

TITLE PAGE

Drug-coated balloons for dysfunctional hemodialysis venous access: A patient-level meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Fong Khi Yung^{1, *}; Joseph J Zhao^{1, *}; Eelin Tan, BMed, MD^{2, 3, 4, *}; Nicholas Syn^{1, *}; Rehena Sultana⁵, MSc; Kun Da Zhuang^{2, 3, 4}, MBBS, FRCR, MMed; Jasmine Chua Ming Er^{2, 3, 4}, MBBS, FRCR, MMed; Ankur Patel^{2, 3, 4}, BMedSc, MB ChB, MRCS, FRCR, MMed, FAMS; Farah Gillan Irani^{2, 3, 4}, MBBS, FRCR; Tay Kiang Hiong^{2, 3, 4}, MBBS, FRCR, FAMS; Tan Bien Soo^{2, 3, 4}, MBBS, FRCR, FAMS; Too Chow Wei^{2, 3, 4, *}, MBBS, FRCR, MMed, FAMS

¹ Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore

² Department of Vascular & Interventional Radiology, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

³ Division of Radiological Sciences, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

⁴ Radiological Sciences Academic Clinical Program, SingHealth-Duke-NUS Academic Medical Centre, Singapore

⁵ Centre for Quantitative Medicine, Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School, Singapore

*These authors contributed equally

Corresponding author:

Adjunct Assistant Professor Too Chow Wei, MBBS, FRCR, MMed, FAMS

Department of Vascular & Interventional Radiology, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

Division of Radiological Sciences, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

Radiological Sciences Academic Clinical Program, SingHealth-Duke-NUS Academic Medical Centre, Singapore

Outram Road, Singapore 169608

too.chow.wei@singhealth.com.sg

Keywords: Individual patient-data meta-analysis; Hemodialysis Access Circuit; Drug-coated Balloon; Paclitaxel-coated Balloon; Conventional Balloon Angioplasty

[Words: 3,108, Citations: 59]

ABSTRACT

Drug-coated balloons for dysfunctional hemodialysis venous access: A patient-level meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Purpose: To perform an individual patient data-level meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing drug-coated balloon angioplasty (DCB) against conventional percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (PTA) in the treatment of dysfunctional hemodialysis venous access.

Methods: A search was conducted from inception till 13th November 2020. Kaplan-Meier curves comparing DCB to PTA by target lesion primary patency (TLPP) and access circuit primary patency (ACPP) were graphically reconstructed to retrieve patient-level data. One-stage meta-analyses with Cox-models with random-effects gamma-frailties were conducted to determine hazard ratios (HRs). Dynamic restricted mean survival times (RMST) were conducted in view of violation of the proportional hazards assumption. Conventional two-stage meta-analyses and network meta-analyses under random-effects Frequentist models were conducted to determine overall and comparative outcomes of paclitaxel concentrations utilised. Where outliers were consistently detected through outlier and influence analyses, sensitivity analyses excluding those studies were conducted.

Results: Among 10 RCTs (1,207 patients), HRs across all models favoured DCB (one-stage shared-frailty HR=0.62, 95%-CI: 0.53–0.73, $P<0.001$; two-stage random-effects HR=0.60, 95%-CI: 0.42–0.86, $P=0.018$, $I^2=65\%$) for TLPP. Evidence of time-varying effects ($P=0.005$) was found. TLPP RMST was +3.47 months (25.0%) longer in DCB-treated patients compared to PTA ($P=0.001$) at 3-years. TLPP at 6-months, 1-year and 2-years was 75.3% vs 58.0%, 51.1% vs 37.1% and 31.3% vs 26.0% for DCB and PTA respectively. P-Scores within the Frequentist network meta-analysis suggest that higher concentrations of paclitaxel were associated with better TLPP and ACPP. Among 6 RCTs (854 patients), the one-stage model favoured DCB (shared-frailty HR=0.72, 95%-CI: 0.60–0.87, $P<0.001$) for ACPP. Conversely, the two-stage random-effects model demonstrated no significant difference (HR=0.76, 95%-CI: 0.35–1.67, $P=0.414$, $I^2=81\%$). Sensitivity analysis excluding outliers significantly favoured DCB (HR=0.61, 95%-CI: 0.41–0.91, $P=0.027$, $I^2=62\%$).

Conclusion: Overall evidence suggests that DCB is favoured over PTA in TLPP and ACPP. The increased efficacy of higher concentrations of paclitaxel may warrant further investigation.

Keywords: Meta-analysis, Hemodialysis Access Circuit, Target Lesion Primary Patency, Access Circuit Primary Patency, Drug-coated Balloon, Paclitaxel-coated Balloon, Conventional Balloon Angioplasty

[298 words]

MANUSCRIPT

Drug-coated balloons for dysfunctional hemodialysis venous access: A patient-level meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Introduction

Venous stenosis is the commonest cause of dysfunction in arteriovenous fistulas (AVFs) and arteriovenous grafts (AVGs) used for hemodialysis [1]. The Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative (KDOQI) recommends percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (PTA) as first-line treatment to restore vessel patency [2]. While PTA procedural success is generally high, microscopic damage to the vessel wall upon inflation may cause reactive intimal hyperplasia [3-5], inducing restenosis and poor long-term patency [6].

Presently, drug-coated balloon (DCB) angioplasty has become an increasing subject of discussion as an adjunct to PTA. DCBs are commonly coated with paclitaxel, which prevents neointimal hyperplasia in blood vessels [7-9].

Paclitaxel DCB has been demonstrated to be superior to PTA in the contexts of femoropopliteal artery disease [10] and coronary in-stent restenosis [11]. However, findings are mixed in the setting of hemodialysis access – some meta-analyses significantly favoured DCB over PTA [12, 13], while others reported no significant benefit [14, 15]. Not long ago, two new randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on this subject were published [16, 17]; this article aims to re-evaluate the field with these new inclusions. To our knowledge, this is first meta-analysis which includes these 2 new RCTs.

In lieu of this area's uncertain and developing nature, more precise methods are needed to quantify the comparison between DCB and PTA. Thus, we utilised graphical reconstructive algorithms to attain survival information of individual patients [18, 19] from Kaplan-Meier curves. Individual patient data (IPD) is recognised as the gold standard approach for evidence synthesis [20, 21]. The source of IPD for this study was restricted to RCTs only, as baseline characteristic differences between patients and differing indications for treatment render non-randomized studies difficult to interpret definitively.

Leveraging the IPD of 11 RCTs, this meta-analysis aims to compare the relative efficacy of DCB to PTA in maintaining target lesion primary patency (TLPP) and access circuit primary patency (ACPP) in hemodialysis patients with stenosed venous access.

Methodology

Literature Search

The electronic literature search was conducted on EMBASE, Scopus, PubMed and Web of Science for RCTs from inception to 13th November 2020 using a search string [**Supplementary Table 1**], in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses and Cochrane Guidelines (PRISMA) for IPD and network meta-analysis (NMA) [22, 23]. Only full-text articles were included. If the same publication appeared more than once, the most recent publication was used for the analysis.

We included RCTs reporting TLPP and ACPP between DCB and PTA that provided Kaplan-Meier curves. The exclusion criteria for this study were: (a) Studies only comparing differences within a single approach. (b) Studies with combination approaches including multiple intra-arterial approaches.

For studies with multiple treatment arms, we only analysed the treatment arms in our inclusion criteria. The abstracts were reviewed by 3 investigators J.J.Z., K.Y.F. and E.T. and conflicts resolved by C.W.T. The data was extracted by K.Y.F., J.J.Z. and E.T. using predefined data fields including study characteristics, patient demographics and primary endpoints.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The RCTs were assessed for risk of bias by K.Y.F. and J.J.Z. using the Cochrane Risk of bias (RoB 2) tool for RCTs [24]. Studies were also assessed for trustworthiness and relevance with the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal tool for RCTs [25].

Statistical Analysis

Reconstruction of Individual Patient Data

Prior to meta-analyses, we reconstructed IPD from published survival curves using a graphical reconstructive algorithm by Guyot et al [18]. Images of Kaplan-Meier curves from included studies were digitised to obtain the step function values and timings of the steps. Survival information of individual patients were then recovered based on the numerical solutions to the inverted Kaplan-Meier product-limit equations [18]. The IPD dataset was reconstructed by J.J.Z and K.Y.F. and were approved by E.T. by visual comparisons against original curves, and comparing reconstructed raw hazard ratio (HR) and P-values to reported values [**Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Comparisons 1, 2**].

One-Stage Meta-Analysis

The Kaplan-Meier method was used to determine TLPP and ACPP for both groups. To account for between-study heterogeneity, Cox-models with random-effects gamma-frailties and stratification were conducted to determine HRs of patients undergoing DCB versus PTA. The primary analysis was based on a shared-frailty approach which assumes that individual patients are at an equal risk of death as other individuals within the same study. Then, we stratified the Cox model by study subgroups, modelling inter-study heterogeneity by assuming a baseline hazard amongst patients in each unique study.

