

Supplementary Figure S12 Distribution of single or adjunctive unknown extracorporeal shockwave therapy evidence

Energy level	Disease or condition	Outcome	No of RCTs	T sample	C sample	Effect estimate (95%CI)	CoE	Control group intervention
High energy	Large or Moderate or Small Effect with Low or Very low Certainty							
	Plantar heel pain							
	ESWT vs SESWT	Pain intensity (Numerical Rating Scale)	2	126	125	SMD=-0.28 [-0.53, -0.03]	low	SESWT: shockwave separated by thin foam or air cushion or without energy stimulation
	Myofascial pain syndrome							
	ESWT vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	30	30	SMD=-0.85 [-1.38, -0.32]	very low	TCMET: manual acupuncture
	Plantar fasciitis							
	ESWT vs DI	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	108	72	SMD=0.37 [0.07, 0.67]	very low	DI: methylprednisolone and lidocaine and epinephrine
	Stenosing tenosynovitis							
ESWT vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	12	12	SMD=-1.25 [-2.14, -0.36]	very low	TCMET: electro-acupuncture	
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	12	12	SMD=-1.41 [-2.12, -0.70]	very low		
Osteonecrosis of the femoral head								
ESWT + RH + MT vs RH	Quality of life (Modified Barthel Index)	1	56	56	SMD=1.19 [0.79, 1.59]	very low	RH: hyperbaric oxygen therapy; MT: nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and bisphosphate and calcium carbonate	
Medium energy	Large or Moderate Effect with Low or Very low Certainty							
	Plantar heel pain							
	ESWT vs SESWT	Pain intensity (Numerical Rating Scale)	2	39	40	SMD=-0.81 [-1.28, -0.35]	low	SESWT: shockwave of the same sound without energy stimulation
	Lateral epicondylitis							
	ESWT vs DI	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	20	20	SMD=0.98 [0.32, 1.64]	low	
	ESWT vs DI	Function (Grip Strength)	1	20	20	SMD=-1.46 [-2.16, -0.75]	low	DI: methylprednisolone
	Peyronie's disease							
	ESWT vs ST	Function(International Index of Erectile Function-Erectile Function Domain Score)	1	10	10	SMD=-1.06 [-2.01, -0.11]	very low	
	ESWT vs ST	Symptom (Penile Curvature)	1	10	10	SMD=-1.08 [-2.03, -0.13]	very low	ST: autologous perididymal patch grafting
	Rotator cuff tear							
	ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (University of California at Los Angeles Shoulder Score)	1	56	64	SMD=0.61 [0.24, 0.97]	low	
	ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Constant-Murley Score)	1	56	64	SMD=1.22 [0.83, 1.62]	low	
	ESWT + RH vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	56	64	SMD=-0.96 [-1.78, -0.14]	low	RH: range of motion exercises and stretching exercises
	ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Range of Motion)	1	56	64	SMD=0.82 [0.45, 1.19]	low	
	ESWT vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	15	15	SMD=1.55 [1.07, 2.03]	very low	
	ESWT vs TCMET	Function (Range of Motion)	1	15	15	SMD=-2.76 [-4.31, -1.21]	very low	TCMET: floating acupuncture
	ESWT vs TCMET	Function (Range of Motion)	1	15	15	SMD=-0.66 [-0.91, -0.42]	very low	
	ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	2	53	53	SMD=-1.16 [-2.20, -0.13]	very low	
	ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Function (University of California at Los Angeles Shoulder Score)	1	26	26	SMD=5.70 [4.44, 6.97]	very low	TCMET: manual acupuncture or floating acupuncture
	ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Quality of life (36-item Short-Form)	1	26	26	SMD=1.32 [0.73, 1.92]	very low	
ESWT + RH +TCMET vs RH + TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	32	32	SMD=-4.48 [-5.42, -3.54]	very low	RH: joint mobilization; TCMET: acupuncture and tuina	
ESWT + RH +TCMET vs RH + TCMET	Function (Range of Motion)	1	32	32	SMD=2.13 [1.35, 2.92]	very low	RH: joint mobilization; TCMET: acupuncture and tuina	

