Search Strategy

Supplemental Table 1 | Search strategy

Medline search strategy for Refractory Pouchitis and prepouch ileitis

("Pouchitis" [Mesh] or pouchitis [tw] or Pouch Ileitis [tw] or Prepouch Ileitis [tw] or "colonic pouches" [Mesh] or colonic pouches [tw] or Pelvic Pouches [tw] or Pelvic Pouches [tw] or W Pouch [tw] or Ileal Pouche [tw] or J Pouch [tw] or s-pouch [tw] or IPAA [tw])

AND

("Biologics" [Mesh] or Biologic* [tw] or Biopharmaceutical* [tw] or Biological Drug* [tw] or Biological* [tw] or Biologic Medicine* [tw] or Biologic Pharmaceutical* [tw] or Biologic Drug* [tw] or Biological Medicine [tw] or "Monoclonal Antibodies" [Mesh] or Monoclonal Antibody* [tw] or anti-TNF [tw] or "Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha" [Mesh] or Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha [tw])

AND

("Therapy" [Mesh] or therapy [tw] or treatment [tw] or "remission induction" [Mesh] or remission induction [tw])

Medline search strategy for Crohn's disease of the pouch

("Colonic Pouche" [Mesh] or Colonic Pouche [tw] or Ileoanal Pouche* [tw] or Ileoanal Reservoir [tw] or Pelvic Pouche* [tw] or Pelvic Pouche [tw] or W Pouch [tw] or Ileal Pouche [tw] or J Pouch [tw] or spouch [tw] or IPAA [tw])

AND

("Biologics" [Mesh] or Biologic* [tw] or Biopharmaceutical* [tw] or Biological Drug* [tw] or Biological* [tw] or Biologic Medicine* [tw] or Biologic Pharmaceutical* [tw] or Biologic Drug* [tw] or Biological Medicine [tw] or "Monoclonal Antibodies" [Mesh] or Monoclonal Antibody* [tw] or anti-TNF [tw] or "Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha [Mesh] or Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha [tw])

AND

("Therapy" [Mesh] or therapy [tw] or treatment [tw] or "remission induction" [Mesh] or remission induction [tw])

Medline search strategy for Cuffitis

(Rectal cuff inflammation*[tw] or cuffitis*[tw])

AND

("Biologics" [Mesh] or Biologic* [tw] or Biopharmaceutical* [tw] or Biological Drug* [tw] or Biological* [tw] or Biologic Medicine* [tw] or Biologic Pharmaceutical* [tw] or Biologic Drug* [tw] or Biological Medicine [tw] or "Monoclonal Antibodies" [Mesh] or Monoclonal Antibody* [tw] or anti-

TNF[tw] or "Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha" [Mesh] or Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha[tw])

AND

("Therapy" [Mesh] or therapy [tw] or treatment [tw] or "remission induction" [Mesh] or remission induction [tw])

Supplemental Table. 2

Study	Number of patients	Gender (male) n	Mean age	Disease duration before IPAA (years)	Mean follow up after IPAA (months)	Outcomes	Study type
Bar et al	20	12	22.5	3.5	Not reported	The effectiveness was measured using the Oresland Score (OS) at week 2, 6, 10 and 14 and the pouch disease activity index (PDAI) at week 0 and 14.	Retrospective
Calabrese et	10	6	39.2	6.3	7.3	Macroscopic remission was defined as the disappearance of all large lesions and the persistence of £3 small lesions, at WCE and pouch endoscopy.	Prospective
Colombel et	26	7	32	4	21.5	The main clinical outcomes for long term response were pouch excision and presence of diverting ileostomy.	retrospective

