S3 Table: Synthesis of findings

Outcome	Comparison	Effect Size	#studies, # partici- pants	Reference
Suction				
Death or disability	Suction vs no first aid	Not statistically significant: 0/3 vs 1/15 § RR: 1.33, 95%CI [0.07; 26.98] *¥ (p=0.85)	1, 3 vs 15	Michael, 2011
Amount of anti- venom required (mL) (median [IQR])	Suction vs no suc- tion	Not statistically significant: 50 [0;60] vs 20 [20;30] £ (p=0.45)	1, 3 vs 69 §	
Duration of hospital stay (days) (median)		Not statistically significant: 6 vs 4 £ (p=0.70)	1, 3 vs 69 §	-
Tourniquet				•
Local swelling	Tourniquet vs no first aid	<u>Statistically significant</u> : 78/78 vs 86/148 § RR: 1.71, 95%CI, [1.49;1.96] * (p<0.00001) If favor of no tourniquet	1, 78 vs 148	Bhat, 1974
	Tourniquet with incision vs no first aid	Statistically significant: 71/71 vs 86/148 § RR: 1.71, 95% CI, [1.49;1.96] * (p<0.00001) In favor of no tourniquet	1, 71 vs 148	
Hemorrhagic syn- drome	Tourniquet vs no first aid	Not statistically significant: 49/78 vs 98/148 § RR: 0.95, 95%CI, [0.77;1.17] * (p=0.62)	1, 78 vs 148	-
	Tourniquet with incision vs no first aid	Not statistically significant: 46/71 vs 98/148 § RR: 0.98, 95%CI, [0.80;1.20] * (n=0.84)	1, 71 vs 148	-
Amount of anti- venom required (ml)	Tourniquet vs no tourniquet	Not statistically significant: 139±56.4 vs 156.5±65.8 MD: -17.5, 95% CI [-41.82;6.82] * (p=0.16)	1, 45 vs 52 §	Amaral 1998
		Statistically significant: 20 [20;40] vs 20 [10;20] £ (median and IQR) (p=0.03)	1, 53 vs 19 §	Michael, 2011
	Tourniquet vs no first aid	Statistically significant: 24.52±13.6 vs 39.33±34.32 MD: -14.81 ££ (p<0.01) In favor of tourniquet use	1, 35 vs 19 §	Madaki, 2005
Acute renal failure	Tourniquet vs no tourniquet	Not statistically significant: 4/42 vs 4/52 § RR: 1.24, 95%CI [0.33;4.66] * ¥ (p=0.75)	1, 42 vs 52	Amaral 1998
Acute respiratory failure	-	Not statistically significant: 3/35 vs 3/49 § RR: 1.4, 95%CI [0.3;6.53] *¥ (p=0.67)	1, 35 vs 49	
Death		Not statistically significant: 2/45 vs 3/52 § RR: 0.77, 95%CI [0.13:4.41] * ¥	1, 45 vs 52	

		(p=0.77)		
Local edema		Not statistically significant: 17/42 vs 21/51 § RR: 0.98, 95% CU [0.6:1.61] * ¥	1, 42 vs 51	
		(n=0.95)		
Envenoming	Tourniquet vs no first aid	Not statistically significant: 31/35 vs 16/19 § RR: 1.05, 95% CI [0.84;1.32] * ¥ (p=0.66)	1, 35 vs 19 §	Madaki, 2005
Duration of hospital stay (days)		Not statistically significant: 6±2.6 vs 6.3±3 MD: -0.3, 95%CI [-1.9;1.3] *¥ (p=0.71)		
		Statistically significant: 4.6±2.0 vs 3.7±2.5 MD: 0.9 ££ (p=0.04) In favor of no tourniquet	1, 53 vs 15 §	Michael, 2011
Tissue necrosis	Tourniquet/ Tour- niquet with incisions vs no first aid	Not statistically significant: 3/38 vs 1/19 § RR: 0.75, 95%CI [0.14;4.12] * ¥ (p=0.74)	1, 38 vs 19	Madaki, 2005
Death or disability	Tourniquet vs no tourniquet	Not statistically significant: 14/53 vs 1/15 § OR: 4.7, 95%CI [0.58;212] ¥ (p=0.16)	1, 53 vs 15	Michael, 2011
Serum venom level before antivenom treatment (ng/ml)		Not statistically significant: 77.85±74.82 vs 60.88±39.39 λ ¤ MD: 16.97, 95%CI [-20.79;54.73] *¥ (p=0.38)	1, 20 vs 17 §	Khin Ohn Lwin, 1984
		Not statistically significant: 197.7±230.4 vs 283.5±406.6 MD: -85.8, 95%CI [-204.34;32.74] * (p=0.16)	1, 56 vs 61 §	França, 2003
Severity of local en- venomation (mild vs moderate)		Statistically significant: aOR: 4.31, 95%CI, [1.33;13.89] (p=0.015) £££ In favor of no tourniquet		
Incidence of multi- ple organ dysfunction syn- drome Skin grafting re-		Not statistically significant: 17/220 vs 3/72 § RR: 1.85, 95% CI [0.56;6.15] *¥ (p=0.31) Statistically significant:	1, 220 vs 72	Wang, 2014
quired		44/220 vs 7/72 § RR: 2.06 ££ (p=0.046) In favor of no tourniquet		
Efficacy	auon			
Time to reach 80% maximal blood counts of radioactiv- ity (min)	Elastic bandage and splinting vs no treatment	Not statistically significant: 26±17.06 vs 26±3.61 ¤ MD: 0.0, 95%CI [-19.73;19.73] *¥ (p=1.00)	1, 3 vs 3 §	Anker, 1982
	Pressure cloth vs no treatment	Statistically significant: 74.3±3.79 vs 26±3.61 ¤ MD: 48.3, 95%CI [42.38;54.22] * (p<0.00001) In favor of pressure cloth		