For Cox-based models, we verified the proportional hazards (PH) assumption by examining scaled Schoenfeld residuals [26] and through the quantitative Grambsch-Therneau test [27]. Where the PH assumption was violated, we analysed restricted mean survival times (RMST) and modelled patency outcomes at prespecified epochs up to 1-, 2- and 3-years [28]. RMST is an alternative treatment outcome measure that can be estimated as the area under the survival curve up to a prespecified time horizon and hence can account for all survival information before that time horizon [28, 29]. To fully capture the dynamic changes of RMST differences and ratios, we computed RMST values over a range of values to the restriction time (τ) to trace out an evolving treatment effect profile over time [30].

Patency rates were calculated from the one-stage meta-analysis along with Greenwood 95% confidence intervals to account for censorship status. To account for the group of patients who no longer contribute to excess hazard (as seen by long plateaus on Kaplan-Meier curves), we fitted flexible parametric cure models to estimate “long term patency rates” using an identity link [31].

Two-Stage Meta-Analysis

We computed summary HRs for individual studies based on the reconstructed individual patient dataset and pooled them under a conventional two-stage Frequentist meta-analysis. The random-effects model was chosen in light of the high degree of heterogeneity found (I^2). I^2 can be interpreted as the disparity in study results due to between-study variability. In light of the potentially high degree of clinical heterogeneity of included studies (as evidenced by differences in inclusion criteria, paclitaxel dose concentrations, proportions of AVFs versus AVGs and devices utilised), a random-effects model was used. Quantitative analysis of funnel plot asymmetry was done using Egger’s regression test [32]. Heterogeneity was considered low, moderate, or considerable for I^2 values <40%, 40-75%, and >75% respectively [33, 34]. Where considerable heterogeneity was found, we searched for extreme effect sizes (outliers) using outlier and influence analysis [35, 36]. Where outliers were consistently detected across these analyses, sensitivity analyses excluding those studies were conducted.

Frequentist Network Meta-Analysis

Where concentration of paclitaxel was provided, natural log-transformed hazard ratios were estimated for each IPD study and were pooled together in an NMA within a Frequentist setting. Treatment strategies were ranked using P-Scores, with higher P-Scores corresponding to greater efficacy [37].

Meta-Regression

To identify potential sources of heterogeneity, we performed a meta-regression with aggregate level data. Prior to meta-regression, we imputed missing means and standard deviations (SDs) from medians, ranges (minimum to maximum), and interquartile ranges (IQRs) using the methods proposed by Hozo et al [38], Wan et al [39] and Furukawa et al [40]. Conventional mixed effects meta-regression of variables (with more than 10 studies) were performed against logarithmic transformed hazard ratios.

All analyses were conducted in R-4.0.0 (with packages 'digitize', 'survival', 'flexsurvcure', 'metafor', 'dmetar' and 'netmeta'). $P < 0.05$ were regarded to indicate statistical significance.

Results

Study Selection

The search strategy retrieved 503 studies; after de-duplication and screening, 11 RCTs [16, 17, 41-48] comprising 1,243 patients were eligible and included in the meta-analysis [Figure 1]. One RCT was excluded as no curve was provided for graphical reconstruction to retrieve patient-level patency information [49].

Study Characteristics

Breakdown of studies and extracted outcomes are reported in Table 1 and in Supplementary Table 2 respectively. Of note: 1) 5 of the 11 studies had 20 or less patients per arm; 2) all studies had a higher percentage of males except Liao et al [47]; 3) a significant proportion of patients in most studies received antiplatelet treatment, either preoperatively or postoperatively; 4) 6 studies reported a significant benefit with DCB based on primary and secondary endpoints, while the other 5 found no significant difference compared with PTA; 5) 4 studies involved AVGs, of which 1 study (Liao et al [47]) studied only AVGs; the other 7 involved only AVFs.

Reconstructed Curves

All included studies had IPD reconstructed from published Kaplan-Meier curves [Figure 2]. Comparisons against original Kaplan-Meier curves are shown in Supplementary Comparisons 1 & 2. The reconstructed dataset is available on request.

Quality Assessment of Trials

Our risk-of-bias analysis [Table 2] yielded overall 'some concerns' for all 11 studies. As all studies were single-blinded or non-blinded, they ran the risk of observer bias, wherein knowledge of which patients were assigned DCB or PTA might have influenced the judging of outcomes. Particularly, decisions on the need for reintervention in all studies may have been influenced by knowledge of assignment to treatment or control arm, since the reinterventions in most studies involved clinical evaluation of graft dysfunction. Our JBI analysis [Supplementary Table 3] noted that Björkman et al [44] discontinued their trial after only 39 patients were recruited, despite requiring a sample size of 140 in their initial power calculations.

Survival Outcomes

Target Lesion Primary Patency

Among 10 RCTs comprising 1,207 patients, the stratified and gamma-frailty models yielded HRs in favour of DCB (shared-frailty HR=0.62, 95%-CI: 0.53–0.73, P<0.001; stratified HR=0.62, 95%-CI: 0.53–0.73, P<0.001) [Figure 3]. Patency rates at intervals of 6-months are reported in Figure 3.

While time-varying effects were noted (Grambsch-Therneau test, $P=0.005$) [**Supplementary Figure 1A**], dynamic RMST curves demonstrate that DCB is consistently favoured throughout the follow-up period [**Figure 4A, B**].

This was consistent within a two-stage Frequentist random-effects model (HR=0.60, 95%-CI: 0.42–0.86, $P=0.018$, $I^2=65\%$) [**Figure 4C**]. The funnel plot was visually symmetrical and did not suggest publication bias (Egger's test = 0.507) [**Supplementary Figure 4A**].

Access Circuit Primary Patency

Among 6 RCTs comprising 854 patients, the stratified and gamma-frailty models yielded HRs in favour of DCB (shared-frailty HR=0.72, 95%-CI: 0.60–0.87, $P<0.001$; stratified HR=0.72, 95%-CI: 0.60–0.86, $P<0.001$) [**Figure 5A**]. Time-varying effects were not found (Grambsch-Therneau test, $P=0.300$) [**Supplementary Figure 1B**]. Patency rates at intervals of 6-months are reported in **Figure 5A**.

This was inconsistent within the overall two-stage Frequentist random-effects model (HR=0.76, 95%-CI: 0.35–1.67, $P=0.414$, $I^2=81\%$) [**Figure 5B**]. In view of the considerable heterogeneity found, we undertook efforts to identify potential outliers. The Baujat plot suggested that Björkman et al [44] contributed to the most between-study heterogeneity [**Supplementary Figure 5A**]. At cut-offs proposed by Viechtbauer and Cheung [35], Björkman et al was likewise detected as an influential case [**Supplementary Figure 5B**]. Leave-one-out analyses showed that omission of Björkman et al yielded the least between-study heterogeneity ($I^2=62\%$) [**Supplementary Figure 5C**].

Sensitivity analysis excluding Björkman et al significantly favoured DCB (two-stage Frequentist random-effects model HR=0.61, 95%-CI: 0.41–0.91, $P=0.027$, $I^2=62\%$) [**Figure 5C**]. The one-stage model excluding this study yielded congruent results with one-stage meta-analysis of the overall cohort [**Supplementary Figure 6**]. The funnel plot was visually asymmetrical and suggestive of publication bias [**Supplementary Figure 4B**].

Frequentist Network Meta-Analysis of Paclitaxel Concentrations

6 RCTs comprising 1,050 patients were included in a network meta-analysis to evaluate TLPP within a random-effects Frequentist setting ($I^2=56.1\%$). Among all comparisons against PTA, only DCB 3.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ (HR=0.37, 95%-CI: 0.17–0.80, $P=0.012$) and DCB 3.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ (HR=0.52, 95%-CI: 0.34–0.80, $P=0.002$) had a statistically significant TLPP advantage [**Table 3**]. Indirect comparisons between DCB 3.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ and DCB 3.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ showed no differences (HR=0.71, 95%-CI: 0.29–1.70, $P=0.437$) [**Table 3**].

3 RCTs comprising 736 patients were included in a network meta-analysis to evaluate ACPP within a random-effects Frequentist setting. Heterogeneity was not estimable. Björkman et al was excluded from this analysis in view of the upstream influence analysis. Among all comparisons against PTA, only DCB 3.5µg/mm² (HR=2.34, 95%-CI: 1.59–3.45, P<0.001) had a statistically significant ACPP advantage [Table 3]. Indirect comparisons between DCB 3.5µg/mm² and DCB 2.0µg/mm² was significantly in favour of DCB 3.5µg/mm² (HR=2.09, 95%-CI: 1.30–3.36, P=0.002) [Table 3].

The comparison adjusted funnel plots were symmetrical [Supplementary Figure 7]. Within the network meta-analysis, we surmise that the transitivity assumption was likely to be met, based on the observations that the common treatment (PTA) was reasonably consistent across trials, effect modifiers were equally distributed across studies, and participants may, in principle, be randomized to any of the treatments being compared in the network. Given the star shaped nature of our network of treatment arms, statistical inconsistency could not be evaluated [Supplementary Figure 8].

