

1 **Efficacy and safety of TiNO-coated stents versus drug-eluting**  
2 **coronary stents. Systematic literature review and meta-analysis.**

3 Frederic C. Daoud, MD, MSc<sup>a</sup>, Louis Létinier, MD, MSc<sup>a</sup>, Nicholas Moore, MD, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Pierre  
4 Coste, MD<sup>b</sup>, Pasi P. Karjalainen, MD, PhD<sup>c</sup>

5

6 **Short title:** TiNO-coated stents *versus* DES meta-analysis

7

8 **Affiliations**

9 <sup>a</sup> Univ. Bordeaux, INSERM, BPH, U1219, F-33000, Bordeaux, France

10 <sup>b</sup> Coronary Care Unit, Cardiologic Hospital, University of Bordeaux, Pessac, France

11 <sup>c</sup> Cardiac unit, Heart and Lung Center, Helsinki University Hospital and Helsinki University,  
12 Helsinki, Finland

13

14 **Address for correspondence**

15 Frederic C. Daoud, M.D., M.Sc.  
16 [orcid.org/0000-0002-0469-9723](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0469-9723)  
17 Université de Bordeaux  
18 Unité de Pharmacologie clinique  
19 INSERM U1219 Bordeaux Population Health Center  
20 Bâtiment 1A, 1er étage, Case 36  
21 146 rue Léo Saignat  
22 33076 Bordeaux Cedex, France  
23 Tel. +33 (0)5 57 57 15 60, Fax +33 (0)5 57 57 46 71 06  
24 E-mail: [frederic.daoud-pineau@u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:frederic.daoud-pineau@u-bordeaux.fr)

25

26 **Manuscript file word count:** 5,843

27 **Figures:** 3

28 **Tables:** 2

29 **Abstract word count:** 295

30

31 **Abstract**

32 Objectives: To compare clinical outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) using  
33 titanium-nitride-oxide coated stents (TiNOS) versus drug-eluting stents (DES) in coronary artery  
34 disease (CAD) including acute coronary syndrome (ACS).

35 Design: Prospective systematic literature (SLR) conducted according to PRISMA. Medline,  
36 Embase, Cochrane, Web of Science were searched in March 2018 and updated.

37 Setting: Interventional cardiology.

38 Participants: Patients with CAD, including ACS, requiring PCI.

39 Interventions: All prospective randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that compared clinical  
40 outcomes after PCI with DES versus TiNOS.

41 Outcome measures: The pooled risk ratios (RR), TiNOS over DES, with 95% confidence  
42 intervals (CI) are computed for device-oriented Major Adverse Cardiac Events (MACE), non-  
43 fatal myocardial infarction (MI), cardiac death (CD), clinically driven target lesion  
44 revascularization (TLR), probable or definite stent thrombosis (ST), total mortality, at one to five  
45 years after PCI. Pooled RRs are stratified according to baseline ACS versus other CAD.  
46 Sensitivity analysis (SA) and certainty of the evidence are rated per GRADE.

47 Results: Five RCTs are eligible with 1,855 patients with TiNOS versus 1,363 with DES at 1-year  
48 follow-up and 783 versus 771 at 5-year. Three RCTs included patients with ACS only. One-year  
49 RRs in ACS are: MACE 0.93 [0.72, 1.20], MI 0.48 [0.31, 0.73], CD 0.66 [0.33, 1.31], TLR 1.55  
50 [1.10, 2.19] and ST 0.35 [0.20, 0.64]. One-year MACE, MI, and ST are robust to SA. The  
51 certainty of the evidence is high in MACE, moderate in MI, and low or very low in the other  
52 endpoints. There are too few observations to conclude about other CAD and 5-year outcomes.  
53 However, 5-year interim results are consistent with 1-year conclusions.

54 Conclusions: A similar risk of MACE is found in TiNOS and DES, with potentially fewer MI  
55 and ST but more TLR in TiNOS. TiNOS are safe and effective in ACS at 1-year follow-up.

56

57 Registration: PROSPERO CRD42018090622

58

59 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

60 - Strengths:

61 ○ The level of certainty of the evidence is high for the primary endpoint at one-year  
62 follow-up in patients treated for acute coronary syndrome.

63 ○ The primary endpoint and critical secondary endpoints are robust to sensitivity  
64 analysis.

65 - Limitations:

66 ○ Outcomes in patients treated for chronic coronary artery disease cannot be  
67 analyzed.

68 ○ The level of certainty of the evidence of secondary endpoints is moderate or low.

69 ○ Analysis of five-year outcomes is still at an interim stage.

70

71

## 72 **Objectives**

73 Percutaneous coronary interventions (PCI) with drug-eluting stents (DES) is the standard of care  
74 in Coronary Artery Disease (CAD), including Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS).<sup>1-6</sup> mTOR  
75 inhibitors such as everolimus and paclitaxel have been the main drug types used on stents to  
76 inhibit post-stenting restenosis.<sup>7-9</sup> Their side effect is the increased risk of stent thrombosis (ST),  
77 requiring prolonged Dual AntiPlatelet Therapy (DAPT) with its own risk of complications.<sup>10,11</sup>  
78 Titanium-nitride-oxide coated coronary stents (TiNOS), also designated “bioactive stents” (BAS)  
79 have a pharmacologically inactive, non-absorbable coating. Preclinical data has shown less  
80 neointimal hyperplasia with TiNOS than with bare-metal stents (BMS).<sup>12,13,14</sup>  
81 Several trials comparing TiNOS with DES have been conducted but no systematic review of that  
82 evidence has been published so far.

