


Meta-analysis using log hazard ratios and standard errors

Study	TE	SE	Weight	Weight	Hazard Ratio	
			(fixed)	(random)	IV, Fixed + Random, 95% CI	IV, Fixed + Random, 95% CI
FCG on CLL 1996	-0.59	0.3450	3.7%	5.8%	0.55 [0.28; 1.09]	
Leporrier 2001	-0.08	0.0787	70.7%	59.8%	0.92 [0.79; 1.08]	
Rai 2000	-0.24	0.1440	21.1%	27.3%	0.79 [0.59; 1.05]	
Robak 2000	0.16	0.3120	4.5%	7.1%	1.18 [0.64; 2.17]	
Total (fixed effect, 95% CI)			100.0%	--	0.89 [0.78; 1.01]	
Total (random effects, 95% CI)			--	100.0%	0.87 [0.74; 1.03]	
Heterogeneity: $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.0061$; $\text{Chi}^2 = 3.62$, $\text{df} = 3$ ($P = 0.30$); $I^2 = 17\%$						



Meta-analysis using hazard ratios and confidence limits

Study	TE	SE	Weight		Hazard Ratio	
			(fixed)	(random)	IV, Fixed + Random, 95% CI	IV, Fixed + Random, 95% CI
FCG on CLL 1996	-0.60	0.3467	3.7%	5.8%	0.55 [0.28; 1.09]	
Leporrier 2001	-0.08	0.0798	70.8%	60.5%	0.92 [0.79; 1.08]	
Rai 2000	-0.24	0.1470	20.8%	26.7%	0.79 [0.59; 1.05]	
Robak 2000	0.17	0.3115	4.6%	7.1%	1.18 [0.64; 2.17]	
Total (fixed effect, 95% CI)			100.0%	--	0.88 [0.78; 1.01]	
Total (random effects, 95% CI)			--	100.0%	0.87 [0.74; 1.03]	
Heterogeneity: $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.0057$; $\text{Chi}^2 = 3.57$, $\text{df} = 3$ ($P = 0.31$); $I^2 = 16\%$						

