Table: Summary of Outcomes of the Published Prospective Randomized Control Trials

Author/year	Number of patients (no clip/clip group)	Inclusion criteria			Anticoagulant /antiplatelet use (%) (no clip/clip group)	Lesion characteristics (no clip/clip group)		Procedural characteristics			Study outcomes (no clip vs. clip group)				
		Lesion size (mm)	Lesion morphology	Polypectomy techniques		Mean/median polyp size (mm)	Proximal polyp location [†] (%)	Definition of complete clip closure	Mean/median number of clips used for defect closure	Rate of complete closure (%)	Rate of delayed bleeding (%) [‡]	Time from procedure to bleeding episode (median days)	Bleeding rate in proximal colon (%)	Bleeding rate in patients with anticoagulant use (%)	Bleeding rate depending on polyp size (%)
Feagin et al., 2019	520/530	≥ 10	Any morphology (pedunculated ~ 30%)	Any polypectomy techniques*	5.8-6.7/5.7-6.8	14.0/13.7	52.8/49.2	Not defined	1.5	98.4	2.9 vs. 2.3 (P = 0.53)	6.0 vs. 5.5 (P = 0.54)	4.7 vs. 4.6 (P = 0.96)	11.4 vs. 2.8 (P = 0.15)	5.0 vs. 4.0 (P = 0.82) for size ≥ 20 mm
Pohl et al., 2019	464/455	≥ 20	Sessile/flat 100%	EMR	6.2-28.0/4.4-22.2	28/30	66.3/66.7	Edges were approximated with clips < 1 cm apart	4	68.4	7.1 vs. 3.5 (P = 0.015)	1 vs. 7 (P = 0.008)	9.6 vs. 3.3 (P = 0.001)	9.2 vs. 5.2 (P = 0.21)	6.4 vs. 3 (P = 0.034) for 20-39 mm
Albeniz et al., 2019	116/119	≥ 20	Sessile/flat 100%	EMR	26.7-29.3/25.2-42	37.3/36.1	75.9/75.6	Edges were approximated with clips next to each other and no substantial submucosal area seen in the closure line	6	57.1	12.1 vs. 5.0 (P = 0.053); 12.1 vs. 1.5 (P = 0.01) if complete closure	NA	12.5 vs. 2 (P = 0.033) in PP analysis	23.5 vs. 10 (P = 0.092)	16.7 vs. 7.6 (P = 0.123) for 20-39 mm
Gupta et al., 2022	113/118	≥ 20	Sessile/flat 100%	EMR	11-29/10-25	37.2/35.7	100/100	Placement of clips from one end of the defect to the other, resulting in little or no visible submucosa in between	5	71	10.6 vs. 3.4 (P = 0.031) in ITT and 9.4 vs. 1.1 (P = 0.019) in PP analysis	3.8 vs. 3 (P = NS)	10.6 vs. 3.4 (P = 0.031); 19 vs. 5 (P = 0.046) in cecum	17 vs. 8 (P = 0.544)	13 vs. 0 (P = 0.005) for 20-39 mm

EMR = endoscopic mucosal resection; ITT = intention-to-treat analysis; NA = not available; NS = not significant; PP = per-protocol analysis.

*Include hot snare, cold snare, cold forceps, piecemeal resection, fulguration, lift before polypectomy techniques.

†Proximal location is defined as the segment proximal to the hepatic flexure by all authors except Gupta et al., who defined the proximal location as proximal to and including the mid-transverse colon.

‡Rate of delayed bleeding in the study by Gupta et al. was applicable for lesions located in the proximal colon.