83

## 84 **Participants – Interventions - Outcome measures**

85 The question was specified using the PICOS framework<sup>15</sup>: **P**atients presented CAD including  
86 ACS. **I**ntervention was PCI using TiNOS. **C**omparator was PCI using DES. **O**utcomes were the  
87 device-oriented Major Adverse Cardiac Events (MACE) and the components of that composite  
88 i.e., Cardiac death (CD), recurrent myocardial infarction (MI), and clinically driven target lesion  
89 revascularization (TLR). Probable or definite ST, and all-cause mortality (“total death”: TD)  
90 were also analyzed. Outcomes were assessed at 1-year and 5-year follow-ups. **S**tudy methods  
91 were prospective randomized controlled clinical trials (RCTs).

92

## 93 **Methods**

94 This systematic literature review (SLR) is the first to compare the efficacy and safety of TiNOS  
95 *versus* DES in CAD. It was designed and conducted according to methods described in the  
96 Cochrane Handbook with the use of “Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development  
97 and Evaluation” (GRADE). The protocol was registered in PROSPERO (CRD4201809062)  
98 before initiation. It is reported according to “Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews  
99 and Meta-Analyses” (PRISMA).<sup>16-18</sup>

100 Data recording and the meta-analysis were conducted in RevMan 5.3 (Review Manager Version  
101 5.3 software. Copenhagen, Denmark: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, 2014). The certainty of  
102 evidence according was rated with GRADEpro GDT software 2020 on-line version,  
103 (<https://grade.pro>). Additional analyses were performed in STATA 16 (StataCorp LP, College  
104 Station, Tx, USA) using the metan and metaprop packages.

105  
106 **Data sources**

107 MEDLINE, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library, and Web of Science (WoS) electronic databases,  
108 were queried on March 8, 2018, using their search engines. The search terms were: *((bioactive*  
109 *OR (Titanium AND nitride AND oxide) OR TiNO OR TNO OR BAS) AND stent) AND (DES OR*  
110 *(drug AND eluting AND stent)) AND (RCT OR ((randomized OR randomised) AND controlled*  
111 *AND trial))*. No exclusion filter was applied related to language, country, year, or any other  
112 aspect. The websites of AHA, TCT, ESC, EuroPCR, and clinicaltrials.gov were also searched.  
113 The queries were updated on July 22, 2020, when all initially identified RCTs were published to  
114 retrieve new evidence if any, from RCTs meeting the PICOS specifications of this SLR.  
115 The downloaded record files were imported and pooled and sifted in EndNote X8 (Clarivate  
116 Analytics, Philadelphia, PA, USA). One reference only was selected when duplicates were

117 identified. When different references concerned the same study, their information was pooled  
118 using the citation of the most recent one. Full articles were reviewed for all references.

119

## 120 **Study selection and Data extraction**

121 Two reviewers (FD and LL) performed independently the following steps: (1)Exhaustive  
122 reference screening, (2)Reference classification according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria,  
123 (3)Extraction of study methods, (4)Patient baseline data, (5)Treatment data and results of each  
124 eligible RCT, (6)Individual eligible RCT risk of bias rating, (7)Assessment of the certainty of the  
125 evidence for each outcome variable according to GRADE. The results were recorded in RevMan  
126 5.3 file.

127 Differences were adjudicated by a third reviewer (NM). The similarity of the definitions of  
128 endpoints across the RCTs was discussed with one investigator (PK). The risk of bias of  
129 individual RCTs was rated according to the criteria proposed by the Cochrane Collaboration with  
130 operator blinding as a separate item.

131 The screened studies were included if they met the following criteria: First-hand clinical  
132 evidence with prospective inclusion; patients with CAD treated with coronary PCI; implantation  
133 of either TiNOS or DES after the random allocation of the stent type; target outcomes reported at  
134 1-year and/or 5-year follow-up; the outcomes reported as the number of patients who were  
135 included along with the number or proportion of them who presented an event of interest.

136 Studies were ruled out if any of the study selection criteria were not met or if IRB/ethics  
137 committee approval and patient informed consent were not explicitly required.

138 The term ACS referred to patients who presented at baseline with ST-elevated myocardial  
139 infarction (STEMI), or non-ST-elevated myocardial infarction (NSTEMI), or unstable angina  
140 pectoris.

141 The definitions of outcomes aimed in this SLR protocol are those defined by the Academic  
142 Research Consortium (ARC).<sup>19</sup> Data extraction is stratified according to patient clinical  
143 presentation, i.e., ACS *versus* with other CAD.

144

#### 145 **Statistical analysis**

146 The two treatment arms are compared for each endpoint using the risk ratio (RR) defined as  $((n$   
147  $patients\ with\ an\ event\ in\ TiNOS)/(n\ patients\ in\ TiNOS))/((n\ patients\ with\ an\ event\ in\ DES)/(n$   
148  $patients\ in\ DES))$ . As a result,  $RR > 1$  reflects a higher frequency of events in the TiNOS arm

149 than in the DES arm and conversely. Outcomes are analyzed on an intention-to-treat (ITT) basis.

150 The numerator is the number of patients presenting an event and counted in the treatment arm  
151 they were randomized to and the denominator is the sample size of the corresponding arm.

152 For each endpoint, individual study RRs are calculated with their 95% confidence interval (CI  
153 [.,]) and their degree of heterogeneity is determined. If no significant heterogeneity is detected,  
154 the pooled RR is calculated with its CI using the M-H method with a fixed-effect model.<sup>16,20,21</sup>

155 In the case of significant heterogeneity, pooling uses the M-H method with a random-effects  
156 model. The pooled analysis is stratified according to baseline clinical presentation, ACS *versus*  
157 other CAD. One-year and 5-year outcomes are analyzed separately. Sensitivity analysis is  
158 performed by iteratively recalculating the pooled RR after removing one eligible RCT. As a  
159 result, the impact of each RCT on the pooled RR is estimated. It estimates the impact of

160 differences in stent generations and the potential risk of indirection related to differences in  
161 outcome definitions.