	I						
Haveran et	22	14	27.8	8.9	97	Success in treatment was defined as complete resolution or significant improvement of symptoms specific to the indication for therapy	Retrospective
Li et al	48	29	25.3	4	25	Complete clinical response was defined as the resolution of symptoms as well as the modified Pouchitis Disease Activity Index (mPDAI) score being less than 5	Prospective
Ricart et al	7	2	38	4.3	5	A complete response was defined as cessation of fistula(s) drainage and total closure of all fistula(s), or cessation of diarrhea, incontinence, and abdominal pain.	Retrospective
Robbins et	92	50	32	5	Not reported	we evaluated whether IBD serology changed over time with disease diagnosis and examined whether there were differences in serology between patients who developed denovo CD versus patients who did not develop pouch inflammation	Prospective
Shen et al	92	12	36	Not reported	reported 2	Complete clinical response was defined as resolution of symptoms. Partial clinical response was defined as improvement in symptoms.	Prospective
Weaver et al	56	24	44.1	Not reported	12	Clinical response or remission was judged by the treating physician's assessment at 6 months.	Retrospective

Ferrante et al	28	14	26	Not reported	Not reported	Clinical response was defined as complete in case of cessation of diarrhea, blood loss, and abdominal pain, and as partial in case of marked clinical improvement	Retrospective
Gionchetti et	12	7	32.6	Not reported	Not reported	Remission was defined as a combination of a clinical PDAI score of 1. QOL was assessed using Inflammatory Bowel less or equal 2	Prospective
Gregory et al	83	38	42.1	4.9	12	clinical response at any time point was determined through chart review as defined in a prior study by our group as a decrease in the number of bowel movement, abdominal pain, or fistula drainage	Retrospective
Kelly et al	42	11	32.6	63	12	Complete response was defined as symptomatic and endoscopic resolution with modified Pouchitis Disease Activity Index (mPDAI) <5.	Retrospective
Khan et al	12	3	41	Not reported	Not reported	modified Pouchitis Disease Activity Index (mPDAI).mPDAI is the 18-point pouchitis disease activity index consisting of three principal component scores: symptom (range, 0–6 points), endoscopy, (range 0–6 points), and histology (range, 2–6 points).	Case series
Kjaer et al	13	2	40.1	Not reported	3	Primary outcome was reduction in clinical pouchitis disease activity index (PDAI) of more than 2 at any time.	RCT

Ollech et al	24	14	35.6	Not reported	12.6	Outcomes included a change in the endoscopic subscore of the Pouchitis Disease Activity Index (PDAI), change in the ulcerated surface area, clinical response, and the number of bowel movements per 24 h.	Retrospective
Segal et al (ileitis)	29	17	53	Not reported	21	Outcomes included the continued presence of PPI following biologic therapy, pouch failure defined by the need for an ileostomy	Retrospective
Segal et al	34	19	25	Not reported	9.3	The primary outcome was the development of IFX failure defined by early failure to IFX or secondary loss of response to IFX.	Retrospective
Singh et al	19	10	26.7	Not reported	3	The primary outcomes were to assess the improvement or reduction in the mPDAI symptom (range: 0–6) and endoscopy (range: 0–6) subscores after 3 months of vedolizumab therapy for CARP.	Retrospective
Verstockt et	33	13	34.4	4.8	3.5	The primary endpoint, short-term clinically relevant remission was assessed at week 14, and defined as mPDAI<5 and reduction in the mPDAI score with2 points from baseline	Retrospective
Viazis et al	7	3	37.1	6.2	36	Complete clinical response was defined as cessation of diarrhea, urgency, incontinence, blood loss and abdominal pain.	Prospective

Viscido et al	7	3	30	4	2.5	Clinical response was classified as complete, partial, and no response. Fistulae closure was classified as complete, partial, and no closure. The pouchitis disease activity index (PDAI) and quality of life (QoL) were also used as outcome measures.	Prospective
Barreiro-de Acosta et al (1)	33	18	45	Not reported	13	Complete response was defined as cessation of diarrhea and urgency and partial response as marked clinical improvement but persisting symptoms	Retrospective
Barreiro-de Acosta et al (1)	8		42	Not reported	13	The short-term and mid- term efficacy of ADA was evaluated	Retrospective

Supplemental Table 3.

