8 14.77 9.45 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.	Total 21 27 21 45 42 27 45 57 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 5	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{C}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -3.3\\ 0.2\\ 5.3\\ -4.4\\ -2.05\\ -0.6\\ -3.23\\ -0.7\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -4.4\\ -2.05\\ -0.6\\ -0.7\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -4.4\\ -2.05\\ -0.6\\ -0.7\\ (\textbf{P}=0.1\\ -3.3\\ 0.2\\ 5.3\\ -2.2\\ -3.23\\ \textbf{4} (\textbf{P} < \textbf{C})\\ \textbf{C}\\ \textbf{C}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -4.4\\ -2.05\\ -0.6\\ -0.7\\ -3.3\\ 0.2\\ -3.23\\ \textbf{4} (\textbf{P} < \textbf{C})\\ \textbf{C}\\ $	Control SD 1.2 5.5 8.83 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 4.69 1.1 0.00001) Control SD 11.55 8.83 19.9 9.59 1.1 00002); F 1.2 5.5 33 16.92 4.69 0.00001)	Total 47 26 19 48 15 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 5	Weight 10.4% 10.9% 10.5% 11.4% 11.4% 11.9% 10.9% 10.9% Weight 20.5% 17.1% 20.6% 20.6% 17.9% 100.0% 19.6% 20.7% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] 0.34 [-0.21, 0.89] Std. Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.54 [0.12, 0.95] 0.12 [-0.47, 0.71] 0.04 [-0.37, 0.45] 0.05 [-0.17, 0.27] -1.10 [-1.65, -0.55] -0.05 [-0.47, 0.38] 3.64 [2.99, 4.30] 0.00 [-0.54, 0.54] -0.05 [-0.67, 0.57] 1.29 [0.77, 1.81] -0.02 [-0.26, 0.22] 0.96 [-0.21, 2.13]	Year 2010 2011 2012 2015 2016 2020 2021 2021 2021 2016 2018 2021 2011 2012 2018 2020		Std. Mean D	Difference n. 95% Cl 	4

FIGURE 3 | The effect of ULT compared with the group on eGFR (A) All patients. (B) Subgroup analysis of patients with hyperuricemia and CKD or patients with hyperuricemia and eGFR <60 ml/min/1.73 m². (C) Subgroup analysis including patients with a treatment duration of 6 months or over. (D) Subgroup analysis for ULT drugs including febuxostat and allopurinol. Abbreviations: SMD, standard mean difference; CI, confidence interval; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate.





patients showed that the risk of cardiovascular events was slightly lower in the allopurinol group than in the control group (Risk Ratio (RR) = 0.68: 95% CI: 0.48, 0.97), while four studies with 690 patients demonstrated that febuxostat had no effect on the risk of cardiovascular events (RR = 0.74: 95% CI: 0.36, 1.52) (Supplementary Figure S1). Furthermore, there were no differences in the other adverse events between the ULT and control groups (Supplementary Figure S2).

Assessment of Risk of Bias and Publication Bias

The risk of bias of each study is shown in **Figure 5**. The overall risk of bias comprised of 8 studies with a low risk (17-21, 23, 25, 26) and 4 studies with a high risk of bias (15, 16, 22, 24), which was mainly due to the risk of participant or investigator blinding.

Egger's test assessing bias for our main primary outcome (the change in eGFR) was not significant (p = 0.312). However, the funnel plot for the outcome of eGFR in this meta-analysis showed asymmetry (**Supplementary Figure S3**). Therefore, the results may be affected by publication bias.

DISCUSSION

We performed this meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy, renoprotective effect, and safety of ULT among patients with CKD. Twelve RCTs with 1,469 participants were included (15-26). ULT has been shown to effectively lower SUA, and the result was consistent in subgroup analyses and the sensitivity analysis. However, ULT was not found to have renoprotective effects, in terms of eGFR or serum creatinine, each of which was stable in the subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses.

Our study is the largest meta-analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of renal protection between the ULT and control groups. We included 12 RCTs with 1,469 participants in all and ultimately assessed the change in the level of eGFR in 10 RCTs with 1,157 participants, which demonstrated no difference between the ULT and control groups. This was in agreement with some RCTs suggesting that there were no renoprotective effects with ULT. For example, Badve et al. (Badve et al., 2020) performed an RCT across 31 centres with 351 participants published in the New England Journal of Medicine and demonstrated that allopurinol did not ameliorate the renal function in terms of eGFR in patients with CKD. In contrast, ULT was demonstrated to have renoprotective effects in meta-analyses performed by Wang et al. (Wang et al., 2013), Kanji et al.