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Treatment with	Statistically significant:	1, 14 vs 8 §	Tun Pe, 1994	
pad and splinning vs no treatment MD: 23.69, 95%C1 [1.7.53:29.85] * (p-0.00001) in favor of rubber pressure pad and splinning Amount of radioac- lisity in blood and radioactivity in blood after 60 mini In favor of rubber pressure pad and splinning vs not 06.7-45.1 vs 46.33-16.17 rs (p-0.056) I, 3 vs 3 § Anker, 1983 Amount of radioac- sample (% of maxi- mat radioactivity in blood after 60 mini) Pressure cloth vs no treatment In 65, 95%C1 [-24.66, 13.34] * ¥ (p=0.056) I, 3 vs 3 § Anker, 1983 Transit of tracer rest vs while walk- log Losey Similicant: vhile walk- statistically significant: vhile appropriate I, 13 vs 9 (within while valk- satistically significant: vhile appropriate I, 13 vs 6 (within subjects) Howarth, 1994 Feasibility Training vs no vraining Statistically significant: vhile appropriate I, 13 vs 6 (within subjects design) Canale, 2009 Feasibility Training vs no vraining Not statistically significant: vhile marker I, 36 vs 36 (within subjects design) Canale, 2009 Correct application for pressure immobi- balticare vorker Lay pople vs Not statistically significant: vhile bandage pressure applied written instructions F7.10 vs 13100 g I, 100 vs 100 Norris, 2005 Training vs 10 and g merse training vs P_0-0.0001) In anor dinense training MD: 47.2, 95%C1 [0.43; 1.58] * Y p_0-0.0001) <td></td> <td>rubber pressure</td> <td>66.07±9.71 vs 42.38±5.01 ¤</td> <td></td> <td></td>		rubber pressure	66.07±9.71 vs 42.38±5.01 ¤			
		pad and splinting	MD: 23.69, 95%CI [17.53;29.85] *			
Amount of radioac- itivity in blood sample (% of maxi- mal patienting vs not MoTs4151 vs d53216.17 m reatment 1, 3 vs 3 § Anker, 1983 Amount of radioac- itivity in blood sample (% of maxi- mal radioactivity in blood after 60 min) Pressure cloth vs no treatment 1, 2 vs 3 § Anker, 1983 Pressure cloth vs no treatment MD: 5-560, 50% CI [-24.66;13.34] * ¥ (p=0.560) 1, 13 vs 3 § Anker, 1983 Transit of tracer rest vs while walk- low of pressure cloth rag I, 13 vs 9 (within subjects) I, 13 vs 9 (within subjects) Transit of tracer rest vs while walk- reg 0.0060 RR: 0.34, 95% CI [0.16;0.73] * (p=0.006) I, 13 vs 6 (within subjects) Feasibility Training vs no vithin appropriate range Training vs no training Statistically significant: vithin appropriate range I, 36 vs 36 (within subjects) Correct application with bandage truthen appropriate ressure applied Lay people vs vortisten approver of training for sest (10.14;1.04] * ¥ (p=0.05) I, 10 vs 100 Pressure applied with bandage truthen instructions for pressure applied Intense training vs 10 statistically significant: vith bandage truthen instructions for sest (10.43;1.58] * ¥ (p=0.02) I, 20 vs 20 § Simpson, 2008 Pressure applied truthen instructions for pressure applied truthen instructions for pressure applied Intense training vs 10 after for of intense training statistically significant: vith bandage truthen instructions for pressure applied I. 20 vs 20 (within subjects design) Training vs		vs no treatment	(p<0.00001)			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			In favor of rubber pressure pad and			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			splinting	1 2 2 8	4 1 1002	
	Amount of radioac-	Elastic bandage	Not statistically significant: 40.67+4.51 vs $46.33+16.17$ v	1, 3 vs 3 §	Anker, 1983	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	sample (% of maxi-	treatment	$MD: -5 \ 66 \ 95\% CL[-24 \ 66.13 \ 34] * Y$			
Initiation of the set of	mal radioactivity in	treatment	(n=0.56)			
	blood after 60 min)	Pressure cloth vs	Statistically significant:			