		Selection		Comparability		Outcome		
Study	Representati veness of sample (maximum: one star)	Sample size (maximum: one star)	Assessment of the exposure (maximum: one star)	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis (maximum: 2 stars)	Assessment of the outcome (maximum: one star)	Was follow up long enough? (maximum: one star)	Adequacy of follow up cohorts (maximu m: one star)	Total score (maximu m: 8 stars)
Bar et al	*	*	*	**	*			*****
Calabrese et	*		*		*			(6) *** (3)
Ferrante et al	*	*	*	*	*	*		***** (6)
1 011 011 01 01	*	*		**	*			***** (5)
Gregory et al								
Kelly et al	*	*	*	**	*			******
Ollech et al	*	*	*		*	*	*	*****
Oneen et ui	*		*	*	*	*		***** (5)
Khan et al								
	*		*	**		*	*	******
Segal et al								(0)
Segal et al (prepouch ileitis)			*	*	*			***(3)
Singh et al			*		*			** (2)
Versockt et al			*		*			** (2)

Viscido et al	*	*			*		*** (3)
Viazis et al	*	*	*		*		*** (3)
Gionchetti et al	*	*		*	*		**** (4)
Barreiro-de Acosta et al	*	*	*	*			**** (4)
Colombel et al	*		*	*	*	*	***** (5)
Haveran et al	*		*	*			***(3)
Robbins et al	*		*		*		***(3)
Ricart et al	*	*	*				***(3)
Li et al	*	*	*	*	*	*	***** (6)
Shen et al	*	*	*	*	*		*****(5)
Weaver et al	*		*	*	*	*	***** (5)

Supplemental Table 4. Risk of Bias Assessment

Study	Risk of Bias
Bar et al	Moderate
Calabrese et al	Moderate
Ferrante et al	Low
Gregory et al	Low
Kelly et al	Low
Khan et al	Moderate
Ollech et al	Low
Segal et al (prepouch ileitis)	Low
Segal et al	Low
Singh et al	Moderate
Versockt et al	Low
Viscido et al	Low
Viazis et al	Low
Gionchetti et al	Low
Barreiro-de Acosta et al	Low
Barreiro-de Acosta et al	Low
Colombel et al	Moderate
Haveran et al	Low
Robbins et al	Low
Ricart et al	Moderate

Li et al	Low
Shen et al	Low
Weaver et al	Low
Kjaer et al	Low

Sensitivity Analysis

Supplemental Figure. 1 Sensitivity analysis By Country

drug and study		Effect (95% CI)	% Weigh
INFLIXIMAB			
Colombel et al	_	0.62 (0.41, 0.80)	8.74
Haveran et al		0.54 (0.25, 0.81)	
Kelly et al		0.62 (0.46, 0.76)	
Ricart et al		- 0.86 (0.42, 1.00)	
Robbins et al	_	0.67 (0.22, 0.96)	
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, p = 0.586)	- 5	0.64 (0.54, 0.74)	
212g. 22p, 22 (* 21212, p 21223)	Ť		
VEDOLIZUMAB			
Gregory et al	-	0.52 (0.41, 0.63)	12.87
Singh et al		0.74 (0.49, 0.91)	8.13
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 69.8\%$, p = 0.069)	\Leftrightarrow	0.61 (0.40, 0.82)	21.00
ADALIMUMAB			
Li et al	-	0.50 (0.35, 0.65)	
Robbins et al		0.73 (0.39, 0.94)	5.96
Shen et al		0.47 (0.23, 0.72)	
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 17.0\%$, p = 0.300)	\Diamond	0.54 (0.41, 0.67)	23.65
LIGTELSHIPMAN			
USTEKINUMAB	_	0.50 (0.00, 0.74)	0.40
Ollech et al		0.50 (0.29, 0.71)	
Weaver et al		0.83 (0.69, 0.93)	
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 86.0\%$, p = 0.007)		• 0.68 (0.35, 1.00)	20.48
Overall, DL (I ² = 55.9%, p = 0.009)	~	0.63 (0.54, 0.71)	100.00
Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.652	~	0.03 (0.34, 0.71)	100.00
rictorogenoity between groups, p = 0.002			