Meta-Regression

Meta-regression of proportions of males, diabetics, arteriovenous fistulas and publication year against logarithmic transformed HRs for TLPP did not demonstrate any significant associations [Table 4]. Meta-regression for variables against ACPP between DCB and PTA was not conducted as there were insufficient studies.

Discussion

In view of cost [41, 50], potential morbidity [51] and uncertain theoretical benefit in prolonging patency rates, DCB angioplasty has yet to earn its place as the “holy grail” for dysfunctional hemodialysis venous access [52]. In 2019, in a meta-analysis of RCTs and retrospective studies by Wee et al [12], DCB was concluded to be superior to PTA (6-month TLPP RR=0.57, 95%-CI: 0.44-0.74, $P<0.0001$). In contrast, in a 2020 meta-analysis by Liao et al [14], DCB did not demonstrate significant patency benefit (6-month TLPP RR=0.75, 95%-CI: 0.56-1.01, $P=0.06$), even in the AVF-only subgroup.

Between the randomized trials conducted, significant heterogeneity was quantitatively, and qualitatively noted with regard to patient recruitment and access details – rendering the interpretation of its authentic efficacy challenging. Devices utilized (from IN.PACT Admiral, Passeo-Lux and Lutonix) varied in a multitude of aspects; such as its excipient, a chemical added to locally retain paclitaxel at the intended site of action.

Amidst this unresolved backdrop, this patient-level meta-analysis of 11 RCTs comprising 1,243 patients presents a statistically robust and up-to-date pool of evidence demonstrating a consistent benefit of using DCB over PTA in prolonging TLPP.

Despite incorporating random-effects shared-frailties and stratification to account for clinical heterogeneity within the one-stage model, patients treated with DCB were at a lower hazard rate of restenosis. Sensitivity analyses with aggregate data within a random-effects Frequentist models likewise re-affirm the upstream findings. In view of the violation of the proportionality assumption, dynamic restricted mean survival times consistently favoured DCB across the follow-up period. Collectively, these strongly suggest that the benefit of paclitaxel is likely a reflection of a true biological phenomenon, attesting to its superiority to plain old balloon angioplasty.

Albeit the promising outcomes in prolonging TLPP, comparisons of ACPP in the overall two-stage Frequentist random-effects model showed no significant differences as opposed to the significant differences demonstrated within one-stage models. Nonetheless, sensitivity analysis excluding outliers significantly favoured DCB in both one & two-stage models.

Other factors which are not directly related to the target lesion may cause eventual dysfunction elsewhere in the circuit. Perhaps, the puncture of AVGs and AVFs during the procedure could cause platelet thrombi and cytokine release; even though in most instances antiplatelets are

given, gradually causing vessel stenosis [3]. Additional lesions in the dialysis circuit may also have formed over time, resulting in reduced circuit patency [53].

In particular, Björkman et al [44] heavily favoured PTA over DCB in the setting of ACP. Björkman et al postulated that the younger and more immature AVFs (<1 year compared to the other studies) were more venous than arterial in nature; and with thinner venous walls, local paclitaxel overdose and potential toxicity could be more pronounced, accounting for the poor performance in the DCB arm. The authors stated that the study was discontinued due to slow recruitment; it was also limited by a smaller sample size than necessary for statistical power calculations, slow randomization and possibility of type I error. Insufficient studies provided information on age of AVFs to elucidate an association between age of AVFs and DCB efficacy in our study.

Looking forward, it is critical to determine the optimal concentration of paclitaxel where benefits are best observed. As suggested by the wide intervals between ranking P-Scores, there seems to be some evidence that higher concentrations of paclitaxel may be associated with longer TLPP and ACP. Of note, among all comparisons against PTA, only DCBs with paclitaxel concentrations of $3.5\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ and $3.0\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ had a statistically significant TLPP advantage. However, upon closer inspection of indirect treatment comparisons generated through the Frequentist network meta-analysis, we did not find a significant difference in TLPP between concentrations of 2.0, 3.0 and $3.5\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$.

While specific and potentially influential lesion covariates (such as length, location, type/location of access point and balloon diameter) were not consistently accounted for amongst the RCTs, this may suggest that the true benefit of adding paclitaxel may lie beyond concentrations beyond $3.0\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$ – and may be an area of inquiry for further investigations.

Limitations

This study was not without limitations. In the course of our analyses, we were unable to account for competing risks to restenosis, such as patient mortality, for which previous studies yielded mixed findings. A DCB trial in femoropopliteal stenosis [10] showed increased mortality compared to PTA (24-month fixed-effect RR=1.74, 95%-CI: 1.08-2.81, P=0.02), and a meta-analysis of paclitaxel-coated devices demonstrated an increased mortality by 4.6% at 5-years [51]. That being said, a meta-analysis of paclitaxel-coated devices in dialysis access [54] found no difference in short to midterm mortality among patients compared to PTA (RR=1.26, 95%-CI: 0.85-1.89, P=0.25).

Additionally, although IPD was recovered graphically, the reconstruction algorithm is unable to retrieve patient-level covariate information, which may offer beneficial insight if adjusted for in

models utilised. Potentially prognostic covariates for restenosis include vascular access age (as mentioned above), type of access point (AVF or AVG – where the absence of vascular smooth muscle in AVGs may prevent paclitaxel from exerting its desired action), diabetes mellitus [55], lesion length [56], blood flow volume [57], location of the AVF or AVG (forearm versus arm) [58], and type or duration of antiplatelet treatment [59]. Unfortunately, not all studies reported these parameters; there was hence inadequate data for us to perform a meta-regression.

Finally, clinical judgement to proceed with either DCB or PTA should be considered alongside the side effects of paclitaxel, procedure-related morbidity and cost-benefit analysis which are beyond the scope of this forum.

Conclusion

Hereto, we present the first patient-level, RCT-only meta-analysis comparing DCB to PTA in hemodialysis access restenosis. Pooled-analyses of 11 RCTs comprising 1,243 patients – including 2 recent RCTs published in 2020 – demonstrate that the overall evidence suggests that DCB is favoured over PTA in prolonging TLPP and ACPP.

Intriguingly, we also found some evidence that higher paclitaxel concentrations may be associated with longer TLPP. Future investigations may benefit from exploring more dose-efficacy relationships and may benefit from adjusting for more lesion specific covariates such as age, length, location, type and balloon diameter.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1 PRISMA flowchart

PRISMA indicates preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. N=, number of studies; n=, number of patients; TLPP, target lesion primary patency; ACPP, access circuit primary patency; IPD, individual patient data; RCT, randomized controlled trials.

Figure 2 Reconstructed Curves

DCB, drug coated balloon; PTA, percutaneous transluminal angioplasty.

Figure 3 Kaplan-Meier plot and number-at-risk table for target lesion primary patency

HR, hazard ratio; 95CI, 95% confidence intervals; DCB, drug coated balloon; PTA, percutaneous transluminal angioplasty.

Figure 4 (A) Dynamic RMST Ratios (B) Dynamic RMST Differences for Target Lesion Primary Patency (C) Two-stage Frequentist meta-analysis for target lesion primary patency

RMST-R, restricted mean survival time ratio; RMST-D, restricted mean survival time difference; HR, hazard ratio; 95CI, 95% confidence intervals; DCB, drug coated balloon; PTA, percutaneous transluminal angioplasty.

Figure 5 (A) Kaplan-Meier plot and number-at-risk table for access circuit primary patency (B) Two-stage Frequentist meta-analysis for access circuit primary patency (C) Two-stage Frequentist meta-analysis for access circuit primary patency excluding outliers

HR, hazard ratio; 95CI, 95% confidence intervals; DCB, drug coated balloon; PTA, percutaneous transluminal angioplasty.

DISCLOSURE

Funding: None.

Conflict of interest: J.J.Z. is supported by the SingHealth SMSTDA Talent Development Award administered by SingHealth, Singapore and NUS Enterprise Innovation and Entrepreneurship Practicum Award awarded by National University of Singapore, Singapore.

Contributions:

Study design: C.W.T., J.J.Z., K.Y.F.

Data collection: K.Y.F., J.J.Z., E.T.

Statistical analysis: J.J.Z., R.S., N.S., E.T.

Manuscript writing: K.Y.F., J.J.Z.

Critical revision of manuscript: all authors.

Study supervision: C.W.T.

Data Sharing Policy: This manuscript makes use of publicly-available data from published studies, therefore no original or additional data is available for sharing.

Ethics: Not applicable.