MD:: 41.66, 95%CI [-60.32;-23.0] * [p-0.001] In favor of pressure cloth I, 13 vs 9 (within subjects) Transit of tracer rest vs while walk ing Lower limbs: Statistically significant: 4/13 vs 9/9 § RR: 0.34, 95%CI [0.16;0.73] * (p=0.006) I, 13 vs 9 (within subjects) Feasibility RR: 0.58, 95%CI [0.34;0.98] * (p=0.04) In favor of rest I, 13 vs 6 (within subjects) Feasibility Training vs no training Statistically significant: 13/36 vs 5/36 § NR: 0.58, 95%CI [0.34;0.98] * (p=0.04) In favor of rest Correct application of pressure immobi- fization technique Training vs no training Statistically significant: 10/376 § Nort statistically significant: 11/100 vs 100 Correct application izitation technique Nort statistically significant: 14/100 vs 17/100 § RR: 0.38, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * 1/20 vs 20 § Correct bandage pressure applied written instructions 7/7.71.71.vs 10.51.1.0 (nmHg) Intense training vs 10.521.0 ND: 47.2, 95%CI [38.33;56.07] * (p=0.000) In favor of intense training Tension within the correct range (55.70 mMHg) Intense training vs 10.421 (32.0206) ND: 47.2, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Training vs 10.442 vs 16/19 § Use of Concections/Traditional medi- reation intense training intense training I, 20 vs 20 (within ubjects design)		no treatment	4.67+3.25 vs $46.33+16.17$ ×			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			MD: -41.66. 95%CI [-60.32:-23.0] *			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			(p<0.0001)			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			In favor of pressure cloth			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Transit of tracer	rest vs while walk-	Lower limbs:	1, 13 vs 9 (within	Howarth, 1994	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		ing	Statistically significant:	subjects)	,	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		C	4/13 vs 9/9 §	5 /		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			RR: 0.34, 95%CI [0.16;0.73] *			
$ \left \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			(p=0.006)			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			In favor of rest			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Upper limbs:	1, 13 vs 6 (within		
$ \left \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			Statistically significant:	subjects)		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			7/13 vs 6/6 §			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline (p=0.04) & n favor of rest \\ \hline Feasibility \\ \hline Feasibility \\ \hline Tension generated within appropriate range \\ range \\ \hline Training vs no training & Istatistically significant: \\ range \\ \hline Correct application \\ for pressure immobilization technique \\ \hline Correct bandage \\ pressure applied \\ \hline Tension within the \\ correct range (55-70 \\ mmHg) \\ \hline Tension within the \\ generating vs for training \\ \hline Tension within the \\ correct range (55-70 \\ mmHg) \\ \hline Use of Concoctions/Traditional medi- \\ \hline Tension mining \\ \hline Use of Concoctions/Traditional medi- \\ \hline Envenoming \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Envenoming \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Envenoming \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Correct Mining \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Correct range (sing vs 100 \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Correct range (sing vs 100 \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Envenoming \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Correct range (sing vs 100 \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Correct range (sing vs 100 \\ \hline Traditional medi- \\ \hline Correct range (sing vs 100 \\ \hline Correct$			RR: 0.58, 95%CI [0.34;0.98] *			
In favor of restFeasibilityTension generated within appropriate rangeTraining vs no training 18/36 vs 5/36 § OR: 6.20 ££ (p=0.002) In favor of training1,36 vs 36 (within subjects design)Correct application of pressure immobi- lization techniqueLay people vs Not statistically significant: Not statistically significant: I/100 § RR: 0.38, 95%CI [0.14;1.04] * ¥ (p=0.06)1,100 vs 100Correct bandage pressure applied withe nadage (mmHg)Intense training vs Statistically significant: I/4/100 vs 17/100 § RR: 0.28, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56)1, 20 vs 20 §Pressure applied withen instructions 57.7±17.0 vs 10.5±11.0 mmHg)Intense training vs Statistically significant: I/2/20 vs 0/20 §1, 20 vs 20 §Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)Statistically significant: I/2/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training J advs after intense Statistically significant: training vs In after site training Statistically significant: training vs In after p=0.001 In favor of Ih after training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medi- EnvenomingNot statistically significant: I raditional medi- 34/40 vs 16/19 §1, 40 vs 19Madaki, 2005			(p=0.04)			