(Kanji et al., 2015) and Su et al. (Su et al., 2017). However, the studies by Wang et al. and Kanji et al. both analyzed trials with short follow-up times (less than 2 months). The three studies all incorporated several non-English RCTs and assessed eGFR with fewer RCTs than our study. Owing to these contradictory results, large-scale RCTs of high quality are needed to explore the effects of ULT on renal function, especially in patients with CKD.

At present, many studies including clinical and mechanistic research, have explored the relationships among uric acid, cardiovascular diseases and the effect of ULT, and the causality among these variables is very controversial. A crosssectional study in patients with unilateral small kidney or renal agenesis conducted by Yazici et al. demonstrated that the SUA level was positively correlated with arterial stiffness (Yazici et al., 19932017). Mechanistic studies have shown that uric acid causes endothelial dysfunction, resulting in cardiovascular events (Khosla et al., 2005; Liang et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2021). In our meta-analysis, we found that allopurinol might slightly reduce the risk of cardiovascular complications in only three RCTs. Therefore, the sample is not enough to draw a conclusion. Large-scale studies are needed. Moreover, there were no differences in the other adverse events between the ULT and control groups. The results above suggest that ULT is at least safe for patients with CKD.

There are some strengths in our review. First, we included only RCTs with a treatment duration of more than 3 months. Second, the number of included RCTs and patients was relatively appreciable. Furthermore, we performed subgroup analysis by CKD stage and treatment duration, and changes in renal function, including eGFR and serum creatinine, were comprehensively evaluated. The adverse effects incorporating deterioration of renal or liver function, cardiovascular events, gastrointestinal symptoms and hypersensitivity were also analyzed. However, our study also has some limitations. First, the risk of bias of 4 studies was high and this was reflected in the risk of participant or investigator blinding. Second, the evaluation of progression to end-stage renal disease was insufficient (no data). Third, the sample sizes of the studies included were quite small, ranging from 40 to 351.

REFERENCES

- Badve, S. V., Pascoe, E. M., Tiku, A., Boudville, N., Brown, F. G., Cass, A., et al. (2020). Effects of Allopurinol on the Progression of Chronic Kidney Disease. N. Engl. J. Med. 382 (26), 2504–2513. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1915833
- Bobulescu, I. A., and Moe, O. W. (2012). Renal Transport of Uric Acid: Evolving Concepts and Uncertainties. Adv. Chronic Kidney Dis. 19 (6), 358–371. doi:10. 1053/j.ackd.2012.07.009
- Cannella, A. C., and Mikuls, T. R. (2005). Understanding Treatments for Gout. Am. J. Manag. Care 11 (15 Suppl. 1), S451–S458.
- Crişan, T. O., Cleophas, M. C., Oosting, M., Lemmers, H., Toenhake-Dijkstra, H., Netea, M. G., et al. (2016). Soluble Uric Acid Primes TLR-Induced Proinflammatory Cytokine Production by Human Primary Cells via Inhibition of IL-1Ra. Ann. Rheum. Dis. 75 (4), 755–762. doi:10.1136/ annrheumdis-2014-206564
- Dalbeth, N., Choi, H. K., Joosten, L. A. B., Khanna, P. P., Matsuo, H., Perez-Ruiz, F., et al. (2019). Gout. Nat. Rev. Dis. Primers 5 (1), 69. doi:10.1038/s41572-019-0115-y

CONCLUSION

The findings of our meta-analysis suggest that the evidence is insufficient to support the renoprotective effects of ULT in CKD patients. Furthermore, ULT shows a superior decrease in SUA and ULT is safe for patients with CKD. However, a well-designed, large-scale, controlled study is required for further clarification.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

XL: study design, literature search, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, figures, tables, and writing. XL: study design, literature search, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and writing. DL study design, literature search, data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation. YL: study design, data analysis, data interpretation, and checking of all works. WQ: study design, data analysis, data interpretation, and checking of all works. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the 1.3.5 project for disciplines of excellence, West China Hospital, Sichuan University (Grant Number: ZYGD18015, ZYJC18003).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2022.798150/full#supplementary-material