REFERENCES

















- [1] M. C. Riella and P. Roy-Chaudhury, "Vascular access in haemodialysis: strengthening the Achilles' heel," *Nature Reviews Nephrology*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 348-357, 2013/06/01 2013, doi: 10.1038/nrneph.2013.76.
- [2] C. E. Lok *et al.*, "KDOQI Clinical Practice Guideline for Vascular Access: 2019 Update," *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*, vol. 75, no. 4, pp. S1-S164, 2020, doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2019.12.001.
- [3] P. Roy-Chaudhury, V. P. Sukhatme, and A. K. Cheung, "Hemodialysis Vascular Access Dysfunction: A Cellular and Molecular Viewpoint," *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 1112, 2006, doi: 10.1681/ASN.2005050615.
- [4] A. Mima, "Hemodialysis Vascular Access Dysfunction: Molecular Mechanisms and Treatment," *Therapeutic Apheresis and Dialysis*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-9987.2012.01066.x> vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 321-327, 2012/08/01 2012, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-9987.2012.01066.x>.
- [5] T. Lee and N. Ul-Haq, "New Developments in Our Understanding of Neointimal Hyperplasia," (in eng), *Advances in chronic kidney disease*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 431-7, Nov 2015, doi: 10.1053/j.ackd.2015.06.010.
- [6] K. Maeda, A. Furukawa, M. Yamasaki, and K. Murata, "Percutaneous transluminal angioplasty for Brescia-Cimino hemodialysis fistula dysfunction: technical success rate, patency rate and factors that influence the results," (in eng), *Eur J Radiol*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 426-30, Jun 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2004.07.011.
- [7] B. H. Lee *et al.*, "Paclitaxel-coated expanded polytetrafluoroethylene haemodialysis grafts inhibit neointimal hyperplasia in porcine model of graft stenosis," *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 2432-2438, 2006, doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfl070.
- [8] T. Masaki *et al.*, "Inhibition of neointimal hyperplasia in vascular grafts by sustained perivascular delivery of paclitaxel," *Kidney International*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2061-2069, 2004/11/01/ 2004, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1755.2004.00985.x>.
- [9] W. Heldman Alan *et al.*, "Paclitaxel Stent Coating Inhibits Neointimal Hyperplasia at 4 Weeks in a Porcine Model of Coronary Restenosis," *Circulation*, vol. 103, no. 18, pp. 2289-2295, 2001/05/08 2001, doi: 10.1161/01.CIR.103.18.2289.
- [10] C. Klumb, T. Lehmann, R. Aschenbach, N. Eckardt, and U. Teichgräber, "Benefit and risk from paclitaxel-coated balloon angioplasty for the treatment of femoropopliteal artery disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials," *EClinicalMedicine*, vol. 16, pp. 42-50, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.09.004.
- [11] B. Scheller *et al.*, "Two year follow-up after treatment of coronary in-stent restenosis with a paclitaxel-coated balloon catheter," *Clinical Research in Cardiology*, vol. 97, no. 10, pp. 773-781, 2008/10/01 2008, doi: 10.1007/s00392-008-0682-5.
- [12] I. J. Yan Wee *et al.*, "A systematic review and meta-analysis of drug-coated balloon versus conventional balloon angioplasty for dialysis access stenosis," *Journal of Vascular Surgery*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 970-979.e3, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jvs.2019.01.082.
- [13] S. A. Kennedy, S. Mafeld, M. O. Baerlocher, A. Jaber, and D. K. Rajan, "Drug-Coated Balloon Angioplasty in Hemodialysis Circuits: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 483-494.e1, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jvir.2019.01.012.
- [14] M.-T. Liao *et al.*, "Drug-coated balloon versus conventional balloon angioplasty of hemodialysis arteriovenous fistula or graft: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. e0231463, 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0231463.
- [15] S. Abdul Salim, H. Tran, C. Thongprayoon, T. Fülöp, and W. Cheungpasitporn, "Comparison of drug-coated balloon angioplasty versus conventional angioplasty for arteriovenous fistula stenosis: Systematic review and meta-analysis," *The Journal of Vascular Access*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 357-365, 2020/05/01 2019, doi: 10.1177/1129729819878612.
- [16] R. A. Lookstein *et al.*, "Drug-Coated Balloons for Dysfunctional Dialysis Arteriovenous Fistulas," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 383, no. 8, pp. 733-742, 2020/08/20 2020, doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1914617.
- [17] J. W. Kim, J. H. Kim, S. S. Byun, J. M. Kang, and J. H. Shin, "Paclitaxel-Coated Balloon versus Plain Balloon Angioplasty for Dysfunctional Autogenous Radiocephalic Arteriovenous

- Fistulas: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial," *Korean J Radiol*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1239-1247, 11/ 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3348/kjr.2020.0067>.
- [18] P. Guyot, A. E. Ades, M. J. N. M. Ouwens, and N. J. Welton, "Enhanced secondary analysis of survival data: reconstructing the data from published Kaplan-Meier survival curves," *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 9, 2012/02/01 2012, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-12-9.
- [19] Y. Wei and P. Royston, "Reconstructing time-to-event data from published Kaplan-Meier curves," (in eng), *Stata J*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 786-802, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29398980>
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5796634/>.
- [20] R. D. Riley, P. C. Lambert, and G. Abo-Zaid, "Meta-analysis of individual participant data: rationale, conduct, and reporting," *BMJ*, vol. 340, p. c221, 2010, doi: 10.1136/bmj.c221.
- [21] M. C. Simmonds, J. P. Higgins, L. A. Stewart, J. F. Tierney, M. J. Clarke, and S. G. Thompson, "Meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomized trials: a review of methods used in practice," (in eng), *Clin Trials*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 209-17, 2005, doi: 10.1191/1740774505cn087oa.
- [22] L. A. Stewart *et al.*, "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses of individual participant data: the PRISMA-IPD Statement," (in eng), *Jama*, vol. 313, no. 16, pp. 1657-65, Apr 28 2015, doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.3656.
- [23] B. Hutton *et al.*, "The PRISMA Extension Statement for Reporting of Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses of Health Care Interventions: Checklist and Explanations," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, vol. 162, no. 11, pp. 777-784, 2015/06/02 2015, doi: 10.7326/M14-2385.
- [24] J. A. C. Sterne *et al.*, "RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials," *BMJ*, vol. 366, p. l4898, 2019, doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4898.
- [25] Z. Munn *et al.*, "The development of software to support multiple systematic review types: the Joanna Briggs Institute System for the Unified Management, Assessment and Review of Information (JBI SUMARI)," *JBI Evidence Implementation*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://journals.lww.com/ijebh/Fulltext/2019/03000/The_development_of_software_to_support_multiple.5.aspx.
- [26] D. Schoenfeld, "Partial residuals for the proportional hazards regression model," *Biometrika*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 239-241, 1982, doi: 10.1093/biomet/69.1.239.
- [27] P. M. Grambsch and T. M. Therneau, "Proportional hazards tests and diagnostics based on weighted residuals," *Biometrika*, vol. 81, no. 3, pp. 515-526, 1994, doi: 10.1093/biomet/81.3.515.
- [28] H. Uno *et al.*, "Moving beyond the hazard ratio in quantifying the between-group difference in survival analysis," (in eng), *J Clin Oncol*, vol. 32, no. 22, pp. 2380-5, Aug 1 2014, doi: 10.1200/jco.2014.55.2208.
- [29] H. Uno *et al.*, "Alternatives to Hazard Ratios for Comparing the Efficacy or Safety of Therapies in Noninferiority Studies," (in eng), *Ann Intern Med*, vol. 163, no. 2, pp. 127-34, Jul 21 2015, doi: 10.7326/m14-1741.
- [30] J. J. Z. Liao, G. F. Liu, and W.-C. Wu, "Dynamic RMST curves for survival analysis in clinical trials," *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 218, 2020/08/27 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12874-020-01098-5.
- [31] M. Othus, B. Barlogie, M. L. LeBlanc, and J. J. Crowley, "Cure Models as a Useful Statistical Tool for Analyzing Survival," *Clinical Cancer Research*, vol. 18, no. 14, pp. 3731-3736, 2012, doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.Ccr-11-2859.
- [32] M. Egger, G. D. Smith, M. Schneider, and C. Minder, "Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test," *BMJ*, vol. 315, no. 7109, p. 629, 1997, doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.
- [33] T. J. Higgins JPT, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.1 (updated September 2020). Cochrane, 2020. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook. (accessed).
- [34] J. P. Higgins, S. G. Thompson, J. J. Deeks, and D. G. Altman, "Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses," (in eng), *Bmj*, vol. 327, no. 7414, pp. 557-60, Sep 6 2003, doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.
- [35] W. Viechtbauer and M. W. L. Cheung, "Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis," *Research Synthesis Methods*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11> vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 112-125, 2010/04/01 2010, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11>.