FeasibilityTension generated within appropriate rangeIraining vs no trainingStatistically significant: 18/36 vs 5/36 § OR: 6.20 ££ (p=0.002) In favor of trainingI, 36 vs 36 (within subjects design)Canale, 2009 subjects design)Correct application of pressure immobi- lization technique pressure appliedLay people vs Not statistically significant: I/100 vs 13/100 § RR: 0.38, 95% CI [0.14;1.04] * ¥ (p=0.06)I, 100 vs 100Norris, 2005Correct bandage pressure applied withen instructionsIntense training vs Statistically significant: I/100 vs 17/100 § RR: 0.82, 95% CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56)I, 20 vs 20 §Simpson, 2008Pressure applied witten instructionsIntense training vs Statistically significant: I/2/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training Statistically significant: I/2/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of Intense training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)Statistically significant: I/2/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of Intense training 3 days after intense F2/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § 95% CI [6:44%] (p<-0.001) In favor of Ih after training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicine EnvenomingIraditional medicineIn favor of Ih after training P5% CI [1.58] (1.54%) [1, 40 vs 19EnvenomingIraditional medicineNot statistically significant: (p<-0.001) In favor of Ih after training1, 40 vs 19			In favor of rest			
Tension generated within appropriate rangeTraining vs no trainingStatistically significant: (p=0.002) In favor of trainingI, 36 vs 36 (within subjects design)Correct application of pressure immobi- healthcare workerLay people vs Not statistically significant: (p=0.06)1, 100 vs 100Norris, 2005Correct bandage pressure appliedLat y people vs healthcare workerNot vs 13/100 § RR: 0.38, 95% CI [0.14;1.04] * ¥ (p=0.06)1, 100 vs 100Norris, 2005Pressure applied with bandage (mmHg)Intense training vs 10 statistically significant: tatistically significant: In favor of intense training1, 20 vs 20 §Simpson, 2008Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)Intense statistically significant: tatistically significant: tatistically significant: taristically significant: training vs 1h after y 0.0001) In favor of intense training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)3 days after intense Statistically significant: raning vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (06%) § p<0.001) In favor of 1h after training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicine EnvenomingTraditional medi- Vot statistically significant: p<0.001) In favor of 1h after training1, 40 vs 19Madaki, 2005	Feasibility					
within appropriate rangetraining18/36 vs 5/36 § NCR 6.20 ££ (p=0.002) 	Tension generated	Training vs no	Statistically significant:	1, 36 vs 36 (within	Canale, 2009	
rangeOR: $6.20 \ \text{ff}$ ($p=0.002$) In favor of trainingIn favor of trainingCorrect application of pressure immobi- lization techniqueLay people vs healthcare workerNot statistically significant: $S/100 \ vs \ 13/100 \ \$$ RR: $0.38, 95\% \text{CI } [0.14;1.04] * \forall (p=0.06)1, 100 vs 100Correct bandagepressure appliedNot statistically significant:14/100 \ vs \ 17/100 \ \$RR: 0.82, 95\% \text{CI } [0.43; 1.58] * \forall (p=0.66)1, 20 vs 20 \ \$Pressure appliedIntense training vswritten instructions 57.7\pm17.0 \ vs \ 10.5\pm11.0MD: 47.2, 95\% \text{CI } [38.33; 56.07] *(p<0.0001)In favor of intense trainingStatistically