- Eleftheriadis, T., Golphinopoulos, S., Pissas, G., and Stefanidis, I. (2017). Asymptomatic Hyperuricemia and Chronic Kidney Disease: Narrative Review of a Treatment Controversial. J. Adv. Res. 8 (5), 555–560. doi:10. 1016/j.jare.2017.05.001
- Ghane Sharbaf, F., and Assadi, F. (2018). Effect of Allopurinol on the Glomerular Filtration Rate of Children with Chronic Kidney Disease. *Pediatr. Nephrol.* 33 (8), 1405–1409. doi:10.1007/s00467-018-3943-1
- Goicoechea, M., de Vinuesa, S. G., Verdalles, U., Ruiz-Caro, C., Ampuero, J., Rincón, A., et al. (2010). Effect of Allopurinol in Chronic Kidney Disease Progression and Cardiovascular Risk. *Clin. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* 5 (8), 1388–1393. doi:10.2215/CJN.01580210
- Higgins, J. P., Altman, D. G., Gøtzsche, P. C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A. D., et al. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's Tool for Assessing Risk of Bias in Randomised Trials. *Bmj* 343, d5928. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
- Kanji, T., Gandhi, M., Clase, C. M., and Yang, R. (2015). Urate Lowering Therapy to Improve Renal Outcomes in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. BMC Nephrol. 16, 58. doi:10.1186/ s12882-015-0047-z

- Kao, M. P., Ang, D. S., Gandy, S. J., Nadir, M. A., Houston, J. G., Lang, C. C., et al. (2011). Allopurinol Benefits Left Ventricular Mass and Endothelial Dysfunction in Chronic Kidney Disease. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol. 22 (7), 1382–1389. doi:10.1681/ ASN.2010111185
- Khosla, U. M., Zharikov, S., Finch, J. L., Nakagawa, T., Roncal, C., Mu, W., et al. (2005). Hyperuricemia Induces Endothelial Dysfunction. *Kidney Int.* 67 (5), 1739–1742. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1755.2005.00273.x
- Kimura, K., Hosoya, T., Uchida, S., Inaba, M., Makino, H., Maruyama, S., et al. (2018). Febuxostat Therapy for Patients with Stage 3 CKD and Asymptomatic Hyperuricemia: A Randomized Trial. *Am. J. Kidney Dis.* 72 (6), 798–810. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2018.06.028
- Lee, T. S., Lu, T. M., Chen, C. H., Guo, B. C., and Hsu, C. P. (2021). Hyperuricemia Induces Endothelial Dysfunction and Accelerates Atherosclerosis by Disturbing the Asymmetric Dimethylarginine/dimethylarginine Dimethylaminotransferase 2 Pathway. *Redox Biol.* 46, 102108. doi:10.1016/j.redox.2021.102108
- Liang, W. Y., Zhu, X. Y., Zhang, J. W., Feng, X. R., Wang, Y. C., and Liu, M. L. (2015). Uric Acid Promotes Chemokine and Adhesion Molecule Production in Vascular Endothelium via Nuclear Factor-Kappa B Signaling. *Nutr. Metab. Cardiovasc. Dis.* 25 (2), 187–194. doi:10.1016/j.numecd.2014.08.006
- Liu, X., Liu, K., Sun, Q., Wang, Y., Meng, J., Xu, Z., et al. (2018). Efficacy and Safety of Febuxostat for Treating Hyperuricemia in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease and in Renal Transplant Recipients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Exp. Ther. Med.* 16 (3), 1859–1865. doi:10.3892/etm.2018.6367
- Liu, X., Qiu, Y., Li, D., Tan, J., Liang, X., and Qin, W. (2021). Effectiveness of Drug Treatments for Lowering Uric Acid on Renal Function in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease and Hyperuricemia: A Network Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Front. Pharmacol.* 12, 690557. doi:10.3389/fphar.2021.690557
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., and Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: the PRISMA Statement. *BMJ* 339 (7), b2535. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.100009710.1136/bmj.b2535
- Momeni, A., Shahidi, S., Seirafian, S., Taheri, S., and Kheiri, S. (2010). Effect of Allopurinol in Decreasing Proteinuria in Type 2 Diabetic Patients. *Iran J. Kidney Dis.* 4 (2), 128–132.
- Mukri, M. N. A., Kong, W. Y., Mustafar, R., Shaharir, S. S., Shah, S. A., Abdul Gafor, A. H., et al. (2018). Role of Febuxostat in Retarding Progression of Diabetic Kidney Disease with Asymptomatic Hyperuricemia: A 6-months Open-Label, Randomized Controlled Trial. *EXCLI J.* 17, 563–575. doi:10.17179/excli2018-1256
- Preitner, F., Bonny, O., Laverrière, A., Rotman, S., Firsov, D., Da Costa, A., et al. (2009). Glut9 Is a Major Regulator of Urate Homeostasis and its Genetic Inactivation Induces Hyperuricosuria and Urate Nephropathy. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A.* 106 (36), 15501–15506. doi:10.1073/pnas.0904411106
- Richette, P., and Bardin, T. (2010). Gout. *The Lancet* 375 (9711), 318–328. doi:10. 1016/s0140-6736(09)60883-7
- Saag, K. G., Whelton, A., Becker, M. A., MacDonald, P., Hunt, B., and Gunawardhana, L. (2016). Impact of Febuxostat on Renal Function in Gout Patients with Moderate-To-Severe Renal Impairment. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 68 (8), 2035–2043. doi:10.1002/art.39654
- Shi, Y., Chen, W., Jalal, D., Li, Z., Chen, W., Mao, H., et al. (2012). Clinical Outcome of Hyperuricemia in IgA Nephropathy: a Retrospective Cohort Study and Randomized Controlled Trial. *Kidney Blood Press. Res.* 35 (3), 153–160. doi:10.1159/000331453
- Singh, C., Jain, S., Dhawan, V., Kalra, N., and Kumari, S. (2021). Uric Acid as a Predictor of Endothelial Dysfunction in Patients with Metabolic Syndrome. *Arch. Endocrinol. Metab.* 64 (6), 810–815. doi:10.20945/2359-3997000000298