- [36] B. Baujat, C. Mahé, J. P. Pignon, and C. Hill, "A graphical method for exploring heterogeneity in meta-analyses: application to a meta-analysis of 65 trials," (in eng), *Statistics in medicine*, vol. 21, no. 18, pp. 2641-52, Sep 30 2002, doi: 10.1002/sim.1221.
- [37] G. Rucker and G. Schwarzer, "Ranking treatments in frequentist network meta-analysis works without resampling methods," (in eng), *BMC Med Res Methodol*, vol. 15, p. 58, Jul 31 2015, doi: 10.1186/s12874-015-0060-8.
- [38] S. P. Hozo, B. Djulbegovic, and I. Hozo, "Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample," *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 13, 2005/04/20 2005, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-5-13.
- [39] X. Wan, W. Wang, J. Liu, and T. Tong, "Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range," *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 135, 2014/12/19 2014, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-14-135.
- [40] T. A. Furukawa, C. Barbui, A. Cipriani, P. Brambilla, and N. Watanabe, "Imputing missing standard deviations in meta-analyses can provide accurate results," (in eng), *J Clin Epidemiol*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 7-10, Jan 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2005.06.006.
- [41] P. M. Kitrou, S. Spiliopoulos, K. Katsanos, E. Papachristou, D. Siablis, and D. Karnabatidis, "Paclitaxel-Coated versus Plain Balloon Angioplasty for Dysfunctional Arteriovenous Fistulae: One-Year Results of a Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial," *Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 348-354, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jvir.2014.11.003.
- [42] L. J. Roosen, Y. Karamermer, J. A. Vos, G. M. Jong, W. Bos, and O. E. Elgersma, "Paclitaxel-coated balloons do not prevent recurrent stenosis in hemodialysis access fistulae: Results of a randomized clinical trial," *Italian Journal of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery*, vol. 24, pp. 35-40, 06/01 2017, doi: 10.23736/S1824-4777.17.01282-7.
- [43] S. O. Trerotola, T. F. Saad, and P. Roy-Chaudhury, "The Lutonix AV Randomized Trial of Paclitaxel-Coated Balloons in Arteriovenous Fistula Stenosis: 2-Year Results and Subgroup Analysis," *Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1-14.e5, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jvir.2019.08.035.
- [44] P. Björkman, E.-M. Weselius, T. Kokkonen, V. Rauta, A. Albäck, and M. Venermo, "Drug-Coated Versus Plain Balloon Angioplasty In Arteriovenous Fistulas: A Randomized, Controlled Study With 1-Year Follow-Up (The Drecorest li-Study)," *Scandinavian Journal of Surgery*, vol. 108, p. 145749691879820, 09/05 2018, doi: 10.1177/1457496918798206.
- [45] J. J. Swinnen *et al.*, "Multicentre, randomised, blinded, control trial of drug-eluting balloon vs Sham in recurrent native dialysis fistula stenoses," *The Journal of Vascular Access*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 260-269, 2019/05/01 2018, doi: 10.1177/1129729818801556.
- [46] F. G. Irani *et al.*, "Hemodialysis Arteriovenous Fistula and Graft Stenoses: Randomized Trial Comparing Drug-eluting Balloon Angioplasty with Conventional Angioplasty," *Radiology*, vol. 289, no. 1, pp. 238-247, 2018/10/01 2018, doi: 10.1148/radiol.2018170806.
- [47] M.-T. Liao *et al.*, "A randomized controlled trial of drug-coated balloon angioplasty in venous anastomotic stenosis of dialysis arteriovenous grafts," *Journal of Vascular Surgery*, vol. 71, no. 6, pp. 1994-2003, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jvs.2019.07.090.
- [48] T. Moreno-Sánchez, M. Moreno-Ramírez, F. H. Machancoses, P. Pardo-Moreno, P. F. Navarro-Vergara, and J. García-Revilla, "Efficacy of Paclitaxel Balloon for Hemodialysis Stenosis Fistulae After One Year Compared to High-Pressure Balloons: A Controlled, Multicenter, Randomized Trial," *CardioVascular and Interventional Radiology*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 382-390, 2020/03/01 2020, doi: 10.1007/s00270-019-02372-w.
- [49] Y. Liu *et al.*, "Comparison of macrovascular invasion-free survival in early-intermediate hepatocellular carcinoma after different interventions: A propensity score-based analysis," (in eng), *J Cancer*, vol. 10, no. 17, pp. 4063-4071, 2019, doi: 10.7150/jca.29850.
- [50] N. I. Marupudi, J. E. Han, K. W. Li, V. M. Renard, B. M. Tyler, and H. Brem, "Paclitaxel: a review of adverse toxicities and novel delivery strategies," (in eng), *Expert opinion on drug safety*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 609-21, Sep 2007, doi: 10.1517/14740338.6.5.609.
- [51] J. Rocha-Singh Krishna *et al.*, "Mortality and Paclitaxel-Coated Devices," *Circulation*, vol. 141, no. 23, pp. 1859-1869, 2020/06/09 2020, doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.119.044697.
- [52] F. G. Irani and B. S. Tan, "Drug Coated Balloons: Are they the Holy Grail for Dysfunctional Dialysis Arteriovenous Fistulas?," *CardioVascular and Interventional Radiology*, 2020/11/06 2020, doi: 10.1007/s00270-020-02690-4.
- [53] M. R. Chan, H. N. Young, and A. S. Yevzlin, "The effect of in-stent restenosis on hemodialysis access patency," *Hemodialysis International*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4758.2009.00389.x> vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 250-256, 2009/07/01 2009, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4758.2009.00389.x>.

- [54] K. Dinh *et al.*, "Mortality After Paclitaxel-Coated Device Use in Dialysis Access: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Endovascular Therapy*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 600-612, 2019/10/01 2019, doi: [10.1177/1526602819872154](https://doi.org/10.1177/1526602819872154).
- [55] F. C. Prischl *et al.*, "Parameters of prognostic relevance to the patency of vascular access in hemodialysis patients," *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, vol. 6, no. 6, p. 1613, 1995. [Online]. Available: <http://jasn.asnjournals.org/content/6/6/1613.abstract>.
- [56] T. W. I. Clark, D. A. Hirsch, K. J. Jindal, P. J. Veugelers, and J. LeBlanc, "Outcome and Prognostic Factors of Restenosis after Percutaneous Treatment of Native Hemodialysis Fistulas," *Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 51-59, 2002/01/01/ 2002, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1051-0443\(07\)60009-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1051-0443(07)60009-8).
- [57] K. Miyamoto *et al.*, "Analysis of factors for post-percutaneous transluminal angioplasty primary patency rate in hemodialysis vascular access," *The Journal of Vascular Access*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 892-899, 2020/11/01 2020, doi: [10.1177/1129729820910555](https://doi.org/10.1177/1129729820910555).
- [58] M. Monroy-Cuadros, S. Yilmaz, A. Salazar-Bañuelos, and C. Doig, "Risk Factors Associated with Patency Loss of Hemodialysis Vascular Access within 6 Months," *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, vol. 5, no. 10, p. 1787, 2010, doi: [10.2215/CJN.09441209](https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.09441209).
- [59] C.-C. Lin and W.-C. Yang, "Prognostic Factors Influencing the Patency of Hemodialysis Vascular Access: Literature Review and Novel Therapeutic Modality by Far Infrared Therapy," *Journal of the Chinese Medical Association*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 109-116, 2009/03/01/ 2009, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1726-4901\(09\)70035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1726-4901(09)70035-8).






medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.11.20240069>; this version posted December 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



One-Stage Meta-Analysis – Target Lesion Primary Patency

Strata — DCB — PTA




Number at risk

DCB	606	399	173	46	27	5	2	0
PTA	601	320	137	45	33	7	5	0




Two-Stage Frequentist Meta-Analysis – Target Lesion Primary Patency



One-Stage Meta-Analysis – Access Circuit Primary Patency

Strata — DCB — PTA




Number at risk

	430	249	72	24	10
	424	214	68	24	17

Two-Stage Frequentist Meta-Analysis – Access Circuit Primary Patency

Study	TE	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Kitrou, 2015–A	-0.69	0.3515	14.8%	0.50 [0.25; 1.00]
Bjorkman, 2018	1.41	0.4420	12.4%	4.08 [1.71; 9.70]
Irani, 2018	-0.35	0.2343	18.0%	0.70 [0.44; 1.11]
Liao, 2019	-0.62	0.3294	15.4%	0.54 [0.28; 1.03]
Trerotola, 2019	-0.11	0.1399	20.4%	0.89 [0.68; 1.17]
Lookstein, 2020	-0.85	0.1968	19.0%	0.43 [0.29; 0.63]
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.76 [0.35; 1.67]
Prediction interval				[0.15; 3.91]

Heterogeneity: $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.2536$; $\text{Chi}^2 = 26.65$, $\text{df} = 5$ ($P < 0.01$); $I^2 = 81\%$



Two-Stage Frequentist Meta-Analysis – Access Circuit Primary Patency (excluding outliers)

Study	TE	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Kitrou, 2015–A	-0.69	0.3515	13.7%	0.50 [0.25; 1.00]
Bjorkman, 2018	1.41	0.4420	0.0%	4.08 [1.71; 9.70]
Irani, 2018	-0.35	0.2343	20.6%	0.70 [0.44; 1.11]
Liao, 2019	-0.62	0.3294	14.8%	0.54 [0.28; 1.03]
Trerotola, 2019	-0.11	0.1399	27.6%	0.89 [0.68; 1.17]
Lookstein, 2020	-0.85	0.1968	23.3%	0.43 [0.29; 0.63]
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.61 [0.41; 0.91]
Prediction interval				[0.22; 1.71]