significant:(p<0.00001)In favor of intense trainingStatistically significant:1.220 \ vs \ 0.20 \ \$Simpson, 2008Tension within thecorrect range (55-70mmHg)MD: 47.2, 95\% \text{CI } [1.58; 395.48] *(p=0.02)In favor of intense training1.220 \ vs \ 0.20 \ \$Simpson, 2008With space (55-70mmHg)M2 safter intenses1.220 \ vs \ 0.20 \ \$1, 20 vs 20 (withinsubjects design)3 days after intenseintense training95\% \text{CI } [6;44\%](p<0.001)In favor of In after training1, 20 vs 20 (withinsubjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medic-intense trainingNot statistically significant:1.700 \ vs \ 12/20 \ (60\%) \ \$1, 40 vs \ 19$ Madaki, 2005 cine (with or $34/40 \ vs \ 16/19 \ \$$ Not statistically significant: $1.40 \ vs \ 19$ 1, 40 vs \ 19	within appropriate	training	18/36 vs 5/36 §	subjects design)		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	range		OR: 6.20 ££			
In favor of trainingIn favor of trainingCorrect applicationLay people vs Not statistically significant:1, 100 vs 100of pressure immobi- lization techniqueNot statistically significant: $(p=0.06)$ 1, 100 vs 100Correct bandage pressure appliedNot statistically significant: $14/100$ vs $17/100$ § RR: 0.82, 95% CI [0.14;1.04] * ¥ $(p=0.65)$ 1, 20 vs 20 §Pressure applied with bandage (mmHg)Intense training vs Statistically significant: $Not * 12, 2, 95\%$ CI [38.33;56.07] * $(p<0.00001)$ In favor of intense training $Navor of intense training$ 1, 20 vs 20 §Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)Statistically significant: $12/20$ vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * $(p=0.02)$ In favor of 1 intense training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)3 days after intense intense trainingStatistically significant: $1/20$ vs 0/20 § $Navor of 1 hafter training1, 20 vs 20 (withinsubjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medici-cine (with orNot statistically significant:34/40 vs 16/19 §1, 40 vs 19$			(p=0.002)			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			In favor of training			
of pressure immobi- lization technique Correct bandage pressure applied Not statistically significant: 14/100 vs 17/100 § RR: 0.82, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56) Pressure applied with bandage (mmHg) Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg) 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of 1h after training Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicine Envenoming Traditional medi- cine (with or Statistically significant: af440 vs 16/19 § Intense training Intense training Statistically significant: training vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of 1h after training Statistically significant: training Vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of 1h after training Intense training Statistically significant: training Vs 1h after p=0.001) In favor of 1h after training Intense training Statistically significant: training Vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of 1h after training Intense training Statistically significant: training Vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of 1h after training Intense training Statistically significant: training Vs 1h after p=0.02) In favor of 1h after training Intense training Intense training Statistically significant: training Vs 1h after p=0.001) In favor of 1h after training Intense training Inte	Correct application	Lay people vs	Not statistically significant:	1, 100 vs 100	Norris, 2005	
lization technique RR: 0.38, 95%CI [0.14;1.04] * ¥ (p=0.06) Not statistically significant: pressure applied RR: 0.82, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56) Pressure applied with bandage (mmHg) MD: 47.2, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.00001) Intense training vs Statistically significant: (mmHg) MD: 47.2, 95%CI [38.33;56.07] * (p<0.0001) In favor of intense training Statistically significant: correct range (55-70 mmHg) RR: 25.0, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § intense training 95%CI [6,44%] (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after training Use design) Use of Concoctions/Traditional medic- Envenoming Traditional medi- cine (with or 34/40 vs 16/19 §	of pressure immobi-	healthcare worker	5/100 vs 13/100 §			
