Supplementary Table 3. GRADE evaluation of meta-analysis

Outcome	Ν	Effect	2	Risk	Inconsistenc	Indirectnes	Imprecisio	Quality of	
outcome		size		of	Y <sup>₅</sup>	S <sup>c</sup>	n <sup>4</sup>	evidence	
		with		bias	Ŷ	5		evidence	
		95%		a					
		CI							
Pre-post treatmer	nt ef	-							
Facial erythema	2	-	97.34	0	-1	0	0	Moderate	
-1 month		3.386	%	-	_	-	-		
(CEA/mexamete		(-	,						
r)		7.825							
• ,									
		, 1.054							
		)							
Facial erythema	2	-	96.51	0	-1	0	0	Moderate	
-2 month		2.354	%						
(CEA/mexamete		(-							
r)		5.492							
		,							
		0.784							
		)							
Facial erythema	2	-	35.76	0	0	0	0	High	
-3 month		1.676	%					_	
(CEA/mexamete		(-							
r)		2.278							
		,-							
		1.074							
		)							
If more than one-third of the studies were high risk of bias, the risk of bias will be rated down. If the									
12 >50%, the inconsistency will be rated down. If the control groups are heterogeneous, indirectness									
will be rated dowr	n. ₀If	the conf	idence int	erval i	s wide or the re	sults are from	a single study,		
imprecision is rate low.									

Outcome Ν Effect I<sup>2</sup> Risk Inconsistenc Indirectnes Imprecisio Quality of size of y₅ S℃ n₫ evidenc with bias 95% е CI Pre-post treatment effect Facial erythema Very 5 89.529 -1 -1 0 0 --1 month % 2.712 Low (CEA/mexamete (r) 4.182 , -

		1.243 )						
Facial erythema -2 month (CEA/mexamete r)	3	, -2.21 (- 3.702 ,- 0.725 )	89.529 %	-1	-1	0	0	Very Low
Facial erythema -3 month (CEA/mexamete r)	4	- 1.912 (- 2.882 ,- 0.941 )	78.219 %	-1	-1	0	0	Very Low
<ul> <li>If more than one- I2 &gt;50%, the incor will be rated dowr imprecision is rate</li> </ul>	nsiste n. «If	ency will the conf	be rated d	own. ۱	f the control gro	oups are hetero	ogeneous; indi	