Heterogeneity: $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.0837$; $\text{Chi}^2 = 10.61$, $\text{df} = 4$ ($P = 0.03$); $I^2 = 62\%$




Table 1A Characteristics of study designs

Study, year	Study details	Balloon type		Experimental DCB paclitaxel dose / $\mu\text{g}/\text{mm}^2$	Stenosis assessment (follow-up)	Primary endpoint(s)	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
		Experimental	Control					
Kitrou-A, 2015	Single-center non-blinded	Paclitaxel-coated IN.PACT Admiral DCB (Medtronic)	HPB	NR	Clinical assessment with optional US	TLR-free survival at 1 year	Age >18 years with mature AVF with inadequate dialysis and clinical signs of failing dialysis access Angiographic confirmation of single stenosis >50%	Participation in other protocols Previous insertion of metal scaffolding in circuit Allergy or known indications to iodinated contrast/paclitaxel Blood coagulation disorders Presence of synthetic AVG Multistenotic disease Circuit thrombosis
Kitrou-B, 2015	Single-center single-blinded	Paclitaxel-eluting IN.PACT DCB (Invatec-Medtronic)	PTA	3	Clinical assessment Angiography every 2 months	Target lesion primary patency at 1 year (<50% angiographic restenosis with no need for any additional procedure)	At least 1 angiographically confirmed significant venous stenosis causing failing dialysis access AVFs & AVGs	Vessel diameter <3mm or >7mm Patients with general contraindication to endovascular therapy
Roosen, 2017	Multicenter single-blind	Paclitaxel-coated DCB (Invatec-Medtronic)	PTA	NR	Duplex US at 3, 6, 12, 24 months	Occlusion Restenosis grade >50% on duplex US Blood flow <600mL/min with duplex US confirmed by angiography	AVF restenosis diagnosed by duplex US	Life expectancy <1 year Pregnancy Allergy to iodine contrast, paclitaxel, heparin or aspirin Age \geq 18 years, not mentally impaired
Trerotola, 2019	Multicenter single-blinded Manufacturer-	Paclitaxel-coated Lutonix 035 DCB	PTA	2	Clinical assessment	Target lesion primary patency at 6 months	Nonthrombosed, dysfunctional, mature AVF in the arm	Pregnancy, lactation, or pregnancy plans Hemodialysis access in leg

	sponsored	(Lutonix)					<p>currently in use for hemodialysis</p> <p>Age \geq 21 years</p> <p>Will and ability to sign informed consent</p> <p>AVF located in the arm presenting with abnormalities warranting angiographic imaging as per KDOQI guidelines</p> <p>Native AVF created \geq 30 days before index procedure; undergone \geq1 hemodialysis sessions with 2 needles and no hemodialysis catheter had been present for \geq 30 days</p> <p>Venous stenosis of an AVF</p> <p>Successful predilation of target lesion with a PTA balloon</p>	<p>2 lesions in access circuit</p> <p>Secondary nontarget lesion that could not be successfully treated</p> <p>Target lesion located central to axillary–subclavian vein junction</p> <p>Secondary lesion in central venous system</p> <p>Thrombosed access or access with thrombosis treated \geq 30 d before index procedure</p> <p>Surgical revision of access site planned or expected \geq6 mo after index procedure</p> <p>Surgical interventions of access site \geq30 d before index procedure</p> <p>Planned concomitant procedure</p> <p>Known contraindication to iodinated contrast or paclitaxel</p> <p>Immunosuppressive therapy</p> <p>Life expectancy < 12 months</p> <p>Anticipation of kidney transplant via living donor</p> <p>Anticipation of conversion to peritoneal dialysis in the next 6 months</p> <p>Bare metal stent in target or secondary nontarget lesion or Covered stent in target or secondary nontarget lesion</p> <p>Infected AV access or systemic infection</p>
--	-----------	-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--

								Current participation in investigational study or previous enrolment in the study
Björkman, 2018	Single-center single-blinded	Paclitaxel-coated IN.PACT DCB (Medtronic)	PTA	3.5	US at 1, 6, 12 months	TLR, loss of AVF at 12 months	US-documented stenosis Eligible for angioplasty Adequate flow above lesion Age > 18 years Signed and dated consent Negative pregnancy test when applicable	Any previous DCB-treatment Known allergy to paclitaxel Any coagulopathy Occluded AVF Central vein stenosis Apparent need for surgical repair life expectancy < 1 year Perianastomotic lesion (<15 mm)
Swinnen, 2018	Multicenter single-blinded	Paclitaxel-coated IN.PACT Admiral DCB (Medtronic)	PTA	3	US at baseline, 6 weeks; 3, 6, 12 months	Late lumen loss as measured at narrowest point in the index trial area on follow-up US	Autogenous arteriovenous haemodialysis fistula Recurrent stenosis, unstented or instent (bare Nitinol) Index trial area clearly visible on US with 12 MHz probe Patient willing to sign informed trial consent and able to attend the 5 follow-up US Age ≥18 years	Severe allergy to contrast Intolerance of platelet blockade Systemic coagulopathy or hypercoagulopathy Active bleeding, bleeding in the past 12 months requiring transfusion or recent (<3 months) intracranial haemorrhage Thrombosed fistula Stent grafted fistulas Pregnancy/planned pregnancy Central vein stenoses Compliance difficulties
Irani, 2018	Single-center unblinded	Paclitaxel-coated	HPB	3	Angiography at 6 months	Target lesion primary patency rate at 6	Upper limb/groin malfunctioning	Thrombosed AVF/AVG Evidence of systemic/local

		IN.PACT Admiral DCB (Medtronic)				months	AVF/AVG AVF/AVG >3 months Native vessel 4-7mm diameter Able to cross lesion with guidewire Platelet count >50 x 10 ⁹ /L PT/PTT <3s above normal	infection associated with AVF/AVG Age <21 years Pregnancy Uncorrectable coagulopathy or hypercoagulable state Enrolled in another investigational study Comorbid limitations limiting ability to comply with follow-up Life expectancy < 6 months
Liao, 2019	Single-center single-blinded	Paclitaxel-coated IN.PACT Admiral DCB (Medtronic)	PTA	NR	Clinical assessment and angiography every 2 months	Target lesion primary patency rate at 6 months	Age 18-90 years Prosthetic AVG in the upper limb Prosthetic AVG implanted for >30 days Prosthetic grafts used for at least one successful hemodialysis session Clinical evidence of hemodynamically significant stenosis Angiography-proved venous anastomotic stenosis ≥50% Anastomotic stenosis extended into the graft <2 cm and native vein <7 cm Entire lesion length	Unwilling or unable to return for follow-up visits Reason to believe that adherence to follow-up visits would be irregular Current or scheduled enrolment in other conflicting studies Thrombotic occlusion within 3 months before enrolment Concomitant disease or condition likely to result in death within 6 months Blood coagulation disorder Sepsis or infected prosthetic AV graft Contraindication to the use of contrast medium Pregnancy

							<p><7 cm</p> <p>No secondary lesions with anatomic stenosis >50%</p> <p>Reference diameter of venous anastomosis within 7 mm</p>	
Moreno-Sánchez, 2020	Multicenter single-blinded Manufacturer-sponsored	Paseo-18 Lux paclitaxel DCB (Biotronik)	HPB	3	Clinical assessment	Target lesion patency defined as time elapsed between completion of effective procedure and appearance of restenosis at 6 and 12 months after angioplasty	<p>Dialysis patients ≥18 years over with a dysfunctional mature AVF/AVG</p>	<p>>2 stenoses in access circuit</p> <p>Allergoid reaction to contrast media</p> <p>Allergy, intolerance or hypersensitivity toward paclitaxel</p> <p>Pregnant or lactating</p> <p>Local or systematic infections</p> <p>Unable to complete 12-month follow-up</p>
Lookstein, 2020	Muticenter single-blinded Manufacturer-sponsored	Paclitaxel-coated IN.PACT DCB (Medtronic)	PTA	3.5	<p>Duplex US at 30 days and 6 months</p> <p>Clinical assessment at 30 days, 3 months, 6 months</p>	Target-lesion primary patency defined as freedom from clinically driven target-lesion revascularization or access-circuit thrombosis measured during the 6 months after index procedure	<p>Age ≥21 years</p> <p>Presented with new or nonstented restenotic native AVF that had at least 50% stenosis</p> <p>Native AVF created at least 60 days before index procedure that had been used for dialysis for at least 8 of 12 sessions during a 4-week period, ensuring fistula maturity</p>	Any history of or current access-circuit thrombosis or previous stent in access circuit