162

### 163 **Patient and public involvement**

164 No patient involved.

165

### 166 **Results**

#### 167 **Overall**

168 Study identification, screening, and selection are described in the PRISMA flowchart (Figure 1).

169 One hundred and eleven references were identified and nine publications with first-hand data  
170 about five RCTs are eligible for inclusion in the meta-analysis.

171 The number of patients with 1-year follow-up data is 1,855 in the TiNOS arm *versus* 1,363 in the  
172 DES arm. Those numbers are 783 *versus* 773 patients at 5-year follow-up. Three RCTs enrolled  
173 only patients presenting with ACS and two enrolled and analyzed jointly patients presenting with  
174 ACS and other CAD. TIDE enrolled 143 patients with ACS (47%) and TITANIC-XV, 112  
175 (64.7%). The baseline characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Funnel plots and Harbord tests  
176 did not detect a risk of publication bias concerning any of the endpoints at 1-year follow-up in all  
177 CAD (supplemental material).

178 Four RCTs report or enable to deduct the number of cases of clinically driven TLR, CD, non-  
179 fatal recurrent MI, and the composite of CD or any non-fatal MI extended or clinically driven  
180 TLR. This results in a modified device-oriented MACE where MI “not clearly attributable to a  
181 nontarget vessel” is replaced by any MI. Given fatal MIs are counted as CD, this modification  
182 adds non-fatal MI in nontarget vessels.



183 In one RCT (TITANIC-XV), the primary endpoint is estimated from the available data as the  
184 sum of CD, any non-fatal MI, and any TLR assuming no overlap between those variables.

185 The risk of bias in individual RCTs is rated moderate or low except for the operator's knowledge  
186 of the type of stent used during the intervention in all RCTs.

187 The pooled RRs of all outcomes at 1-year and 5-year follow-up are reported in Table 2 with CIs  
188 and sensitivity analyses. Results are reported overall and in the ACS subgroup. Given the 5-year  
189 follow-up of patients in the TIDES-ACS trial is ongoing, pooled RRs for 5-year outcomes are  
190 interim results.

191 The stratified (ACS relative to other CAD) pooled RRs of effectiveness endpoints show no  
192 significant difference in 1-year MACE and a significantly higher rate of TLR with TiNOS  
193 (Figure 2). The stratified stratified pooled RRs of safety endpoints show no significant difference  
194 in 1-year CD, but significantly lower rates in non-fatal, MI and ST with TiNOS compared to  
195 DES (Figure 3). The pooled RR of TD is also not significant (supplemental file).

196 The stratified pooled RRs analysis shows a much larger number of patients in the ACS subgroup  
197 compared to the other CAD subgroup (85.2% *versus* 14.8%). The overall effects are driven by  
198 the ACS subgroup. The results of the other CAD subgroup (TIDE and TITANIC-XV) are not  
199 interpretable because outcomes in patients with ACS are not reported separately. Therefore, the  
200 subsequent steps of this SLR are refocused on RCT about ACS only.

### 201 **ACS at 1-year follow-up**

202 The pooled RRs of effectiveness and safety endpoints in MACE are consistent with overall  
203 results but heterogeneity, robustness to sensitivity analysis (Table 2) and the level of certainty of

204 the underlying evidence according to GRADE (supplemental material) need to be assessed  
205 separately.

206 The RR of MACE presents no significant heterogeneity, is robust to sensitivity analysis, and the  
207 certainty of evidence is rated high. The RR of clinically driven TLR presents no significant  
208 heterogeneity but results are not robust to sensitivity analysis, and the certainty of the evidence is  
209 rated low.

210 The pooled RRs of CD and TD present significant heterogeneity, are not robust to sensitivity  
211 analysis, and the certainty of the evidence is rated very low.

212 The pooled RR of non-fatal MI presents no significant heterogeneity, is robust to sensitivity  
213 analysis, and the certainty of the evidence is rated moderate.

214 The pooled RR of probable or definite SE presents no significant heterogeneity, is robust to  
215 sensitivity analysis, and the certainty of the evidence is rated low.

216

## 217 **Discussion**

218 TIDE and TITANIC-XV enrolled 255 patients with ACS but their data are not reported  
219 separately from the other patients. The impact of not including them in the ACS subgroup is  
220 limited given they represent 7.9% of all patients with ACS. The modified definition of device-  
221 oriented MACE results in including non-fatal MIs from nontarget vessels. One can reasonably  
222 assume the index stent does not affect those events. Ninety non-fatal MIs are reported. Assuming  
223 half of them are related to nontarget vessels (i.e., 45 cases), proportionality with sample size  
224 would lead to 27 fewer cases with TiNOS and 18 with DES, which would result in an RR of 0.19  
225 [0.09, 0.42]. The inclusion of nontarget MIs thus results in a dilution that is favorable to DES. If  
226 the same numbers cases were removed from the count of MACE, the RR would be 0.98 [0.73,

227 1.30], which would not change the non-inferiority conclusion. The robustness to sensitivity  
228 analysis of the pooled RRs of MACE, MI, and ST in ACS, shows that the differences in DES  
229 generations, including the elution of paclitaxel and mTOR inhibitors do not significantly change  
230 those results. The interim 5-year pooled results will be updated when the final results of TIDES-  
231 ACS are published, but the current results are consistent with 1-year outcomes.

