

Supplement A. Full overview of the patients and treatment characteristics, and treatment outcomes of the included studies

Author	Journal	Year	RCT/ cohort	Treatment arms	Mono/multi center	Prospective/ retrospective	Median FU (months)	Patient numbers	Age (years)	FIGO Stage				Total Dose EBRT	Boost brachy	type of HT	HT sessions ≥4x n (%)	Chemotherapy (dose, frequency)	Outcome			HT-related toxicity ≥grade 3
										I	II	III	IV						LC/PC	DSS/DFS	OS	
Harima	IJH	2001	RCT	RT vs. RHT	Mono	Prospective	36	40	62 vs. 65	0 (0)	0 (0)	40 (100)	0 (0)	52.2 Gy	Yes	Capacitive	3 Sessions		<b>10 vs. 16*</b>	<b>10 vs. 16*</b>	48 vs. 58*	2/20 (10) at 3 years; not significant different from RT alone
Van der Zee	IJH	2002	RCT	RT vs. RHT	Multi	Prospective	43	114	56 vs. 58	0 (0)	22 (19)	81 (71)	11 (10)	46-50.4 Gy	Yes	Radiative	40/58 (69)		<b>41 vs. 61*</b>	N.A.	<b>27 vs. 51*</b>	No significant difference between treatment groups.
Vasanathan	IJROBP	2005	RCT	RT vs. RHT	Multi	Prospective	16	110	50 vs. 45	0 (0)	56 (51)	51 (46)	3 (3)	50 Gy	Yes	Capacitive	N.A.		69*	N.A.	73*	Acute tox grade 3: 1x blister 1/55 (2); Late tox grade 3: 2x bowel 2/55 (4)
Lutgens	RO	2016	RCT	CRT vs. RHT	Multi	Prospective	85	84	53	18 (21)	46 (55)	18 (21)	2 (3)	50 Gy	Yes	Radiative	38/42 (90)	weekly cispl 40mg/m2	N.A.	1.15^	1.04^	No significant difference between treatment groups.
Harima	IJH	2016	RCT	CRT vs. RCHT	Multi	Prospective	55	101	62 vs. 60	1 (1)	26 (26)	66 (65)	8 (8)		Yes	Capacitive	47/51 (92)	weekly cispl 30-40 mg/m2	71 vs. 80	61 vs. 71	65 vs. 78	No hyperthermia related toxicity was observed
Minnaar	Plos One	2019	RCT	CRT vs. RCHT	Mono	Prospective	6	202	49 vs. 48	0 (0)	75 (36)	2 (1)	129 (63)	50 Gy	Yes	Capacitive	N.A.	2x cispl 80mg/m2 during EBRT in 21 days	20 vs. 39†	<b>20 vs. 39†</b>	82 vs. 87†	No significant difference between treatment groups.
Wang	IJROBP	2020	RCT	CRT vs. RCHT	Mono	Prospective	60	373	50 vs. 51	7 (2)	230 (62)	127 (34)	9 (2)	50.4 Gy	Yes	Capacitive	175/182 (96)	cispl 30 mg/m2, d1-3; 5-fluorouracil 350 mg/m2, d1-5	N.A.	83 vs. 87	<b>72 vs. 82</b>	No significant difference between treatment groups.
Franckena	IJROBP	2009	Cohort		Multi	Retrospective	44	378	58	13 (3)	160 (42)	163 (43)	42 (11)	46-50.4 Gy	Yes	Radiative	339/378 (90)		53	47	40	45/378 (12) at 5 years; No significant different from RT alone
Westermann	IJH	2012	Cohort		Multi	Prospective	81	68	45	3 (4)	42 (62)	21 (31)	2 (3)	45-50.4 Gy	Yes	Radiative	63/68 (93)	weekly cispl 40mg/m2	20 vs. 39	<b>20 vs. 39</b>	82 vs. 87	No significant difference between treatment groups.
Kroesen	OBNAS	2019	Cohort		Mono	Retrospective	52	227	54	32 (14)	118 (52)	53 (23)	24 (11)	46-50.4 Gy	Yes	Radiative	219/227 (96)		73	60^^	40^^	No significant difference between treatment groups.

FIGO: International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics stage 2008; RCT: randomized control trial; RT: radiotherapy; RHT: radiotherapy and hyperthermia; CRT: chemoradiation; RCHT: chemoradiation with hyperthermia; FU: follow-up; LC: local control; PC: pelvic control; DFS: disease free survival; DSS: disease specific survival; OS: overall survival; cispl: cisplatin; N.A.: not available; vs.: versus; \*: based on 3-year follow up; ^: based on 7-years follow-up; †: based on 6 months follow up; ^^: based on 12-years follow-up; bold: significant different;