Correct bandage pressure appliedNot statistically significant: $14/100 \text{ vs } 17/100 \ \$}$ RR: 0.82, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56)I, 20 vs 20 \ \\$Pressure applied withen instructionsIntense training vs $57.7\pm17.0 \text{ vs } 10.5\pm11.0$ MD: 47.2 , 95%CI [38.33;56.07] * (p<0.0001) In favor of intense trainingI, 20 vs 20 \ \\$Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)MD: 47.2 , 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense trainingSimpson, 2008Re: 25.0, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense trainingI, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)3 days after intense training vs 1h after intense trainingStatistically significant: (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after trainingUse of Concoctions/Traditional medic- cine (with orNot statistically significant: $34/40$ vs 16/19 \statistically significant:	lization technique		RR: 0.38, 95%CI [0.14;1.04] * ¥			
Correct bandage pressure appliedNot statistically significant: 14/100 vs 17/100 § RR: 0.82, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56)I, 20 vs 20 §Pressure applied withen instructionsIntense training vs Statistically significant: (p=0.56)I, 20 vs 20 §With bandage (mmHg)Intense training vs MD: 47.2, 95%CI [38.33;56.07] * (p<0.00001) In favor of intense training Statistically significant: 12/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense trainingSimpson, 2008Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)RR: 25.0, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)3 days after intense intense trainingStatistically significant: (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medic- ine (with or or (with or 34/40 vs 16/19 §Not statistically significant: 1, 40 vs 191, 40 vs 19EnvenomingTraditional medi- cine (with or 34/40 vs 16/19 §Not statistically significant: adva to 1/19 §1, 40 vs 19		-	(p=0.06)			
pressure applied 14/100 vs 1//100 § RR: 0.82, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥ (p=0.56) Pressure applied Intense training vs Statistically significant: with bandage written instructions 57.7±17.0 vs 10.5±11.0 1, 20 vs 20 § (mmHg) MD: 47.2, 95%CI [38.33;56.07] * 1, 20 vs 20 § Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg) Statistically significant: 1, 20 vs 20 (within significant: 12/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95%CI [1.58;395.48] * 1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design) 3 days after intenses Statistically significant: 1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design) intense training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § subjects design) subjects design) Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicime Not statistically significant: 1, 40 vs 19 Madaki, 2005 Envenoming Traditional medicime 34/40 vs 16/19 § 16/19 § 16/19 §	Correct bandage		Not statistically significant:			
RR: $0.82, 95\%$ CI $[0.43; 1.58] * #$ (p=0.56)Intense training vs (p=0.56)Simpson, 2008Pressure applied with bandage (mmHg)Intense training vs MD: $47.2, 95\%$ CI $[38.33;56.07] *$ (p<0.0001) In favor of intense training Statistically significant: $1/20$ vs $0/20$ § RR: $25.0, 95\%$ CI $[1.58;395.48] *$ (p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense training vs 1h after $5/20$ (25%) vs $12/20$ (60%) § intense training 95% CI[$6;44\%$] (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medic- cine (with orNot statistically significant: $1/40$ vs 19 1, 40 vs 19	pressure applied		14/100 vs 17/100 §			
Image: pressure applied with bandage withen instructions \$7.7±17.0 vs 10.5±11.0 1, 20 vs 20 § MD: 47.2, 95%CI [38.33;56.07] * (p<0.00001)			RR: 0.82, 95%CI [0.43; 1.58] * ¥			