232

### 233 **Conclusions**

234 This systematic literature review shows that titanium-nitride oxide coated-coronary stents and  
235 drug-eluting stents have a similar risk of device-oriented major adverse cardiac events at one-  
236 year follow-up in patients with an acute coronary syndrome. This result is robust and the level of  
237 certainty of the evidence is high. It also shows a lower risk of recurrent myocardial infarction  
238 and stent thrombosis with titanium-nitride oxide coated-coronary stents than with drug-eluting  
239 stents with a potentially higher risk of target lesion revascularization. Interim five-year pooled  
240 outcomes are consistent with one-year outcomes. These results show that the titanium-nitride  
241 oxide coated-coronary stents are safe and effective in acute coronary syndrome at one-year  
242 follow-up.

243

244

245 **Table 1 Baseline characteristics**

Study	Age & prior events			Clinical presentation			Procedural data & medication			Attrition & cross-overs
		TiNOS	DES		TiNOS	DES		TiNOS	DES	
TITAX-AMI <sup>22,23</sup> [NCT00495664]	Patients n age prior MI prior PCI prior CABG	214 64±11 15% 10% 7%	211 64±11 9% 5% 6%	NSTEMI STEMI	61% 39%	54% 46%	stents in culprit lesion n TSL (mm) post-dilation procedural success DAPT 12-months	1.1±0.3 18.5±6.4 42% 99.5% 31%	1.1±0.4 19.2±7.2 35% 98.1% 65%	LFU 1y TiNOS: 0 DES: 0 5y TiNOS 3 DES: 7
TIDE <sup>24</sup> [NCT00492908]	Patients n age prior MI prior PCI prior CABG	152 65.9±9.0 27.6% 25.7% 7.9%	150 63.4±10.5 28.7% 21.3% 25.3% 2.7%	Stable CAD  NSTEMI  Unstable angina	57.9%  32.9% 9.2%	47.3%  42.0% 10.7%	stents in culprit lesion n TSL (mm) device success DAPT 12-months	1.28±0.55 19.3±11.1 93.0%	1.17±0.45 19.6±10.0 94.6%	LFU 1y TiNOS: 0 DES: 2 5y : N.R.
TITANIC-XV <sup>25</sup> [NCT01510509]	Patients n age prior MI prior PCI prior CABG	83 66.5±8.8 10.8% 8.4% 2.4%	90 64.5±10.1 15.6% 11.1% 2.2%	NST ACS  Deducted other CAD	69.9% 30.1%	60.0% 40.0%	stents in culprit lesion n TSL (mm) stent failure DAPT 12 months	1.1±0.3 18.72±8.20 N.R.	1.1±0.3 21.63±9.65 N.R.	N.R.
BASE-ACS <sup>26,27</sup> [NCT00819923]	patients age prior MI prior PCI prior CABG	417 63±12 13.4% 9.6% 4.8%	410 63±12 9.8% 10.5% 4.1%	NSTEMI STEMI Unstable angina	49.4% 38.8% 11.8%	45.6% 38.8% 15.6%	stents in culprit lesion n TSL (mm) post-dilation stent failure  DAPT : Aspirin : protocol indefinite, actual N.R. Clopidogrel: protocol 6 months, actual N.R.	1.15±0.38 20.8±9.4 42.2% 0.0%	1.14±0.36 20.6±8.2 43.9% 1.0%	LFU 1y TiNOS: 3 DES: 3 5y TiNOS 29 DES: 28
TIDES-ACS <sup>28,29</sup> [NCT02049229]	Patients n age prior MI prior PCI prior CABG	989 62.7±10. 7.6% 7.0% 0.6%	502 62.6±10.5 9.0% 6.6% 1.2%	NSTEMI STEMI	46.3% 44.9%	45.0% 47.6%	stents in culprit lesion n TSL (mm) post-dilation stent failure DAPT 12-months	1.13±0.38 20.5±7.8 33.0% 0.3% 80.3%	1.14±0.37 20.6±7.2 38.0% 1.0% 86.0%	LFU 1y TiNOS: 7 DES: 4