Kim, 2020	Single-center single-blinded	Paclitaxel- coated IN.PACT Admiral DCB (Medtronic)	PTA	NR	Clinical examination at 6, 12, 24, 36 months	Target lesion primary patency defined as presence of a functional dialysis circuit with no clinical need for repeat intervention at target lesion	Malfunctioning radiocephalic AVF Lesions (de novo/restenosis) at juxta-anastomotic venous site within 8 cm of anastomotic point of AVF Angiographic confirmation of stenosis >50% Ability to cross lesion with guide wire	Dialysis access type other than radiocephalic AVFs Thrombosed AVFs Evidence of systemic or local infection associated with AVF Uncorrectable coagulopathy (despite transfusion) or hypercoagulable state Allergy/contraindications to iodinated contrast media/paclitaxel Age < 19 years Life expectancy < 1 year
-----------	---------------------------------	--	-----	----	--	--	---	---

Table 1B Patient characteristics of included studies

Study, year	No. of patients (male, female)		Age		Baseline dialysis access age		Follow-up period (months)	Diabetes mellitus (%)		Hypertension (%)		AVFs (%)	
	DCB	PTA	DCB	PTA	DCB	PTA		DCB	PTA	DCB	PTA	DCB	PTA
Kitrou-A, 2015	20 (12M, 8F)	20 (14M, 6F)	64.3±14.5	57±14.2	2.13±2.12 years	2.74±2.4 years	12	20	35	15	15	100	100
Kitrou-B, 2015	20 (15M, 5F)	20 (14M, 6F)	65.7±13.2	62.5±15.4	2.5±2.0 years	2.5±3.2 years	12	20	20	15	10	35	35
Roosen, 2017	16 (7M, 9F)	18 (14M, 4F)	80 [71-86]	83 [78-86]	NR	NR	24	37.5	22.2	43.8	38.9	83.5	83.3
Trerotola, 2019	141 (87M, 54F)	144 (85M, 59F)	64±15	61±13	1164±973 days	1056±1122 days	24	58.2	65.3	94.3	98.6	100	100
Björkman, 2018	18 (10M, 8F)	18 (13M, 5F)	67.4 (46-87)	67.0 (28-82)	165 (45-1165) days	292 (80-3800) days	12	61.1	61.1	77.8	88.9	100	100
Swinnen, 2018	68 (42M, 26F)	60 (37M, 23F)	65.2±13.6	64.5±13.9	2 ≤ 6 months 66 > 6 months	3 ≤ 6 months 57 > 6 months	12	41.2	18.3	17.6	10	100	100
Irani, 2018	59 (39M, 20F)	60 (40M, 20F)	59.0±11.5	59.4±8.80	44.4±58.6 months	47.3±54.3 months	12	62.7	56.7	93.2	91.7	88.1	76.7
Liao, 2019	22 (3M, 19F)	22 (9M, 11F)	70.4±10.6	65.9±15.9	28 [15-41] months	34 [18-68] months	12	77.3	54.5	81.8	50	0	0
Moreno-Sánchez, 2020	70 (55M, 15F)	78 (52M, 26F)	69±12.99	71±11.31	All mature AVF/AVG; exact figures not specified		12	28.5	23	65.7	70.5	100	100
Lookstein, 2020	170 (112M, 58F)	160 (101M, 59F)	65.8±13.1	65.5±13.4	All ≥60 days; exact figures not specified		6	62.9	68.8	91.2	94.4	100	100
Kim, 2020	20 (12M, 8F)	19 (9M, 10F)	60.7±12.2	63.7±11.8	27.3±30.7 months	19.1±11.1 months	36	80	78.9	NR	NR	100	100

Values in square brackets are interquartile range, values in circular brackets are range. DCB, drug coated balloon; PTA, percutaneous transluminal angioplasty; HPB, high pressure balloon; TLR, target lesion restenosis; TLPP, target lesion primary patency; ACP, access circuit primary patency; AVF, arteriovenous fistula; AVG, arteriovenous graft; US, ultrasound; KDOQI, Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative; PT, prothrombin time; PTT, partial thromboplastin time; NR, not reported

Table 2 Quality Assessment of Trials: Cochrane risk of bias (ROB) assessment of randomized controlled trials

Cochrane Risk-of-bias tool for randomized controlled trials (Consensus)							
Study ID	Outcome	Randomization process	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing outcome data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the reported result	Overall
Kitrou-A, 2015	TLR-free survival						
Kitrou-B, 2015	TLPP						
Roosen, 2017	Occlusion Restenosis Blood flow measurement						
Trerotola, 2019	TLPP						
Björkman, 2018	TLR						
Swinnen, 2018	Late lumen loss						
Irani, 2018	TLPP						
Liao, 2019	TLPP						
Moreno-Sánchez, 2020	TLPP						
Lookstein, 2020	TLPP						

Kim, 2020	TLPP						
-----------	------	---	---	---	---	---	---

TLR, target lesion restenosis; TLPP, target lesion primary patency

Table 3
 Frequentist
 Network Meta-
 Analysis

Access Circuit Primary Patency				
Target Lesion Primary Patency	DCB (Paclitaxel 3.5µg/mm²) TLPP P-Score = <u>0.905</u> ACPP P-Score = <u>0.982</u>	1.645 (95%-CI: 0.903 - 2.997) P = 0.104	2.093 (95%-CI: 1.304 - 3.359) P = 0.002	2.343 (95%-CI: 1.593 - 3.446) P < 0.001
	0.705 (95%-CI: 0.292 - 1.703) P = 0.437	DCB (Paclitaxel 3.0µg/mm²) TLPP P-Score = 0.697 ACPP P-Score = 0.599	1.272 (95%-CI: 0.745 - 2.172) P = 0.378	1.424 (95%-CI: 0.900 - 2.255) P = 0.131
	0.442 (95%-CI: 0.157 - 1.245) P = 0.122	0.627 (95%-CI: 0.280 - 1.402) P = 0.255	DCB (Paclitaxel 2.0µg/mm²) TLPP P-Score = 0.295 ACPP P-Score = 0.327	1.120 (95%-CI: 0.851 - 1.473) P = 0.419
	0.369 (95%-CI: 0.170 - 0.800) P = 0.012	0.523 (95%-CI: 0.344 - 0.795) P = 0.002	0.834 (95%-CI: 0.419 - 1.659) P = 0.605	PTA TLPP P-Score = 0.103 ACPP P-Score = 0.092

Treatment effects are described in hazard ratios. HR, hazard ratio; 95%-CI, 95% confidence intervals; DCB, drug coated balloon; PTA, percutaneous transluminal angioplasty, TLPP, target lesion primary patency; ACPP, access circuit primary patency

Table 4 Two-Stage Meta-Regression (Target Lesion Primary Patency)

Covariate	No. of studies	Beta	95%-CI	I^2	R^2	P
Male (%)	10	-0.002	-0.035 to 0.031	68.4	0.0	0.889
Diabetes Mellitus (%)	10	-0.001	-0.020 to 0.019	68.4	0.0	0.932
Arteriovenous Fistula (%)	10	-0.005	-0.017 to 0.006	64.4	2.8	0.332
Publication Year	10	-1.436	-2.989 to 0.116	59.4	8.7	0.063

95%-CI, 95% confidence intervals

PRISMA-IPD Checklist of items to include when reporting a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data (IPD)

PRISMA-IPD Section/topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data.	1
Abstract			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including as applicable:	3-4
		Background: state research question and main objectives, with information on participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes.	
		Methods: report eligibility criteria; data sources including dates of last bibliographic search or elicitation, noting that IPD were sought; methods of assessing risk of bias.	
		Results: provide number and type of studies and participants identified and number (%) obtained; summary effect estimates for main outcomes (benefits and harms) with confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. Describe the direction and size of summary effects in terms meaningful to those who would put findings into practice.	
		Discussion: state main strengths and limitations of the evidence, general interpretation of the results and any important implications.	
Other: report primary funding source, registration number and registry name for the systematic review and IPD meta-analysis.			
Introduction			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions being addressed with reference, as applicable, to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes and study design (PICOS). Include any hypotheses that relate to particular types of participant-level subgroups.	5
Methods			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a protocol exists and where it can be accessed. If available, provide registration information including registration number and registry name. Provide publication details, if applicable.	NA
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify inclusion and exclusion criteria including those relating to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, study design and characteristics (e.g. years when conducted, required minimum follow-up). Note whether these were applied at the study or individual level i.e. whether eligible participants were included (and ineligible participants excluded) from a study that included a wider population than specified by the review inclusion criteria. The rationale for criteria should be stated.	6
Identifying studies -	7	Describe all methods of identifying published and unpublished studies including, as applicable: which bibliographic databases were searched with dates of coverage; details of any hand searching including of conference proceedings; use of study registers	6

