

**Figure S1: Normal distributions of relative treatment effect estimates from frequentist setting (red line) superimposed on posterior distributions of the relative treatment effects from Bayesian model (black line) for a network with Spearman's  $\rho$  of 0.6 between  $SUCRA_F$  and  $SUCRA_B$ .** The network meta-analysis used analysed the effects of four inodilators and placebo on survival in adult cardiac surgery patients (Greco et al., *Br J Anaesth* 2015). LOR = log odds ratios; number in square brackets represents the different interventions in the network.




Figure S2 (previous page): Scatter plots of the average variance in a network and the pairwise agreement between hierarchies from different ranking metrics.




Figure S3 (previous page): Scatter plots of the relative range of variance in a network and the pairwise agreement between hierarchies from different ranking metrics.




Figure S4 (previous page): Scatter plots of the total sample size over the number of treatments in a network and the pairwise agreement between hierarchies from different ranking metrics.

**Table S1: Pairwise agreement between treatment hierarchies from illustrative network example.** Medians, 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quartiles are reported.  $p_{BV}$ : probability of producing the best value;  $SUCRA_F$ : surface under the cumulative ranking curve; relative treatment effect stands for the relative treatment effect against fictional treatment of average performance. The first three column from the left-hand side present the agreements between rankings obtained using the original data; the equivalent three columns on the right-hand side show the agreements between rankings obtained after reducing the standard error of the Conventional versus ARB treatment effect from 0.7 to a fictional value of 0.01.

	Original data			Fictional data with increased precision for Conventional treatment versus ARB		
	$p_{BV}$ vs $SUCRA_F$	$p_{BV}$ vs relative treatment effect	$SUCRA_F$ vs relative treatment effect	$p_{BV}$ vs $SUCRA_F$	$p_{BV}$ vs relative treatment effect	$SUCRA_F$ vs relative treatment effect
<b>Spearman <math>\rho</math></b>	0.64	0.85	0.93	0.89	0.91	1
<b>Kendall <math>\tau</math></b>	0.54	0.69	0.87	0.78	0.82	0.99
<b>Yilmaz <math>\tau_{AP}</math></b>	0.39	0.44	0.87	0.76	0.81	0.96
<b>Average Overlap</b>	0.48	0.54	0.85	0.85	0.94	0.92