246

247

248 **Table 2 Pooled outcomes with sensitivity analysis**

Endpoint	M-H fixed effects RR & 95% CI after the removal of:					
	None: all RCTs included	TITAX-AMI	TIDE	TITANIC-XV	BASE-ACS	TIDES-ACS
<b>ALL CAD: ACS &amp; Other CAD – 1 year follow-up</b>						
MACE	1.01 [0.81, 1.26]	1.06 [0.83, 1.36]	0.96 [0.75, 1.23]	0.98 [0.78, 1.24]	0.99 [0.76, 1.29]	1.07 [0.82, 1.40]
CD or MI	0.55 [0.39, 0.77]	0.57 [0.39, 0.82]	0.52 [0.36, 0.74]	0.55 [0.39, 0.77]	0.53 [0.36, 0.79]	0.60 [0.40, 0.91]
Non-fatal MI	0.52 [0.36, 0.76]	0.51 [0.33, 0.78]	0.48 [0.31, 0.73]	0.52 [0.35, 0.76]	0.60 [0.38, 0.93]	0.51 [0.32, 0.82]
CD	0.66 [0.33, 1.31]	0.77 [0.37, 1.61]	0.66 [0.33, 1.31]	0.66 [0.33, 1.31]	0.30 [0.11, 0.81]	1.11 [0.43, 2.85]
Clinically driven TLR	1.62 [1.20, 2.18]	1.56 [1.13, 2.15]	1.60 [1.15, 2.24]	1.58 [1.16, 2.14]	1.74 [1.22, 2.47]	1.63 [1.14, 2.33]
Probable or definite ST	0.39 [0.22, 0.69]	0.46 [0.25, 0.84]	0.35 [0.20, 0.64]	0.39 [0.22, 0.69]	0.36 [0.18, 0.72]	0.38 [0.16, 0.87]
Definite ST	0.51 [0.26, 0.99]	0.49 [0.25, 0.97]	0.46 [0.23, 0.92]	0.51 [0.26, 0.99]	0.62 [0.29, 1.36]	0.52 [0.18, 1.44]
TD	0.78 [0.48, 1.27]	0.77 [0.46, 1.32]	0.78 [0.47, 1.27]	0.78 [0.48, 1.27]	0.49 [0.26, 0.95] <sup>b</sup>	1.22 [0.65, 2.28]
<b>ACS only – 1 year follow-up</b>						
MACE	0.93 [0.72, 1.20]	0.97 [0.73, 1.30]	N.A.	N.A.	0.86 [0.63, 1.19]	0.95 [0.68, 1.33]
CD or MI	0.52 [0.36, 0.75]	0.53 [0.35, 0.80]	N.A.	N.A.	0.48 [0.30, 0.75]	0.56 [0.35, 0.90]
Non-fatal MI	0.48 [0.31, 0.73]	0.45 [0.27, 0.74]	N.A.	N.A.	0.55 [0.33, 0.92]	0.44 [0.25, 0.77]
CD	0.66 [0.33, 1.31]	0.77 [0.37, 1.61]	N.A.	N.A.	0.30 [0.11, 0.81]	1.11 [0.43, 2.85]
Clinically driven TLR	1.55 [1.10, 2.19]	1.46 [0.99, 2.15]	N.A.	N.A.	1.69 [1.09, 2.63]	1.53 [0.97, 2.40]
Probable or definite ST	0.35 [0.20, 0.64]	0.42 [0.22, 0.78]	N.A.	N.A.	0.32 [0.15, 0.65]	0.31 [0.12, 0.77]
Definite ST	0.46 [0.23, 0.92]	0.43 [0.21, 0.89]	N.A.	N.A.	0.54 [0.24, 1.24]	0.39 [0.12, 1.25]
TD	0.78 [0.47, 1.27]	0.77 [0.45, 1.32]	N.A.	N.A.	0.47 [0.24, 0.93] <sup>b</sup>	1.23 [0.64, 2.35]
<b>ALL CAD: ACS &amp; Other CAD – 5 year follow-up - Interim Results</b>						
MACE	0.82 [0.66, 1.02]	0.91 [0.70, 1.19]	0.74 [0.58, 0.95] <sup>b</sup>	N.A.	0.83 [0.62, 1.10]	Expected
CD or MI	0.57 [0.42, 0.77]	0.67 [0.46, 0.97]	0.53 [0.38, 0.73]	N.A.	0.53 [0.35, 0.80]	Expected
Non-fatal MI	0.56 [0.39, 0.80]	0.59 [0.37, 0.92]	0.54 [0.37, 0.80]	N.A.	0.57 [0.35, 0.93]	Expected
CD	0.68 [0.39, 1.19]	0.93 [0.47, 1.82]	0.59 [0.31, 1.11]	N.A.	0.55 [0.25, 1.24]	Expected
Clinically driven TLR	1.01 [0.75, 1.35]	1.00 [0.71, 1.42]	0.94 [0.66, 1.32]	N.A.	1.13 [0.77, 1.66]	Expected
Probable or definite ST	0.30 [0.14, 0.61]	0.45 [0.19, 1.05]	0.25 [0.12, 0.55]	N.A.	0.22 [0.07, 0.70]	Expected
Definite ST	0.25 [0.11, 0.55]	0.37 [0.14, 0.99]	0.20 [0.09, 0.49]	N.A.	0.22 [0.07, 0.70]	Expected
TD	1.03 [0.74, 1.45]	1.14 [0.75, 1.73]	0.95 [0.65, 1.37]	N.A.	1.05 [0.65, 1.69]	Expected
<b>ACS only – 5 year follow-up - Interim Results</b>						
MACE <sup>a</sup>	0.74 [0.58, 0.95]	0.81 [0.59, 1.12] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	0.65 [0.44, 0.95] <sup>c</sup>	Expected
CD or MI	0.53 [0.38, 0.73]	0.61 [0.40, 0.95]	N.A.	N.A.	0.42 [0.25, 0.71]	Expected
Non-fatal MI	0.54 [0.37, 0.80]	0.56 [0.33, 0.94] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	0.53 [0.30, 0.94] <sup>c</sup>	Expected
CD	0.59 [0.31, 1.11]	0.83 [0.38, 1.84] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	0.33 [0.11, 1.00] <sup>c</sup>	Expected
Clinically driven TLR	0.94 [0.66, 1.32]	0.88 [0.56, 1.37] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	1.03 [0.60, 1.76] <sup>c</sup>	Expected
Probable or definite ST <sup>a</sup>	0.25 [0.12, 0.55]	0.37 [0.15, 0.93] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	0.13 [0.03, 0.57] <sup>c</sup>	Expected
Definite ST <sup>a</sup>	0.20 [0.09, 0.49]	0.28 [0.09, 0.85] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	0.13 [0.03, 0.57] <sup>c</sup>	Expected
TD	0.95 [0.65, 1.37]	1.02 [0.63, 1.65] <sup>c</sup>	N.A.	N.A.	0.85 [0.48, 1.53] <sup>c</sup>	Expected

<sup>a</sup>sensitivity analysis in ACS at 5-year follow-up results in the RR and confidence intervals of individual RCTs; <sup>b</sup>borderline shift with 3 or fewer RCTs contributing to the pooled estimate; <sup>c</sup>results based on a single-trial; N.A. Not applicable

