

**Supplementary Table S1.** Risk of bias assessment

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other
Bieber 2007	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Doss 2009	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Doss 2010	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Hofman 2006	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Luger 2001	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Luger 2004	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low
Mandelin 2010	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Neumann 2008	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low
Reitamo 2002a	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Reitamo 2002b	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Reitamo 2004	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Reitamo 2005	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Sigurgeirsson 2015	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low
Sikder 2005	Low	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low

**Supplementary Table S2.** Summary of the results. Quality of evidence assessment

Outcome	Study population		RR	No. of cases	Quality of evidence
	Calcineurin inhibitor	Topical corticosteroids			
Physician's global assessment of improvement: clear or excellent	2713/3791	1976/3764	1.31 (1.07–1.60)	7555 (12 studies)	Very low <sup>1,2,3,4</sup>
Any adverse events	1939/2880	1826/2861	1.07 (0.86–1.33)	5741 (9 studies)	Very low <sup>1,3,4</sup>
Skin burning	757/2361	276/2339	3.24 (2.55–4.12)	4700 (9 studies)	Moderate <sup>4,5,6</sup>
Pruritus	298/2353	187/2324	1.57 (1.32–1.86)	4677 (8 studies)	Moderate <sup>4</sup>
Serious adverse events	9/1962	32/1932	0.51 (0.11–2.49)	3894 (7 studies)	Very low <sup>4,5,7</sup>
Adverse events leading to discontinuation	46/1894	38/1865	1.19 (0.77–1.83)	3759 (7 studies)	Moderate <sup>4</sup>

**GRADE scale:**

*High quality: further research is very unlikely to change the confidence in the estimate of effect.*

*Moderate quality: further research is likely to have an important impact on the confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.*

*Low quality: further research is very likely to have an important impact on the confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.*

*Very low quality: Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.*

<sup>1</sup>Downgraded due to the risk of bias: Allocation concealment procedure was unclear in more than one study. <sup>2</sup>Downgraded due to the risk of bias: Blinding of outcome assessment was unclear in more than one study. <sup>3</sup>Downgraded due to inconsistency: considerable heterogeneity. <sup>4</sup>Downgraded due to indirectness: corticosteroids of various potency were used. <sup>5</sup>Downgraded due to inconsistency: may represent substantial heterogeneity. <sup>6</sup>Upgraded due to large magnitude of effect: RR > 2. <sup>7</sup>Downgraded due to imprecision: small number of events; small number of studies; wide CI.