Medium energy

Low back pain								
ESWT vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	2	115	115	SMD=-1.53 [-2.30, -0.76]	low	RH: bridging exercises or adductor ball squeeze exercises or abdominal marching exercises or reverse curl exercises	
ESWT vs DI	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	15	15	SMD=-1.80 [-2.67, -0.93]	very low	DI: trigger point injection	
ESWT + RH vs SESWT + RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	38	36	SMD=-0.88 [-1.36, -0.40]	very low	SESWT: shockwave of the same sound without energy stimulation; RH: physical exercises	
Post-stroke shoulder-hand syndrome								
ESWT + RH vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	58	58	SMD=-1.26 [-1.66, -0.86]	very low		
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Fugl-Meyer Assessment Scale)	1	58	58	SMD=1.01 [0.62, 1.40]	very low	RH: exercises	
ESWT + RH vs RH	Quality of life (Stroke Specific Quality of Life Scale)	1	58	58	SMD=0.69 [0.32, 1.07]	very low		
ESWT + TCMET + RH vs TCMET + RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	2	70	70	SMD=-0.76 [-1.14, -0.38]	very low		
ESWT + TCMET + RH vs TCMET + RH	Function (Fugl-Meyer Assessment Scale)	2	70	70	SMD=0.86 [0.23, 1.49]	very low	RH: posture exercises or psychotherapy or medium-frequency electrotherapy or barotherapy; TCMET: acupuncture or tuina	
ESWT + TCMET + RH vs TCMET + RH	Quality of life (Stroke Specific Quality of Life Scale)	2	70	70	SMD=1.11 [0.64, 1.59]	very low		
Knee osteoarthritis								
ESWT vs SESWT	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	30	30	SMD=-1.73 [-2.33, -1.14]	very low		
ESWT vs SESWT	Pain intensity, stiffness and physical function (Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index)	1	30	30	SMD=-0.59 [-1.11, -0.08]	very low	SESWT: shockwave of the same sound without energy stimulation	
ESWT vs SESWT	Symptom (Lequesne Index)	1	30	30	SMD=-0.92 [-1.45, -0.39]	very low		
ESWT vs MT	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	30	30	SMD=-1.84 [-2.45, -1.23]	very low		
ESWT vs MT	Pain intensity, stiffness and physical function (Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index)	1	30	30	SMD=-1.56 [-2.15, -0.98]	very low	MT: glucosamine	
ESWT vs MT	Symptom (Lequesne Index)	1	30	30	SMD=-1.69 [-2.29, -1.10]	very low		
Frozen shoulder								
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	23	23	SMD=-0.62 [-1.21, -0.03]	very low		
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Function (Constant-Murley Score)	1	23	23	SMD=1.49 [0.83, 2.15]	very low	TCMET: small needle-knife therapy	
Chronic prostatitis/chronic pelvic pain syndrome								
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Pain intensity, urinary symptoms, and quality of life (National Institutes of Health-Chronic Prostatitis Symptom Index Total Score)	1	14	14	SMD=-1.90 [-2.81, -0.98]	very low		
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Symptom (International Prostatism Symptom Score)	1	14	14	SMD=-1.27 [-2.10, -0.45]	very low	TCMET: herbal fumigation	
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	14	14	SMD=-3.59 [-4.84, -2.33]	very low		
Calcific tendinitis of the shoulder								
ESWT + TCMET + RH vs TCMET + RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	16	12	SMD=-2.45 [-3.47, -1.43]	very low		
ESWT + TCMET + RH vs TCMET + RH	Function (Constant-Murley Score)	1	16	12	SMD=1.51 [0.65, 2.37]	very low	TCMET: manual acupuncture; RH: infrared therapy	
ESWT + ST vs ST	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	30	30	SMD=-3.39 [-4.20, -2.59]	very low		
ESWT + ST vs ST	Function (University of California at Los Angeles Shoulder Score)	1	30	30	SMD=3.44 [2.63, 4.25]	very low	ST: ultrasound-guided puncture decompression	
Osteonecrosis of the femoral head								
ESWT + TCMIT vs TCMIT	Function and symptom (Harris Hip Score)	1	24	24	SMD=1.89 [0.60, 3.18]	very low	TCMIT: yishenxiaotongwan	
ESWT + RH + MT vs MT	Function and symptom (Harris Hip Score)	1	31	31	SMD=0.61 [0.10, 1.12]	very low	RH: hyperbaric oxygen therapy; MT: celecoxib	