249  
250

251

252 **Supplemental material:**

- 253 - Details of methods applied in this SLR.
- 254 - Methods of individual RCTs
- 255 - Table of the number of patients with events – ITT
- 256 - Funnel plots and results of Harbord tests.
- 257 - Summary of risk of bias in individual RCTs
- 258 - Pooled RR of CD or MI, and TD
- 259 - GRADE certainty of evidence assessment
- 260 - PRISMA checklist

261

262 **Contributors**

263 Frederic Daoud (FD): Main reviewer and meta-analyst with LL.

264 Louis Létinier (LL): Main reviewer and meta-analyst with with FD.

265 Nicholas Moore (NM): Third reviewer. Adjudicated disagreements.

266 Pierre Coste (PC): Advised on protocol and analysis.

267 Pasi Karjalainen (PK): Provided additional information about the methods of the individual  
268 trials.

269

270

271

272 **Funding**

273 This work was exclusively funded by the University of Bordeaux and INSERM BPH U1219,  
274 Bordeaux, France

275

276 **Data sharing statement**

277 All data included in this review are published.

278

279 **References**

- 280 1. Levine GN, Bates ER, Blankenship JC, Bailey SR, Bittl JA, Cercek B, Chambers CE, Ellis  
281 SG, Guyton RA, Hollenberg SM, Khot UN, Lange RA, Mauri L, Mehran R, Moussa ID,  
282 Mukherjee D, Ting H, O'Gara PT, Kushner FG, Ascheim DD, Brindis RG, Casey Jr DE 1 ,  
283 Chung MK, de Lemos JA, Diercks DB, Fang JC, Franklin BA, Granger CB, Krumholz HM,  
284 Linderbaum JA, Morrow DA, Newby LK, Ornato JP, Ou N, Radford MJ, Tamis-Holland JE,  
285 Tommaso CL, Tracy CM, Woo YJ, Zhao DX. 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI Guideline for  
286 Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: a report of the American College of Cardiology  
287 Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the Society for  
288 Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions. *Circulation*. 2011 Dec 6; 124(23):e574-651. doi:  
289 10.1161/CIR.0b013e31823ba622. Epub 2011 Nov 7. Erratum in: *Circulation*. 2012 Feb  
290 28;125(8):e412. Dosage error in article text. PMID: 22064601.
- 291 2. O'Gara PT, Kushner FG, Ascheim DD, Casey DE Jr, Chung MK, de Lemos JA, Ettinger SM,  
292 Fang JC, Fesmire FM, Franklin BA, Granger CB, Krumholz HM, Linderbaum JA, Morrow DA,  
293 Newby LK, Ornato JP, Ou N, Radford MJ, Tamis-Holland JE, Tommaso CL, Tracy CM, Woo  
294 YJ, Zhao DX, Anderson JL, Jacobs AK, Halperin JL, Albert NM, Brindis RG, Creager MA,  
295 DeMets D, Guyton RA, Hochman JS, Kovacs RJ, Kushner FG, Ohman EM, Stevenson WG,  
296 Yancy CW; American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task  
297 Force on Practice Guidelines.. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of ST-elevation  
298 myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American  
299 Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2013 Jan 29; 127(4):e362-  
300 425. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182742cf6. Epub 2012 Dec 17. Erratum in: *Circulation*. 2013  
301 Dec 24;128(25):e481. PMID: 23247304.
- 302 3. Task Force Members, Montalescot G, Sechtem U, Achenbach S, Andreotti F, Arden C, Budaj  
303 A, Bugiardini R, Crea F, Cuisset T, Di Mario C, Ferreira JR, Gersh BJ, Gitt AK, Hulot JS, Marx  
304 N, Opie LH, Pfisterer M, Prescott E, Ruschitzka F, Sabaté M, Senior R, Taggart DP, van der  
305 Wall EE, Vrints CJ; ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines, Zamorano JL, Achenbach S,  
306 Baumgartner H, Bax JJ, Bueno H, Dean V, Deaton C, Erol C, Fagard R, Ferrari R, Hasdai D,  
307 Hoes AW, Kirchhof P, Knuuti J, Kolh P, Lancellotti P, Linhart A, Nihoyannopoulos P, Piepoli  
308 MF, Ponikowski P, Sirnes PA, Tamargo JL, Tendera M, Torbicki A, Wijns W, Windecker S;  
309 Document Reviewers, Knuuti J, Valgimigli M, Bueno H, Claeys MJ, Donner-Banzhoff N, Erol  
310 C, Frank H, Funck-Brentano C, Gaemperli O, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR, Hamilos M, Hasdai D,  
311 Husted S, James SK, Kervinen K, Kolh P, Kristensen SD, Lancellotti P, Maggioni AP, Piepoli  
312 MF, Pries AR, Romeo F, Rydén L, Simoons ML, Sirnes PA, Steg PG, Timmis A, Wijns W,  
313 Windecker S, Yildirir A, Zamorano JL. 2013 ESC guidelines on the management of stable  
314 coronary artery disease: the Task Force on the management of stable coronary artery disease of  
315 the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur Heart J*. 2013; 34(38):2949–3003. doi:  
316 10.1093/eurheartj/eh296. Epub 2013 Aug 30. Erratum in: *Eur Heart J*. 2014 Sep 1;35(33):2260-  
317 1. PMID: 23996286.



