Supplementary Table S1a. Search Strategy PUBMED/Medline (NML).

Search Terms	
#1 (Urothelial Cancer)	((bladder cancer) OR (urothelial cancer) OR (upper urinary tract cancer)) OR (urethral cancer) OR (urothelial bladder cancer))
#2 (Oligometastatic)	(((oligometastatic) OR (metastatic)) OR (advanced stage))
#3 (Stereotactic body radiation therapy)	((metastasis-directed radiotherapy) OR (stereotactic body radiotherapy)) OR (sbrt) OR (ablative radiotherapy) OR (consolidative radiotherapy) OR (metastases directed radiotherapy))
#1 AND #2 AND #3	

Language: English only

Filters:

- Year of publication from 2006 to date of search

Supplementary Table S1b. Search Strategy Clinicaltrials.gov.

Provider/Interface	NLM
Database	Clinicaltrials.gov
Date searched	08/03/2024
Database update	07/03/2024
Search developer(s)	AA, DGB
English only? (default is "Yes")	Yes
Date range	No limit by date
Publication types included	Clinical trials
Search filter source	No search filter used
Items found	0
# of deleted duplicates from columns F-G-H	0
Unique items found	0
Name of saved search: SBRT and omUC	
Search terms	
Condition or Disease	Urothelial cancer
Intervention/ Treatment	Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy
Other	Oligometastatic disease

Supplementary Table S1c. Database Search resumed.

Table ID	Provider/Interface	Database	Date searched	Database update	Searcher(s)	English only?	Date restriction	Pub types excluded	Search filter source	Original # of Items found	# of deleted duplicates	# of Unique items found
1a	National Library of Medicine	PubMed	March 8, 2024	March 8, 2024	AA, DGB	Yes	from 2006	No limit by publication type	Humans	122	0	122
1b	NLM	Clinicaltrials.gov	March 8, 2024	March 8, 2024	AA, DGB	Yes	No limit by date	Clinicaltrials	No search filter used	0	0	0
										Original # of Items found	# of deleted duplicates	# of Unique items found
								Total		122	0	122

Supplementary Table S2. Cohen's KAPPA, Level of agreement calculation.

$$\kappa = \frac{\Pr(a) - \Pr(e)}{1 - \Pr(e)}$$

		Go to full text review	Exclude	# screened
Screener 1 (S1)	Go to full text review	25	41	66
Screener 2 (S2)	Exclude	38	63	101
	# screened	63	104	167

Did you screen the same number?	yes
If you do not show the same number screened, you cannot accurately calculate the Cohen's Kappa.	

Observed Agreement		Raw % of Go to full text review	Raw % of Exclude	"Pr(e)" = Probability of random agreement = ((Raw % of S1 Go to full text review")*(Raw % of S2 "Go to full text review")) + ((Raw % of S1 No's)*(Raw % of S2 No's))	Cohen's Kappa
Both S1 and S2 said "Go to full text review" to same records or "Exclude" to same records	Pr(a) = (# both said "Go to full text review" and "exclude")/(total number screened), i.e. raw agreement				
63	0.95	0.38	0.62	0.52	0.91

Raw % that each said Exclude or Go to full text review		
	Go to full text review	Exclude
Screener 1	0.38	0.62
Screener 2	0.42	0.58

Probability of random agreement	
Exclude	0.52

		Screener 2	
		Go to full text review	Exclude
Screener 1	Go to full text review	25	0
	Exclude	3	38

$$SE_\kappa = \sqrt{\frac{p\,(1-p)}{n\,(1-p_e)^2}}$$

Standard error of Kappa	Confidence interval	
	low end	high end
0.053235016	0.801283774	1.009885035

Supplementary Table S3. Risk of bias assessment.

Study	Newcastle-Ottawa Scale Items											
	Selection				Comparability		Outcome					Sum
Author, year	Representativeness of the Exposed Cohort	Selection of the Non-Exposed Cohort	Ascertainment of Exposure	Demonstration That Outcome of Interest Was Not Present at Start of	1)Comparability of Cohorts on the Basis of the Design or Analysis		Assessment of Outcome	Follow-Up Long Enough for Outcomes to	Adequacy of Follow Up of Cohorts			n. of Stars
Aboudaram, 2023	b) *		a) *	a)*	a, b)**		omUC <5met, I line chemb)*	a)*	b)*			9/9
Miranda, 2021	b) *		a) *	a)*	*		omUC <5met, after cyste b)*	a)*	b)*			7/9
Franzese, 2020	b) *		a) *	a)*	n.a.		b)*	a)*	b)*			6/9
Francolini, 2019	b) *		a) *	a)*	n.a.		b)*	a)*	b)*			6/9
Augugliaro, 2018	b) *		a) *	a)*	n.a.		b)*	a)*	b)*			6/9
Leonetti, 2018	b) *		a) *	a)*	n.a.		b)*	b)	c)			4/9
	Patient selection		Intervention				Outcome					
	Heterogeneous sample of patients; according to: - patients recruited, however, Different histology (HNSCC, NSCLC, Melanoma, RCC, UC)	High total number of only 32 out 96 patients were omUC, and only 16 received SBRT.	Sub-ablative Radiation doses for SBRT plus concurrent I.O. The decision rationale for the radiation dose delivered was mentioned	Standardized intervention: Radiation and I.O. vs I.O. alone (standard of care)	SBRT with 1 to 3 metastatic sites targeted, thus not all patients received SBRT as MDT to all the metastases.	Overall balanced study to assess no benefits from the intervention vs comparison. Not exhaustive data regarding SBRT and omUC specifically.	Follow-up time and assessment is appropriate with the evaluated outcomes	Measure of outcome standardised, it seem to be appropriate				
Spaas, 2023												High RoB
	Quite homogeneous sample	Unclear number of metastasis, no brain mets	Sub-ablative Radiation doses for SBRT plus concurrent I.O. The decision rationale for the radiation dose delivered was mentioned	standardized intervention: Radiation and I.O. either concurrent or before 1°cycle I.O.	SBRT with 1 to 3 metastatic sites targeted, thus not all patients received SBRT as MDT to all the metastases.	Balanced study between the Intervention vs comparison arms. Not exhaustive data regarding SBRT and omUC specifically.	follow-up time and assessment seems appropriate with the study outcomes , however it is shorter than f-up time of	measure of outcome seem to be appropriate for the study aims, not fitting exhaustively the review question				
Sundhal, 2019												High RoB

Scoring: 7-9 =Low Rob (Green) 4-6= High Rob (yellow) 0-3= Very High Rob (red)