

Table1. The characteristic of studies included in this meta-analysis.

Study	Study type	Population size	Age	Follow up (month)	Male %	Baseline proteinuria (g/24hr)	Baseline serum creatinine (mg/dl)	Baseline serum albumin (g/dl)	dosage	Quality
Cravedi et al 2007 [16]	Match – cohort study	12/24	57±13	12	67	10.3±8.9 9.1±3.8	1.4±0.5 1.5±0.7	2.3±0.8 2.4±0.6	B cell -driven treatment 4 weakly dose of 375 mg/m ²	7
Cravedi et al 2011 [10]	Match–cohort study	11/11	48.6±13.9	24	90.9	11.75±3.47	-	2.2±0.8	4 weakly dose of 375 mg/m ² and B cell driven protocol	6
Dahan et al 2016 [11]	RCT	37/38	52.75±5.25	6	75.7	-	1.11±0.14	2.18±0.18	2*375 mg/m ²	Low bias
Rosenzwaig et al 2017 [14]	RCT	16/9	53.5±12	6	75	-	1.29±0.35	2.23±0.33	-	Low bias
Van den band et al 2017 [13]	Retrospective cohort study	100/103	51.5±15.9	40	72	-	1.27±0.12	2.23±0.68	4 weakly dose of 375 mg/m ² or B cell- driven protocol	7
Seitz-polski et al 2019 [15]	Comparative study	28/27	62±5	6	85.71	-	1.2±0.15 1.1±0.1	2±0.25 2.15±0.2	2*1g at 14 days apart 2 infusion of 375 mg/m ² at one week interval	8
Fervenza et al 2019 [6]	RCT	65/65	51.9±12.6	24	47	9.23±1.38	1.3±0.4	2.5±0.2	2*1g at 14 days apart	Low bias
Fenoglio et al 2020 [12]	Retrospective cohort study	28/14	64.4±10.8	24	64.3	7.5±4.8 5.1±1.41	1.05±0.34 1.06±0.46	2.5±0.5 2.6±0.6	One dose of 375 mg/m ² 4 weakly dose of 375 mg/m ²	7

Table 2. Risk of bias: The summary of authors’ judgments about the probable bias for included RCTs using Cochrane collaboration tool.

Study	Randomization process (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Double blinding (performance bias)	Blinding of result assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selection of the reported result (reporting bias)	Other bias
Dahan et al 2016 [11]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rosenzwajg et al 2017 [14]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fervenza et al 2019 [6]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+