318 4. Amsterdam EA, Wenger NK, Brindis RG, Casey DE Jr, Ganiats TG, Holmes DR Jr, Jaffe AS,  
319 Jneid H, Kelly RF, Kontos MC, Levine GN, Liebson PR, Mukherjee D, Peterson ED, Sabatine  
320 MS, Smalling RW, Zieman SJ; ACC/AHA Task Force Members; Society for Cardiovascular  
321 Angiography and Interventions and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons. 2014 AHA/ACC guideline  
322 for the management of patients with non-ST-elevation acute coronary syndromes: a report of the  
323 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice  
324 Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2014; 130(25):2354-2394. doi: 10.1161/CIR.000000000000133. Epub  
325 2014 Sep 23. Erratum in: *Circulation*. 2014 Dec 23;130(25):e431-2. Dosage error in article text.  
326 PMID: 25249586.

327 5. Collet J, Thiele H, Barbato E, Barthélémy O, Bauersachs J, Bhatt D, Dendale P, Dorobantu M,  
328 Edvardsen T, Folliguet T, Gale C, Gilard M, Jobs A, Jüni P, Lambrinou E, Lewis B, Mehilli J,  
329 Meliga E, Merkely B, Mueller C, Roffi M, Rutten F, Sibbing D, Siontis G, ESC Scientific  
330 Document Group. 2020 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes in  
331 patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation. *Eur Heart J*. 2020 Aug 29; ehaa575.  
332 doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa575. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 32860058.

333 6. Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, Antunes MJ, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, Bueno H, Caforio ALP,  
334 Crea F, Goudevenos JA, Halvorsen S, Hindricks G, Kastrati A, Lenzen MJ, Prescott E, Roffi M,  
335 Valgimigli M, Varenhorst C, Vranckx P, Widimský P; ESC Scientific Document Group. 2017  
336 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with  
337 ST-segment elevation: The Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in  
338 patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur*  
339 *Heart J*. 2018; 39(2):119-177. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehx393. PMID: 28886621.

340 8. Wessely R, Schömig A, Kastrati A. Sirolimus and Paclitaxel on polymer-based drug-eluting  
341 stents: similar but different. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2006; 47(4):708-714. doi:  
342 10.1016/j.jacc.2005.09.047. Epub 2006 Jan 26. PMID: 16487832.

343 8. Patterson C, Mapera S, Li HH, Madamanchi N, Hilliard E, Lineberger R, Herrmann R,  
344 Charles P. Comparative effects of paclitaxel and rapamycin on smooth muscle migration and  
345 survival: role of AKT-dependent signaling. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2006; 26(7):1473-  
346 1480. doi: 10.1161/01.ATV.0000223866.42883.3b. Epub 2006 Apr 27. PMID: 16645158.

347 9. Yazdani SK, Sheehy A, Pacetti S, Rittlemeier B, Kolodgie FD, Virmani R. Stent Coating  
348 Integrity of Durable and Biodegradable Coated Drug Eluting Stents. *J Interv Cardiol*. 2016;  
349 29(5):483-490. doi: 10.1111/joic.12303. Epub 2016 Jun 10. PMID: 27282892.

350 10. Costa F, Van Klaveren D, Feres F, James S, Räber L, Pilgrim T, Hong MK, Kim HS,  
351 Colombo A, Steg PG, Bhatt DL, Stone GW, Windecker S, Steyerberg EW, Valgimigli M;  
352 PRECISE-DAPT Study Investigators. Dual Antiplatelet Therapy Duration Based on Ischemic  
353 and Bleeding Risks After Coronary Stenting. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019; 73(7):741-754. doi:  
354 10.1016/j.jacc.2018.11.048. PMID: 30784667.

- 355 11. Saito Y, Kobayashi Y. Update on Antithrombotic Therapy after Percutaneous Coronary  
356 Intervention Intern Med. 2020; 59(3):311-321. doi: 10.2169/internalmedicine.3685-19. Epub  
357 2019 Oct 7. PMID: 31588089; PMCID: PMC7028427.
- 358 12. Windecker S, Mayer I, De Pasquale G, Maier W, Dirsch O, De Groot P, Wu YP, Noll G,  
359 Leskosek B, Meier B, Hess OM; Working Group on Novel Surface Coating of Biomedical  
360 Devices (SCOL). Stent coating with titanium-nitride-oxide for reduction of neointimal  
361 hyperplasia. *Circulation*. 2001; 104(8):928-933. doi: 10.1161/hc3401.093146. PMID: 11514381.
- 362 13. Ignarro LJ, Buga GM, Wei LH, Bauer PM, Wu G, del Soldato P. Role of the arginine-nitric  
363 oxide pathway in the regulation of vascular smooth muscle cell proliferation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*  
364 *U S A*. 2001; 98(7):4202-4208. doi: 10.1073/pnas.071054698. Epub 2001 Mar 20. PMID:  
365 11259671; PMCID: PMC31203.
- 366 14. Windecker S, Simon R, Lins M, Klauss V, Eberli FR, Roffi M, Pedrazzini G, Moccetti T,  
367 Wenaweser P, Togni M, Tüller D, Zbinden R, Seiler C, Mehilli J, Kastrati A, Meier B, Hess OM.  
368 Randomized comparison of a titanium-nitride-oxide-coated stent with a stainless steel stent for  
369 coronary revascularization: the TiNOX trial. *Circulation*. 2005; 111(20):2617-2622. doi:  
370 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.104.486647. Epub 2005 May 9. PMID: 15883209.
- 371 15. Huang X, Lin J, Demner-Fushman D. Evaluation of PICO as a knowledge representation for  
372 clinical questions. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*. 2006; 2006:359-363. PMID: 17238363; PMCID:  
373 PMC1839740.
- 374 16. Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*.  
375 [www.cochrane-handbook.org](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org), version 5.1.0 updated March 2011.
- 376 17. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, Clarke M,  
377 Devereaux PJ, Kleijnen J, Moher D. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews  
378 and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration.  
379 *BMJ*. 2009; 339:b2700. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700. PMID: 19622552; PMCID: PMC2714672.
- 380 18. Schünemann H, Brožek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A, editors. *GRADE handbook for grading*  
381 *quality of evidence and strength of recommendations*. Updated October 2013. The GRADE  
382 Working Group, 2013. Available from [guidelinedevelopment.org/handbook](http://guidelinedevelopment.org/handbook).
- 383 19. Garcia-Garcia HM, McFadden EP, Farb A, Mehran R, Stone GW, Spertus J, Onuma Y,  
384 Morel MA, van Es GA, Zuckerman B, Fearon WF, Taggart D, Kappetein AP, Krucoff MW,  
385 Vranckx P, Windecker S, Cutlip D, Serruys PW; Academic Research Consortium.. Standardized  
386 End Point Definitions for Coronary Intervention Trials: The Academic Research Consortium-2  
387 Consensus Document.. *Eur Heart J*. 2018 Jun 14;39(23):2392–2207. doi:  
388 10.1093/eurheartj/ehy223.; PMID: 29897428.

