

Supplementary table 2: Meta-regression analysis for Endo-LIF vs MIS-LIF

| | | Meta-regression coefficient (95%-CI) [I ²] | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| | | Early post-operative back VAS | Early post-operative leg VAS |
| Variable | Year of publication | 0.5 (0.2;0.8) [91%] | -0.1 (-0.4;0.2) [83%] |
| | Number of Endo-LIF portals | 0.0 (-1.8;1.8) [95%] | 0.0 (-1.1;1.0) [85%] |
| | Type of Endo-LIF approach | | |
| | Interlaminar | _ ^a | _ ^a |
| | Transforaminal | 0.4 (-0.9;1.6) [95%] | 0.0 (-0.8;0.8) [86%] |
| | Mixed | 1.4 (-0.5;3.4) [95%] | 0.7 (-2.6;3.9) [86%] |

Legend: ^a Reference category; CI – Confidence interval; Endo – endoscopic; I² – heterogeneity; LIF – lumbar interbody fusion; MIS – minimally invasive surgery; VAS – Visual analog scale