information sources		and agency or company databases; contact with the original research team and experts in the field; open adverts and surveys. Give the date of last search or elicitation.	
Identifying studies - search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	6
Study selection processes	9	State the process for determining which studies were eligible for inclusion.	6
Data collection processes	10	Describe how IPD were requested, collected and managed, including any processes for querying and confirming data with investigators. If IPD were not sought from any eligible study, the reason for this should be stated (for each such study). If applicable, describe how any studies for which IPD were not available were dealt with. This should include whether, how and what aggregate data were sought or extracted from study reports and publications (such as extracting data independently in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming these data with investigators.	6-8
Data items	11	Describe how the information and variables to be collected were chosen. List and define all study level and participant level data that were sought, including baseline and follow-up information. If applicable, describe methods of standardising or translating variables within the IPD datasets to ensure common scales or measurements across studies.	6-8
IPD integrity	A1	Describe what aspects of IPD were subject to data checking (such as sequence generation, data consistency and completeness, baseline imbalance) and how this was done.	6-8
Risk of bias assessment in individual studies.	12	Describe methods used to assess risk of bias in the individual studies and whether this was applied separately for each outcome. If applicable, describe how findings of IPD checking were used to inform the assessment. Report if and how risk of bias assessment was used in any data synthesis.	6
Specification of outcomes and effect measures	13	State all treatment comparisons of interests. State all outcomes addressed and define them in detail. State whether they were pre-specified for the review and, if applicable, whether they were primary/main or secondary/additional outcomes. Give the principal measures of effect (such as risk ratio, hazard ratio, difference in means) used for each outcome.	6-8
Synthesis methods	14	Describe the meta-analysis methods used to synthesise IPD. Specify any statistical methods and models used. Issues should include (but are not restricted to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of a one-stage or two-stage approach. • How effect estimates were generated separately within each study and combined across studies (where applicable). • Specification of one-stage models (where applicable) including how clustering of patients within studies was accounted for. • Use of fixed or random effects models and any other model assumptions, such as proportional hazards. • How (summary) survival curves were generated (where applicable). • Methods for quantifying statistical heterogeneity (such as I^2 and τ^2). 	6-8

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How studies providing IPD and not providing IPD were analysed together (where applicable). • How missing data within the IPD were dealt with (where applicable). 	
Exploration of variation in effects	A2	If applicable, describe any methods used to explore variation in effects by study or participant level characteristics (such as estimation of interactions between effect and covariates). State all participant-level characteristics that were analysed as potential effect modifiers, and whether these were pre-specified.	6-8
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias relating to the accumulated body of evidence, including any pertaining to not obtaining IPD for particular studies, outcomes or other variables.	6
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of any additional analyses, including sensitivity analyses. State which of these were pre-specified.	6-8
Results			
Study selection and IPD obtained	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the systematic review with reasons for exclusions at each stage. Indicate the number of studies and participants for which IPD were sought and for which IPD were obtained. For those studies where IPD were not available, give the numbers of studies and participants for which aggregate data were available. Report reasons for non-availability of IPD. Include a flow diagram.	9
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present information on key study and participant characteristics (such as description of interventions, numbers of participants, demographic data, unavailability of outcomes, funding source, and if applicable duration of follow-up). Provide (main) citations for each study. Where applicable, also report similar study characteristics for any studies not providing IPD.	9
IPD integrity	A3	Report any important issues identified in checking IPD or state that there were none.	9
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias assessments. If applicable, describe whether data checking led to the up-weighting or down-weighting of these assessments. Consider how any potential bias impacts on the robustness of meta-analysis conclusions.	9
Results of individual studies	20	For each comparison and for each main outcome (benefit or harm), for each individual study report the number of eligible participants for which data were obtained and show simple summary data for each intervention group (including, where applicable, the number of events), effect estimates and confidence intervals. These may be tabulated or included on a forest plot.	Table 1A, 1B
Results of syntheses	21	Present summary effects for each meta-analysis undertaken, including confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. State whether the analysis was pre-specified, and report the numbers of studies and participants and, where applicable, the number of events on which it is based.	Figure 2, 9-11
		When exploring variation in effects due to patient or study characteristics, present summary interaction estimates for each characteristic examined, including confidence intervals and measures of statistical heterogeneity. State whether the analysis was pre-specified. State whether any interaction is consistent across trials.	

		Provide a description of the direction and size of effect in terms meaningful to those who would put findings into practice.	
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias relating to the accumulated body of evidence, including any pertaining to the availability and representativeness of available studies, outcomes or other variables.	Table 2B, 9
Additional analyses	23	Give results of any additional analyses (e.g. sensitivity analyses). If applicable, this should also include any analyses that incorporate aggregate data for studies that do not have IPD. If applicable, summarise the main meta-analysis results following the inclusion or exclusion of studies for which IPD were not available.	Figure 3, 4A-E, 5A-B
Discussion			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarise the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome.	9-11
Strengths and limitations	25	Discuss any important strengths and limitations of the evidence including the benefits of access to IPD and any limitations arising from IPD that were not available.	13-14
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the findings in the context of other evidence.	14
Implications	A4	Consider relevance to key groups (such as policy makers, service providers and service users). Consider implications for future research.	13-14
Funding			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding and other support (such as supply of IPD), and the role in the systematic review of those providing such support.	NA

A1 – A3 denote new items that are additional to standard PRISMA items. A4 has been created as a result of re-arranging content of the standard PRISMA statement to suit the way that systematic review IPD meta-analyses are reported.

© Reproduced with permission of the PRISMA IPD Group, which encourages sharing and reuse for non-commercial purposes

PRISMA NMA Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting A Systematic Review Involving a Network Meta-analysis

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review <i>incorporating a network meta-analysis (or related form of meta-analysis)</i> .	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: Background: main objectives Methods: data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal; and <i>synthesis methods, such as network meta-analysis</i> . Results: number of studies and participants identified; summary estimates with corresponding confidence/credible intervals; <i>treatment rankings may also be discussed. Authors may choose to summarize pairwise comparisons against a chosen treatment included in their analyses for brevity.</i> Discussion/Conclusions: limitations; conclusions and implications of findings. Other: primary source of funding; systematic review registration number with registry name.	3-4
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known, <i>including mention of why a network meta-analysis has been conducted</i> .	5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed, with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	5
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists and if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address); and, if available, provide registration information, including registration number.	NA

Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. <i>Clearly describe eligible treatments included in the treatment network, and note whether any have been clustered or merged into the same node (with justification).</i>	6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	6
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	6
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6-8
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	6-8
Geometry of the network	S1	Describe methods used to explore the geometry of the treatment network under study and potential biases related to it. This should include how the evidence base has been graphically summarized for presentation, and what characteristics were compiled and used to describe the evidence base to readers.	6-8
Risk of bias within individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	6
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). <i>Also describe the use of additional summary measures assessed, such as treatment rankings and surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) values, as well as modified approaches used to present summary findings from meta-analyses.</i>	NA
Planned methods of analysis	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies for each network meta-analysis. This should include, but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Handling of multi-arm trials;</i> • <i>Selection of variance structure;</i> • <i>Selection of prior distributions in Bayesian analyses; and</i> • <i>Assessment of model fit.</i> 	6-8
Assessment of Inconsistency	S2	Describe the statistical methods used to evaluate the agreement of direct and indirect evidence in the treatment network(s) studied. Describe efforts taken to address its presence when found.	6-8
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	6

Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses if done, indicating which were pre-specified. This may include, but not be limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitivity or subgroup analyses; • Meta-regression analyses; • <i>Alternative formulations of the treatment network; and</i> • <i>Use of alternative prior distributions for Bayesian analyses (if applicable).</i> 	6-8
---------------------	----	---	-----

RESULTS†

Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	9
Presentation of network structure	S3	Provide a network graph of the included studies to enable visualization of the geometry of the treatment network.	NA
Summary of network geometry	S4	Provide a brief overview of characteristics of the treatment network. This may include commentary on the abundance of trials and randomized patients for the different interventions and pairwise comparisons in the network, gaps of evidence in the treatment network, and potential biases reflected by the network structure.	9
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	9
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment.	9
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates and confidence intervals. <i>Modified approaches may be needed to deal with information from larger networks.</i>	Table 1A, 1B
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence/credible intervals. <i>In larger networks, authors may focus on comparisons versus a particular comparator (e.g. placebo or standard care), with full findings presented in an appendix. League tables and forest plots may be considered to summarize pairwise comparisons.</i> If additional summary measures were explored (such as treatment rankings), these should also be presented.	9-11
Exploration for inconsistency	S5	Describe results from investigations of inconsistency. This may include such information as measures of model fit to compare consistency and inconsistency models, <i>P</i> values from statistical tests, or summary of inconsistency estimates from different parts of the treatment network.	10-11
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies for the evidence base being studied.	Table 2B, 9

Results of additional analyses	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression analyses, <i>alternative network geometries studied, alternative choice of prior distributions for Bayesian analyses</i> , and so forth).	Figure 3, 4A-E, 5A-B
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy-makers).	12-13
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). <i>Comment on the validity of the assumptions, such as transitivity and consistency. Comment on any concerns regarding network geometry (e.g., avoidance of certain comparisons).</i>	13-14
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	14
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. This should also include information regarding whether funding has been received from manufacturers of treatments in the network and/or whether some of the authors are content experts with professional conflicts of interest that could affect use of treatments in the network.	NA

PICOS = population, intervention, comparators, outcomes, study design.

* Text in italics indicates wording specific to reporting of network meta-analyses that has been added to guidance from the PRISMA statement.

† Authors may wish to plan for use of appendices to present all relevant information in full detail for items in this section.