- Sircar, D., Chatterjee, S., Waikhom, R., Golay, V., Raychaudhury, A., Chatterjee, S., et al. (2015). Efficacy of Febuxostat for Slowing the GFR Decline in Patients with CKD and Asymptomatic Hyperuricemia: A 6-Month, Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 66 (6), 945–950. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2015.05.017
- Siu, Y. P., Leung, K. T., Tong, M. K., and Kwan, T. H. (2006). Use of Allopurinol in Slowing the Progression of Renal Disease through its Ability to Lower Serum Uric Acid Level. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 47 (1), 51–59. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2005. 10.006
- Stack, A. G., Dronamraju, N., Parkinson, J., Johansson, S., Johnsson, E., Erlandsson, F., et al. (2021). Effect of Intensive Urate Lowering with Combined Verinurad and Febuxostat on Albuminuria in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes: A Randomized Trial. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 77 (4), 481–489. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd. 2020.09.009
- Stevens, P. E., and Levin, A. (2013). Evaluation and Management of Chronic Kidney Disease: Synopsis of the Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes 2012 Clinical Practice Guideline. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 158 (11), 825–830. doi:10. 7326/0003-4819-158-11-201306040-00007
- Su, X., Xu, B., Yan, B., Qiao, X., and Wang, L. (2017). Effects of Uric Acid-Lowering Therapy in Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease: A Meta-Analysis. *PloS one* 12 (11), e0187550. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0187550
- Wang, H., Wei, Y., Kong, X., and Xu, D. (2013). Effects of Urate-Lowering Therapy in Hyperuricemia on Slowing the Progression of Renal Function: a Meta-Analysis. J. Ren. Nutr. 23 (5), 389–396. doi:10.1053/j.jrn.2012.08.005
- White, W. B., Saag, K. G., Becker, M. A., Borer, J. S., Gorelick, P. B., Whelton, A., et al. (2018). Cardiovascular Safety of Febuxostat or Allopurinol in Patients with Gout. N. Engl. J. Med. 378 (13), 1200–1210. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1710895
- Wright, A. F., Rudan, I., Hastie, N. D., and Campbell, H. (2010). A 'complexity' of Urate Transporters. *Kidney Int.* 78 (5), 446–452. doi:10.1038/ki.2010.206
- Xiao, J., Fu, C., Zhang, X., Zhu, D., Chen, W., Lu, Y., et al. (2015). Soluble Monosodium Urate, but Not its crystal, Induces Toll like Receptor 4-dependent Immune Activation in Renal Mesangial Cells. *Mol. Immunol.* 66 (2), 310–318. doi:10.1016/j.molimm.2015.03.250
- Yazici, R., Guney, İ., Altintepe, L., and Yazici, M. (19932017), Does the Serum Uric Acid Level Have Any Relation to Arterial Stiffness or Blood Pressure in Adults with Congenital Renal Agenesis And/or Hypoplasia? *Clin. Exp. Hypertens.* 39, 145–149. doi:10.1080/10641963.2016.1210630

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Liang, Liu, Li, Qin and Liu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.