### OS non-squamous

| Study | Hazard Ratio (95% CI) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Chem vs Aliz |                         |
| Mipowr150 | 1.2 (0.94, 1.5) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.2 (0.97, 2.9) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.2 (0.72, 2.9) |
| Chem vs Aliz+Chemo |                     |
| Mipowr130 | 1.3 (1.01, 1.6) |
| Mipowr131 | 1.2 (0.95, 1.4) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.2 (0.85, 1.7) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.2 (0.85, 1.7) |

### PFS PD-L1 nonselective

| Study | Hazard Ratio (95% CI) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Chem vs Aliz+Chemo |                         |
| Mipowr130 | 1.6 (1.3, 2.1) |
| Mipowr131 | 1.5 (1.2, 1.9) |
| Mipowr132 | 1.6 (1.5, 2.1) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.6 (1.3, 2.1) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.6 (1.3, 2.1) |
| Chem vs Carren+Chemo |                     |
| Mipowr131 | 1.7 (1.3, 2.2) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.7 (1.3, 2.6) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.7 (1.3, 2.6) |
| Niv-lipl vs Chem |                        |
| Checkmate227 | 0.93 (0.72, 0.96) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 0.83 (0.57, 1.2) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 0.55 (0.37, 1.2) |

### PFS PD-L1 1%-50%

| Study | Hazard Ratio (95% CI) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Chem vs Aliz |                         |
| Mipowr131 | 1.1 (0.97, 1.6) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.1 (0.89, 1.5) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.1 (0.97, 1.6) |
| Chem vs Aliz+Chemo |                     |
| Mipowr130 | 1.6 (1.2, 2.3) |
| Mipowr131 | 1.4 (1.1, 1.9) |
| Mipowr132 | 1.4 (1.1, 1.9) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.4 (1.1, 1.9) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.4 (1.1, 1.9) |
| Chem vs Carren+Chemo |                     |
| Mipowr131 | 1.5 (1.0, 2) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.5 (0.95, 2.0) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.5 (0.95, 2.0) |

### PFS PD-L1 50%

| Study | Hazard Ratio (95% CI) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Chem vs Aliz |                         |
| Mipowr130 | 1.6 (1.1, 2.2) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.6 (1.04, 3) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.6 (1.04, 3) |
| Chem vs Aliz+Chemo |                     |
| Mipowr130 | 2.1 (1.3, 3) |
| Mipowr131 | 2.4 (1.5, 4.5) |
| Mipowr132 | 2.2 (1.4, 3.3) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 2.2 (1.4, 3.3) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 2.2 (1.4, 3.3) |
| Chem vs Carren+Chemo |                     |
| Mipowr131 | 2.6 (0.97, 7.8) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 2.6 (0.94, 7.7) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 2.5 (0.94, 7.7) |

### Nivo vs Chem

| Study | Hazard Ratio (95% CI) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Chem vs Chem |                         |
| Checkmate526 | 1.1 (0.77, 1.5) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.1 (0.77, 1.5) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.1 (0.77, 1.5) |
| Niv-lipl vs Chem |                        |
| Checkmate227 | 1.8 (1.2, 2.3) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 1.8 (0.87, 3.7) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 1.8 (0.87, 3.7) |
| Pembro vs Chem |                         |
| Keynote189 | 0.5 (0.35, 0.73) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 0.5 (0.35, 0.73) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 0.5 (0.35, 0.73) |

### Pembro+Chem vs Chem

| Study | Hazard Ratio (95% CI) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Keynote189 | 0.5 (0.35, 0.73) |
| Pooled (pair-wise) | 0.5 (0.35, 0.73) |
| Indirect (back-calculated) | NA |
| Pooled (network) | 0.5 (0.35, 0.73) |
Figure 1: Supp Forest plots of heterogeneity analysis. Atez, Atezolizumab; Cam, Camrelizumab; Chemo, Chemotherapy; Dur, Durvalumab; Nivo, Nivolumab; Pemb, Pembrolizumab; Trem, Tremelimumab; Ipi, Ipilimumab