|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subgroup | Level | No. of Trials | N |   | Mean Difference [95% CI]in LDL-C (mmol/L) |   | Residual I 2 (%) | *P*-Value |
|  |  |  |  | Within Subgroups |  |   |  |  | Between Subgroups |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 57 | 3745 | -0.19 [-0.23, -0.14] |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dose  | < 3.0 | 14 | 1047 | -0.12 [-0.20, -0.05] |  |   |  |  | -0.09 [-0.18, 0.00] | 70.71 | 0.051 |
| (g/day) | ≥ 3.0 | 43 | 2698 | -0.21 [-0.26, -0.17] |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duration | < 6  | 28 | 1616 | -0.24 [-0.29, -0.18] |  |   |  |  | 0.09 [0.02, 0.17] | 62.45 | 0.018 |
| (weeks) | ≥ 6 | 29 | 2129 | -0.15 [-0.20, -0.09] |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Study Design | Crossover | 20 | 496 | -0.25 [-0.31, -0.18] |  |   |  |  | 0.09 [0.01, 0.17] | 63.93 | 0.030 |
|  | Parallel | 37 | 3249 | -0.16 [-0.20, -0.11] |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| MQS | < 8 | 48 | 2917 | -0.18 [-0.22, -0.13] |  |   |  |  | -0.05 [-0.15, 0.05] | 66.29 | 0.311 |
|  | ≥ 8 | 9 | 828 | -0.23 [-0.32, -0.14] |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline LDL-C | < 3.5 | 11 | 394 | -0.18 [-0.26, -0.10] |  |   |  |  | -0.02 [-0.11, 0.08] | 70.46 | 0.703 |
| (mmol/L) | ≥ 3.5 | 37 | 1703 | -0.20 [-0.25, -0.15] |   |   |   |   |
| . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Favours Oats | Favours Control |  |  |  |

Figure S2 Categorical *a priori* subgroup analyses for LDL-C. Point estimates for each subgroup level (diamonds) are the pooled effect estimates. The residuals I2 value indicates heterogeneity unexplained by the subgroup. Between subgroup differences represent differences between oat β-Glucan and control group. Within subgroup differences represent the difference between end and baseline values. MQS = Heyland Methodological Quality Score; N = number of participants in each treatment group.