Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 1. Assessment of risk of bias for incidence of grade 3–4 neutropenia.

Outcome: Incidence of grade 3–4 neutropenia					
Overall assessment: No serious risk of bias, do not downgrade.					
	Shaw et al 2017 (NCT01828112) [47]	**Soria et al 2017 (NCT01828099) [48]**	**Hida et al 2017 (JapicCTI-132316) [46]**	**Solomon et al 2014 (NCT01154140) [27]**	**Shaw et al 2013 (NCT00932893) [26]**
Inadequate methods of sequence generation	Sequence generation was adequate	Sequence generation was adequate	Sequence generation was adequate	Not clear if sequence generation was adequate	Not clear if sequence generation was adequate
Lack of allocation concealment	Allocation concealment was performed	Allocation concealment was performed	Allocation concealment was performed	Not clear if allocation concealment was performed	Not clear if allocation concealment was performed
Lack of blinding of each of participants, providers, outcome assessors	Participants and providers were not blinded; outcome assessors were blinded	Participants and providers were not blinded; outcome assessors were blinded	Participants, providers and outcome assessors were not blinded. Independent review committee for primary endpoint were blinded.	Open-label study. Unclear if any of the team were blinded.	Open-label study. Unclear if any of the team were blinded.
Loss to follow up	No patients were lost to follow up	Not clear if any patients were lost to follow up (some patients in each group classed as “Other”)	No patients were lost to follow up	7 patients in each group were lost to follow up or refused further follow up	4 in crizotinib group lost to follow up. 2 in chemotherapy lost to follow up
Failure to follow intention to treat principles in analyses	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles
Selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses
Other sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias

Supplementary Table 2. Assessment of risk of bias for incidence of febrile neutropenia.

Outcome: Incidence of febrile neutropenia					
Overall assessment: No serious risk of bias, do not downgrade.					
	Shaw et al 2017 (NCT01828112) [47]	**Soria et al 2017 (NCT01828099) [48]**	**Hida et al 2017 (JapicCTI-132316) [46]**	**Solomon et al 2014 (NCT01154140) [27]**	**Shaw et al 2013 (NCT00932893) [26]**
Inadequate methods of sequence generation	Sequence generation was adequate	Sequence generation was adequate	Sequence generation was adequate	Not clear if sequence generation was adequate	Not clear if sequence generation was adequate
Lack of allocation concealment	Allocation concealment was performed	Allocation concealment was performed	Allocation concealment was performed	Not clear if allocation concealment was performed	Not clear if allocation concealment was performed
Lack of blinding of each of participants, providers, outcome assessors	Participants and providers were not blinded; outcome assessors were blinded	Participants and providers were not blinded; outcome assessors were blinded	Participants, providers and outcome assessors were not blinded. Independent review committee for primary endpoint were blinded.	Open-label study. Unclear if any of the team were blinded.	Open-label study. Unclear if any of the team were blinded.
Loss to follow up	No patients were lost to follow up	Not clear if any patients were lost to follow up (some patients in each group classed as “Other”)	No patients were lost to follow up	7 patients in each group were lost to follow up or refused further follow up	4 in crizotinib group lost to follow up. 2 in chemotherapy lost to follow up
Failure to follow intention to treat principles in analyses	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles
Selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses
Other sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias

Supplementary Table 3. Assessment of risk of bias for risk of grade 3–4 neutropenia.

Outcome: Risk of grade 3–4 neutropenia					
Overall assessment: No serious risk of bias, do not downgrade.					
	Shaw et al 2017 (NCT01828112) [47]	**Soria et al 2017 (NCT01828099) [48]**	**Hida et al 2017 (JapicCTI-132316) [46]**	**Solomon et al 2014 (NCT01154140) [27]**	**Shaw et al 2013 (NCT00932893) [26]**
Inadequate methods of sequence generation	Sequence generation was adequate	Sequence generation was adequate	Sequence generation was adequate	Not clear if sequence generation was adequate	Not clear if sequence generation was adequate
Lack of allocation concealment	Allocation concealment was performed	Allocation concealment was performed	Allocation concealment was performed	Not clear if allocation concealment was performed	Not clear if allocation concealment was performed
Lack of blinding of each of participants, providers, outcome assessors	Participants and providers were not blinded; outcome assessors were blinded	Participants and providers were not blinded; outcome assessors were blinded	Participants, providers and outcome assessors were not blinded. Independent review committee for primary endpoint were blinded.	Open-label study. Unclear if any of the team were blinded.	Open-label study. Unclear if any of the team were blinded.
Loss to follow up	No patients were lost to follow up	Not clear if any patients were lost to follow up (some patients in each group classed as “Other”)	No patients were lost to follow up	7 patients in each group were lost to follow up or refused further follow up	4 in crizotinib group lost to follow up. 2 in chemotherapy lost to follow up
Failure to follow intention to treat principles in analyses	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles	Study followed intention to treat principles
Selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses	No selective reporting of outcomes and/or analyses
Other sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias	No other identified sources of bias