

## Appendix 2

Patient groups profile at the final examination (according to literature data)

Study	Groups	Indicators at the final examination		Fracture union, %	Severity of pain syndrome according to Denis, n			Occupational adaptation degree according to Denis, n			VAS, points	Oswestry, %
		Cobb angle, degrees	AVBCR, %		P1+P2	P3	P4+P5	W1+W2	W3	W4+W5		
Wild et al. [19]	–	–	–	100.0	–	–	–	17	–	1	–	–
Hwang et al. [20]	Non-fusion group	15.2 ± 6.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.4 ± 0.9	–
Lakshmanan et al. [21]	–	15.7 ± 6.7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lee et al. [22]	Group 1–2	15.6 ± 6.9	19.9 ± 11.9	–	18	8	0	16	10	0	–	–
Liao et al. [23]	–	7.1 ± 4.7	20.0 ± 6.2	–	11	2	1	10	2	2	–	–
Ni et al. [24]	–	7.6 ± 6.8	10.2 ± 4.7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Blondel et al. [25]	Group 1	5.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Group 2	3.6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jiang et al. [26]	Percutaneous group	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.6 ± 0.3	13.5 ± 6.1

Kim et al. [27]	–	–	20.6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.2	–
Li et al. [28]	SSPI group	$7.5 \pm 5.2$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$1.1 \pm 0.6$	–
Wang et al. [29]	–	2.1	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Zhang et al. [30]	–	$5.3 \pm 3.7$	$5.7 \pm 3.2$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$2.0 \pm 0.7$	$34.0 \pm 4.0$
Chou et al. [31]	Non-fusion group	$13.8 \pm 6.6$	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	$2.1 \pm 0.9$	–
Proietti et al. [32]	Group A	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1.8	12.0
	Group B	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4.3	38.0
Takami et al. [33]	–	-0.6	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vanek et al. [34]	MIS group	$4.4 \pm 9.4$	–	–	–	–	–	17	–	–	–	–
Zhao et al. [35]	PFFV group	–	–	–	29	3	0	–	–	–	–	–
	TSSF group	–	–	–	30	5	0	–	–	–	–	–
Fu et al. [36]	Opsf-4	–	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Opsf-6	–	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Ppsf-4	–	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Ppsf-6	–	–	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Lin et al. [37]	Group A	$10.3 \pm 5.2$	$24.5 \pm 12.0$	–	18	1	1	17	2	1	–	–
	Group B	$6.4 \pm 7.8$	$17.8 \pm 9.5$	–	25	4	2	21	6	4	–	–
	Group C	$7.1 \pm 5.3$	$20.8 \pm 6.8$	–	16	2	2	12	4	4	–	–
Fan et al. [38]	PPSF group	$7.0 \pm 6.9$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$0.7 \pm 0.6$	$3.2 \pm 1.7$
Mayer et al. [39]	POST-I group	$14.7 \pm 10.6$	–	90.9	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$16.3 \pm 17.1$
Zhao et al. [40]	–	$6.1 \pm 7.0$	$6.0 \pm 2.0$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–		$5.9 \pm 2.7$
Oh and Seo. [41]	–	$4.6 \pm 11.9$	$13.4 \pm 9.4$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$1.2 \pm 1.2$	$9.5 \pm 6.1$
Trungu et al. [42]	ISG group	2.9		–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.2	16.8
	Nisg group	0.8		–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.4	15.6
Yang et al. [43]	Group A	$11.0 \pm 3.0$	$11.5 \pm 5.6$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$1.3 \pm 0.7$	–
	Group B	$12.8 \pm 4.2$	$11.0 \pm 4.9$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$0.9 \pm 0.7$	–
Yang et al. [44]	MIS group	$10.7 \pm 3.2$	$17.2 \pm 15.7$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$2.2 \pm 0.6$	$4.5 \pm 2.6$
	OPPF group	$9.2 \pm 3.6$	$16.4 \pm 13.9$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$2.5 \pm 0.9$	$4.7 \pm 3.3$
Alkosha et al. [45]	All	–	–	85.7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	TLICS 3 PSF group	$17.0 \pm 3.0$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$15.0 \pm 2.0$

	TLICS 4 PSF group	$17.0 \pm 3.0$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$15.0 \pm 2.0$
	TLICS 5 PSF group	$19.0 \pm 2.0$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$18.0 \pm 2.0$
Collinet et al. [46]	–	$6.2 \pm 5.9$	$17.0 \pm 5.0$	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.3	11.8
Kocis et al. [47]	OPSF group	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	PPSF group	0.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Shao et al. [48]	–	5.5	$16.5 \pm 5.5$	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	$15 \pm 0.7$	$12.2 \pm 4.3$
Zou et al. [49]	PPS group	–	–	–	–	–	–	–			$0.4 \pm 0.4$	$5.3 \pm 1.8$
Cheng et al. [50]	–	$6.9 \pm 4.3$	$2.4 \pm 8.4$	100.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	$0.8 \pm 0.7$	–
Hoffman et al. [51]	CG group	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$21.4 \pm 23.7$
	IG group	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$17.7 \pm 11.8$
Perna et al. [52]	Group A	$8.7 \pm 4.8$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$4.5 \pm 1.8$	$27.3 \pm 10.1$
Zhu et al. [53]	MIS-F group	–	$6.1 \pm 5.1$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$1.2 \pm 0.5$	$11.5 \pm 2.3$
	MIS-O group	–	$7.9 \pm 10.1$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$1.2 \pm 0.8$	$12.0 \pm 2.1$
	Open-C group	–	$6.8 \pm 8.1$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	$1.4 \pm 0.7$	$12.2 \pm 2.6$