Supplemental Figure. 2 Sensitivity analysis by quality of studies

drug and study	Effect (95% CI)	Weigh
VEDOLIZUMAB		
Bar et al	0.64 (0.35, 0.87	7) 5.71
Gregory et al	0.52 (0.41, 0.63	3) 9.61
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, p = 0.405)	0.54 (0.44, 0.64	4) 15.32
INFLIXIMAB		
Barreiro-de Acosta et al	0.33 (0.18, 0.52	2) 7.96
Colombel et al	0.62 (0.41, 0.80	7.28
Ferrante et al	0.38 (0.21, 0.58	3) 7.55
Gionchetti et al	0.75 (0.43, 0.95	5) 5.71
Kelly et al	0.62 (0.46, 0.76	6) 8.52
Segal et al	0.47 (0.30, 0.65	5) 7.82
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 61.4\%$, p = 0.024)	0.52 (0.40, 0.64	44.85
ADALIMUMAB		
Barreiro-de Acosta et al	0.25 (0.03, 0.65	5) 4.73
Gionchetti et al	0.71 (0.29, 0.96	6) 4.31
Li et al	0.50 (0.35, 0.65	5) 8.52
Shen et al	0.47 (0.23, 0.72	2) 6.04
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 24.9\%$, p = 0.262)	0.48 (0.34, 0.62	2) 23.59
USTEKINUMAB		
Ollech et al	0.50 (0.29, 0.7	1) 6.89
Weaver et al	0.83 (0.69, 0.93	3) 9.34
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 86.0\%$, p = 0.007)	0.68 (0.35, 1.00	0) 16.24
Overall, DL (l² = 68.4%, p = 0.000) Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.72	0.54 (0.46, 0.63	3) 100.00

Supplemental Figure. 3 Sensitivity analysis by year

drug and study	Effect (95% CI)	Weight
VEDOLIZUMAB		
Baret al	0.64 (0.35, 0.87)	5.26
Gregory et al	0.52 (0.41, 0.63)	10.83
Singh et al	0.74 (0.49, 0.91)	6.73
Verstockt et al	0.73 (0.45, 0.92)	5.94
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 40.0%, p = 0.172)	0.63 (0.51, 0.75)	28.76
NFLIXIMAB		
Haveran et al	0.54 (0.25, 0.81)	4.78
Kelly et al	0.62 (0.46, 0.76)	9.04
Robbins et al	0.67 (0.22, 0.96)	3.20
Segal et al	0.47 (0.30, 0.65)	8.00
Segal et al (ileitis)	0.35 (0.15, 0.59)	6.40
Verstockt et al	0.65 (0.43, 0.84)	6.89
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 18.4%, p = 0.294)	0.54 (0.45, 0.64)	38.32
ADALIMUMAB		
Kjaer et al	0.50 (0.12, 0.88)	3.07
Robbins et al	0.73 (0.39, 0.94)	4.90
Segal et al (ileitis)	0.50 (0.12, 0.88)	3.07
Verstockt et al	0.46 (0.19, 0.75)	4.78
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 0.0%, p = 0.542)	0.56 (0.41, 0.72)	15.83
USTEKINUMAB		
Ollech et al	0.50 (0.29, 0.71)	6.73
Weaver et al	0.83 (0.69, 0.93)	10.37
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 86.0%, p = 0.007)	0.68 (0.35, 1.00)	17.10
Overall, DL (f ² = 49.8%, p = 0.012)	0.60 (0.52, 0.67)	100.00
Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.675	•	

Supplemental Figure. 4 Publication Bias

