Appendix 4 Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Figure 1 Forest plot for comparison 6.1: Hydrogel compared with gauze or good wound care (gwc), outcome: Number of amputations reported. Data adapted from Jenson 1998 and Vandeputte 1997.

Supplementary Figure 2: Forest plot of comparison 6.2: Hydrogel compared with gauze or good wound care (gwc), outcome: Number of Infections reported. Data adapted from D’Hemecourt 1998, Jenson 1998 and Vandeputte 1997.
Supplementary Figure 3: Forest plot for comparison 10.1 Foam dressing compared with Wet to Dry Saline, outcome: Number of ulcers completely healed. Blackman 1994 and Mazzone 1993.

Supplementary Figure 4: Analysis Forest plot for comparison 13.1: Hydrofiber compared with gauze dressing, outcome: Number of amputations reported. Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009 and Piaggesi 2001.
Supplementary Figure 5: Forest plot for comparison 13.2: Hydrofiber compared with gauze dressing, outcome: Number of Infections reported. Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009 and Piaggesi 2001.

Supplementary Figure 6: Forest plot of comparison 13.4: Hydrofiber compared with gauze dressing, outcome: Number of ulcers completely healed. Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009 and Piaggesi 2001.
Supplementary Figure 7: Forest plot for comparison 13.5: Hydrofiber compared with gauze dressing, outcome: Time to complete healing (days). Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009 and Piaggesi 2001.

Supplementary Figure 8: Forest plot for comparison 19.1: Any debridement compared with saline gauze control, outcome: Number of amputations reported. Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009, Jenson 1998, Vandeputte 1997, Piaggesi 2001 and Piagessi 1998.

Supplementary Figure 10: Forest plot for comparison 19.4: Any debridement compared with saline gauze control, outcome: Quality of life. Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009.
Supplementary Figure 11: Forest plot for comparison 19.6 Any debridement compared with saline gauze control, outcome: Recurrence rates. Data adapted from Jeffcoate 2009, Piaggesi 1998 and Piaggesi 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Any debridement</th>
<th>Gauze</th>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
<th>Risk of Bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events Total</td>
<td>Events Total</td>
<td>M-H, Random, 95% CI</td>
<td>M-H, Random, 95% CI</td>
<td>A: B: C: D: E: F: G: H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffcoate 2009</td>
<td>9 103</td>
<td>1 53</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>1.54 [1.08, 2.14]</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piaggesi 1998</td>
<td>2 21</td>
<td>0 16</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>0.34 [0.11, 1.11]</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (95% CI)</td>
<td>232 125</td>
<td>100 0%</td>
<td>0.81 [0.25, 2.58]</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>Tau²: 0.42 (CI: 0.32, 1.29)</td>
<td>df = 2 (p = 0.18), p = 38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect</td>
<td>Z = 0.06 (p = 0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk of bias legend:
(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
(C) Blinding (performance bias and detection bias; Blinding participants)
(D) Blinding (performance bias and detection bias; Blinding personnel delivering intervention)
(E) Blinding (performance bias and detection bias; Blinding outcome assessors)
(F) Imcomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
(G) Other bias

Favours [Any debridement]
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Supplementary Figure 12 (Comparison 19.3): Funnel plot of comparison: 19 Any debridement compared with Saline Gauze, outcome: 19.3 Number of ulcers completely healed.