

Authors	Year	Study type	Total number of points ^a	Implant Success (%)	Indication	Follow-up	Type pacing
Vijayaraman, P.et al	2019	Comparative (HBP vs RVP)	85	93%	AVB and RVP > 95%	25±24m	S , NS , HBP
Sharma, P. S.et al	2017	Single-arm	30	93%	AVB and PVs	NR	S , NS , HBP
Vijayaraman, P.et al	2015	Single-arm	100	84%	AVB	19±12	S , NS , HBP
Pastore, G.et al	2014	Comparative (HBP vs RVP)	37	NR	AVB , QRS < 120ms , LVEF > 0.50	3	DHBP , PHP
Kronborg, M. B.et al	2014	Comparative (HA vs RVP)	38	NR	AVB,QRS < 120ms , LVEF > 0.40	12	DHBP , PHP
Kronborg, M. B.et al	2011	Comparative (HBP vs RVS)	11	NR ^b	AVB	NR	PHP
Kronborg, M. B.et al	2011	Comparative (HBP vs RVS)	38	85%	AVB,QRS < 120ms , LVEF > 0.40 , sinus rhythm	3 , 12	DHBP , PHP
Barba-Pichardo, R.et al	2010	Single-arm	91	65%	AVB	3	Pure , fused

Table 1 General description of the included studies

BP,Hisbundle pacing;RVP,right ventricular pacing;AVB,atrioventricular block;PVs,prosthetic valve surgery;NS HBP, non-selective His-bundle pacing;SHBP, selective His-bundle pacing; DHBP, direct His-bundle pacing; PHP, Para-Hisian pacing; NR, not reported; ^aTotal number of patients represents number of patients with permanent His-bundle pacing implant attempt.^bOnly included successful implants.^c Calculate according to data based on subgroup