Low energy

Large or Moderate Effect with Low or Very low Certainty

Post-stroke shoulder-hand syndrome								
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	45	45	SMD=-1.32 [-1.78, -0.87]	low		
ESWT + TCMET vs TCMET	Function (Fugl-Meyer Assessment Scale)	1	45	45	SMD=2.45 [1.90, 3.00]	low		TCMET: manual acupuncture
Second-degree burn								
ESWT + SC vs SC	Structure (Wound-Healing Time)	1	22	22	SMD=-1.45 [-2.12, -0.78]	low		SC: burn wound debridement and topical antiseptic therapy
ESWT + SC vs SC	Structure (Wound Infection Rate)	1	22	22	RR=0.67 [0.12, 3.61]	low		
Plantar fasciitis								
ESWT vs DI	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	2	203	208	SMD=-1.92 [-3.72, -0.12]	low		DI: methylprednisolone or lidocaine or betamethasone
Rotator cuff tear								
ESWT + RH vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	30	32	SMD=-0.83 [-1.36, -0.31]	very low		RH: functional training
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Constant-Murley Score)	1	30	32	SMD=1.00 [0.47, 1.53]	very low		
Low back pain								
ESWT vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	35	35	SMD=-0.59 [-1.11, -0.07]	very low		RH: bridging exercises or adductor ball squeeze exercises or abdominal marching exercises or reverse curl exercises
ESWT vs RH	Function (Oswestry Disability Index)	1	50	50	SMD=-0.70 [-1.18, -0.21]	very low		
ESWT + RH vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	13	15	SMD=-1.17 [-1.98, -0.35]	very low		RH: hot pack therapy and ultrasound therapy and electrotherapy
Stenosing tenosynovitis								
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Cooney Score)	1	41	40	SMD=0.99 [0.67, 1.32]	very low		RH: ultrashort wave electrotherapy
Knee osteoarthritis								
ESWT vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	35	35	SMD=-1.65 [-2.19, -1.10]	very low		
ESWT vs RH	Pain intensity, stiffness and physical function (Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index)	1	35	35	SMD=-2.13 [-2.72, -1.54]	very low		RH: general exercises
ESWT vs RH	Symptom (Lequesne Index)	1	35	35	SMD=-1.36 [-1.88, -0.84]	very low		
Patellar tendinopathy								
ESWT vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	38	16	SMD=-4.66 [-7.32, -1.99]	very low		RH: massage
ESWT vs TCMET	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	38	9	SMD=-6.92 [-10.37, -3.47]	very low		TCMET: acupuncture
ESWT vs DI	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	38	4	SMD=5.02 [3.49, 6.55]	very low		DI: prednisone and procaine
Carpal tunnel syndrome								
ESWT + MT vs MT	Function and symptom (Boston Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Questionnaire)	1	47	45	SMD=-2.85 [-3.27, -2.44]	very low		RH: neural mobilization; MT: methylcobalamin
Frozen shoulder								
ESWT + MT vs RH + MT	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	1	15	15	SMD=-1.65 [-2.50, -0.81]	very low		RH: conservative physical therapy; MT: nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
ESWT + MT vs RH + MT	Function (Patient Specific Functional Scale)	1	15	15	SMD=-2.11 [-3.03, -1.19]	very low		
ESWT + RH vs RH	Pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale)	2	117	117	SMD=-1.74 [-2.85, -0.63]	very low		
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Range of motion)	2	117	117	SMD=1.13 [0.90, 1.37]	very low		
ESWT + RH vs RH	Quality of life (36-item Short-Form)	2	95	95	SMD=2.00 [1.54, 2.45]	very low		RH: joint mobilization or functional exercises or pulsed radiofrequency
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (University of California at Los Angeles Shoulder Score)	1	57	57	SMD=1.25 [0.85, 1.65]	very low		
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function and pain intensity (Shoulder Pain and Disability Index)	1	38	38	SMD=-4.06 [-4.86, -3.26]	very low		
Decubitus ulceration								
ESWT + RH vs RH	Structure (Percentage of the wound healing area)	1	15	15	SMD=1.35 [0.88, 1.82]	very low		RH: infrared polarized light therapy

**Low
energy**

Post-stroke upper limb spasticity							
ESWT + RH + TCMET vs RH + TCMET	Function (Fugl-Meyer Assessment Scale)	1	30	30	SMD=1.20 [0.64, 1.75]	very low	RH: occupational therapy; TCMET: manual acupuncture
ESWT + RH + TCMET vs RH + TCMET	Quality of life (Modified Barthel Index)	1	30	30	SMD=0.94 [0.40, 1.47]	very low	RH: occupational therapy; TCMET: manual acupuncture
Post-stroke lower limb spasticity							
ESWT + RH vs RH	Symptom (Modified Ashworth Scale)	1	50	50	SMD=-1.21 [-2.02, -0.40]	very low	
ESWT + RH vs RH	Function (Fugl-Meyer Assessment Scale)	1	50	50	SMD=0.62 [0.33, 0.90]	very low	RH: physiotherapy and exercises

Note: C, control group; CI, confidence interval; CoE, certainty of evidence assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation approach; DI, drug injection; ESWT, extracorporeal shockwave therapy; MT, medication therapy; RCTs, randomised controlled trials; RH, rehabilitation; RR, relative risk; SC, standard care; SESWT, sham extracorporeal shockwave therapy; SMD, standardized mean difference; T, treatment group; TCMET, traditional Chinese medicine external therapy; TCMIT, traditional Chinese medicine internal therapy.