Pressure applied with bandage (mmHg)Intense training vsStatistically significant: (p<0.00001) In favor of intense training Statistically significant: 12/20 vs 0/20 §1, 20 vs 20 §Simpson, 2008Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)Statistically significant: 12/20 vs 0/20 §1, 20 vs 20 §Simpson, 2008additional medicineStatistically significant: (p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § 95% CI[6;44%] (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after training1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design)Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicineNot statistically significant: $1, 40$ vs 191, 40 vs 19EnvenomingTraditional medi- cine (with orNot statistically significant: $34/40$ vs 16/19 §1, 40 vs 19	D	T	$\frac{(p=0.56)}{(p=0.56)}$	1 20 . 20 8	0.000	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Pressure applied	Intense training vs	Statistically significant: 57.7 ± 17.0 we 10.5 ± 11.0	1, 20 vs 20 ş	Simpson, 2008	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(mmHg)	written mstructions	$D_{1.1\pm1.0} = 10.5\pm11.0$			
Image: Construction of the sector of the s	(mmig)		(p < 0.0001)			
Tension within the correct range (55-70 mmHg)Statistically significant: 12/20 vs 0/20 § RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training3 days after intenseStatistically significant: (p=0.02) In favor of intense training3 days after intenseStatistically significant: (p=0.02) In favor of intense training3 days after intenseStatistically significant: (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after trainingUse of Concoctions/Traditional medicineNot statistically significant: (p<0.001) In favor of 1h after trainingEnvenomingTraditional medi- cine (with orMadaki, 2005			In favor of intense training			
correct range (55-70 mmHg) I2/20 vs 0/20 § nmHg) RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § intense training 95% CI[6;44%] (p<0.001)	Tension within the	-	Statistically significant:			
mmHg) RR: 25.0, 95% CI [1.58;395.48] * (p=0.02) In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § 95% CI[6;44%] (p<0.001)	correct range (55-70		12/20 vs 0/20 s			
Image Image <td< td=""><td>mmHg)</td><td></td><td>RR: 25.0. 95%CI [1.58:395.48] *</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	mmHg)		RR: 25.0. 95%CI [1.58:395.48] *			
In favor of intense training 3 days after intense Statistically significant: 1, 20 vs 20 (within training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § 95% CI[6;44%] subjects design) In favor of 1h after training 95% CI[6;44%] (p<0.001)			(p=0.02)			
3 days after intense Statistically significant: 1, 20 vs 20 (within subjects design) intense training 95% CI[6;44%] subjects design) 0 p<0.001)			In favor of intense training			
training vs 1h after 5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) § subjects design) intense training 95% CI[6;44%] (p<0.001)		3 days after intense	Statistically significant:	1, 20 vs 20 (within		
intense training 95% CI[6;44%] (p<0.001)		training vs 1h after	5/20 (25%) vs 12/20 (60%) §	subjects design)		
(p<0.001)		intense training	95%CI[6;44%]			
In favor of 1h after training Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicine Envenoming Traditional medi- cine (with or Not statistically significant: 34/40 vs 16/19 § 1, 40 vs 19 Madaki, 2005			(p<0.001)			
Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicine Envenoming Traditional medicine Interventional medicine Not statistically significant: Interventional medicine 1, 40 vs 19 Madaki, 2005 1, 40 vs 19			In favor of 1h after training			
EnvenomingTraditional medi- cine (with orNot statistically significant: 34/40 vs 16/19 §1, 40 vs 19Madaki, 2005	Use of Concoctions/Traditional medicine					
cine (with or 34/40 vs 16/19 §	Envenoming	Traditional medi-	Not statistically significant:	1, 40 vs 19	Madaki, 2005	
	Ŭ	cine (with or	34/40 vs 16/19 §			

	without other first	RR: 1.01, 95%CI [0.8:1.28] * ¥		
	aid measures) vs	(p=0.94)		
	no first aid			
Amount of anti-	Traditional medi-	Statistically significant:	1 17 vs 19 8	-
venom required	cine with	275+2363 vs 3933+3432	1, 17 15 17 8	
(mI)	tourniquet vs no	MD: -11.83 ff		
(IIIL)	first aid	(n < 0.01)		
		(p<0.01) In favor of traditional modicing		
	Companytion on	In javor of traditional medicine	1 15 57 8	Mahaal 2011
	Concoction ap-	Not statistically significant:	1, 15 VS 57 §	Michael, 2011
	phea vs no	50.0[20;50] VS 20.0[10;50] £		
	concoction applied	(median [IQR])		
	<u> </u>	(p=0.07)	1 10 50 0	_
	Concoction in-	Not statistically significant:	1, 10 vs 62 §	
	gested vs no	30.0 [20;30] vs 20.0 [10;40] £		
	concoction in-	(median [IQR])		
	gested	(p=0.13)		
Duration of hospital	Traditional medi-	Not statistically significant:	1, 40 vs 19	Madaki, 2005
stay (days)	cine (with or	6.9±2.6 vs 6.3±3.0		
	without other first	MD: 0.6, 95%CI [-1.23;2.43] *		
	aid measures) vs	(p=0.52)		
	no first aid			
	Concoction ap-	Not statistically significant:	1, 15 vs 57 §	Michael, 2011
	plied vs no	5 vs 4 (median) £	, 0	,
	concoction	(p=0.60)		
	Concoction in-	Not statistically significant:	1. 10 vs 62 §	
	gested vs no	4 vs 4 (median) f	1, 10, 15, 02, 3	
	concoction in-	(p=0.84)		
	gested	(p 0.01)		
Death/disability	Concoction an	Statistically significant:	1 15 vs 15	-
Death/disability	nlied vs no first aid	$\frac{51austically significant}{8/15}$ vs 1/15 8	1, 15 vs 15	
	plica vs no misi ala	$OP \cdot 15 OS 0.00 CI [1 4.708] Y$		
		(n-0.01)		
		(p=0.01) In favor of no first aid		
	Comos etion in	In javor oj no jirsi ala	1 10 15	-
	Concoction in-	Statistically significant: $c_{10} = 1/15$	1, 10 vs 15	
	gested vs no first	0/10 VS 1/15 §		
	aid	OR: 20, 95%CI [1.4;963] ¥		
		(p=0.009)		
		In favor of no first aid		
Snake stone				
Envenoming	Snake stone vs no	Not statistically significant:	1. 11 vs 19	Madaki, 2005
2	first aid	9/11 vs 16/19 8	.,,	
		RR: 0.97 95%CI [0.69:1.36] *¥		
		(n=0.87)		
Amount of anti	-	Statistically significant:	-	
vonom roquirod		28.75 ± 20.21 vs 20.23 ± 24.22		
(mI)		20.75 ± 20.51 vs 55.55 ± 54.52		
(IIIL)		(m < 0.05)		
		(p<0.03)		
	C	In javor of snake stone	1 4	MC 11. 2011
	Snake stone vs no	Not statistically significant:	1, 4 VS 68 §	Michael, 2011
	snake stone	30.0 [15;35] vs 20.0 [15;35] £		
		(median [IQR])		
		(p=0.71)		
Duration of hospital	Snake stone vs no	Not statistically significant:	1, 11 vs 19	Madaki, 2005
stay (days)	first aid	6.1±3.3 vs 6.3±3		
		MD: -0.2, 95%CI [-2.57;2.17] *		
		(p=0.87)		
	Snake stone vs no	Not statistically significant:	1, 4 vs 68 §	Michael, 2011
	snake stone	2.5 vs 4 (median) £		
		(p=0.09)		

Death/disability	Snake stone vs no	Not statistically significant:	1 A vs 15	
Death/disability	first aid	D/4 vo $1/15$ 8	1, 4 vs 15	
		2/4 vs $1/15$ s		
		OR: 13, 95%CI [0.39;823]		
		(p=0.11)		
Incision				
Local swelling	Incision vs no first	Statistically significant:	1, 13 vs 148	Bhat, 1974
	aid	13/13 vs 86/148 §		
		RR: 1.66, 95%CI, [1.40;1.97] *		
		(P<0.00001)		
		With harm for incision		
Hemorrhagic syn-		Not statistically significant:		
drome		9/13 vs 98/148 §		
		RR: 1.05, 95%CI, [0.71;1.53] * ¥		
		(p=0.82)		
Death/disability		Not statistically significant:	1, 8 vs 15	Michael, 2011
		2/8 vs 1/15 §		
		OR: 4.3, 95%CI [0.18;275] ¥		
		(p=0.53)		
Amount of anti-	Incision vs no inci-	Not statistically significant:	1, 8 vs 64 §	
venom required	sion	25.0 [0;35] vs 20.0 [20;35] £		
(mL) (median		(p=0.71)		
[IQR])				
Duration of hospital		Statistically significant:		
stay (days)		2.9±1.6 vs 4.6±2.2		
		MD: -1.70 (p=0.03) ££		
		In favor of incision		

MD = mean difference, SD = standard deviation, CI = confidence interval, IQR = interquartile range, RR = risk ratio, OR = odds ratio, aOR = adjusted odds ratio.

Mean \pm SD (unless otherwise indicated)

* Calculations done by the reviewer(s) using Review Manager software

 \pounds No effect size and CI available, imprecision due to variability of the results could not be verified \pounds CI could not be calculated, imprecision due to variability of the results could not be verified

£££ No raw data available

¥ Imprecision (large variability of results)

§ Imprecision (limited sample size or low number of events)

 λ data extracted from graph

¤ Mean and SD for each group calculated from subject data in Microsoft Excel