- 389 20. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*. 1986; 7(3):177-  
390 88. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2. PMID: 3802833.
- 391 21. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR. A basic introduction to fixed-effect  
392 and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2010; 1(2):97-111. doi:  
393 10.1002/jrsm.12. Epub 2010 Nov 21. PMID: 26061376.
- 394 22. Karjalainen PP, Ylitalo A, Niemelä M, Kervinen K, Mäkikallio T, Pietili M, Sia J,  
395 Tuomainen P, Nyman K, Airaksinen KE. Titanium-nitride-oxide coated stents versus paclitaxel-  
396 eluting stents in acute myocardial infarction: a 12-months follow-up report from the TITAX  
397 AMI trial. *EuroIntervention*. 2008; 4(2):234-241. doi: 10.4244/eijv4i2a42. PMID: 19110789.
- 398 23. Tuomainen PO, Ylitalo A, Niemelä M, Kervinen K, Pietilä M, Sia J, Nyman K, Nammas W,  
399 Airaksinen KE, Karjalainen PP. Five-year clinical outcome of titanium-nitride-oxide-coated  
400 bioactive stents versus paclitaxel-eluting stents in patients with acute myocardial infarction:  
401 long-term follow-up from the TITAX AMI trial. *Int J Cardiol*. 2013; 168(2):1214-1219. doi:  
402 10.1016/j.ijcard.2012.11.060. Epub 2012 Dec 3. PMID: 23218575.
- 403 24. Pilgrim T, Räber L, Limacher A, Löffel L, Wenaweser P, Cook S, Stauffer JC, Togni M,  
404 Vogel R, Garachemani A, Moschovitis A, Khattab AA, Seiler C, Meier B, Jüni P, Windecker S.  
405 Comparison of titanium-nitride-oxide-coated stents with zotarolimus-eluting stents for coronary  
406 revascularization a randomized controlled trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv*. 2011; 4(6):672-682.  
407 doi: 10.1016/j.jcin.2011.02.017. PMID: 21700254.
- 408 25. López-Mínguez JR, Nogales-Asensio JM, Doncel-Vecino LJ, Merchán-Herrera A, Pomar-  
409 Domingo F, Martínez-Romero P, Fernández-Díaz JA, Valdesuso-Aguilar R, Moreu-Burgos J,  
410 Díaz-Fernández J; members of the TITANIC XV Working Group. A randomized study to  
411 compare bioactive titanium stents and everolimus-eluting stents in diabetic patients (TITANIC  
412 XV): 1-year results. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*. 2014; 67(7):522-530. doi:  
413 10.1016/j.rec.2013.10.021. Epub 2014 Apr 3. PMID: 24952391.
- 414 26. Karjalainen PP, Nammas W, Ylitalo A, de Bruyne B, Lalmand J, de Belder A, Rivero-Crespo  
415 F, Kervinen K, Airaksinen JKE. Long-term clinical outcome of titanium-nitride-oxide-coated  
416 stents versus everolimus-eluting stents in acute coronary syndrome: Final report of the BASE  
417 ACS trial. *Int J Cardiol*. 2016; 222:275-280. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.07.267. Epub 2016 Aug  
418 1. PMID: 27497110.
- 419 27. Karjalainen PP, Niemelä M, Airaksinen JK, Rivero-Crespo F, Romppanen H, Sia J, Lalmand  
420 J, de Bruyne B, Debelder A, Carlier M, Nammas W, Ylitalo A, Hess OM; BACE-ACS study  
421 investigators. A prospective randomised comparison of titanium-nitride-oxide-coated bioactive  
422 stents with everolimus-eluting stents in acute coronary syndrome: the BASE-ACS trial.  
423 *EuroIntervention*. 2012; 8(3):306-315. doi: 10.4244/EIJV8I3A49. PMID: 22829506.

- 424 28. Colkesen EB, Eefting FD, Rensing BJ, Suttorp MJ, Ten Berg JM, Karjalainen PP, Van Der  
425 Heyden JA. TIDES-ACS Trial: comparison of titanium-nitride-oxide coated bio-active-stent to  
426 the drug (everolimus)-eluting stent in acute coronary syndrome. Study design and objectives.  
427 *Minerva Cardioangiol.* 2015; 63(1):21-29. PMID: 25670057.
- 428 29. Tonino PAL, Pijls NHJ, Collet C, Nmmas W, Van der Heyden J, Romppanen H, Kervinen  
429 K, Airaksinen JKE, Sia J, Lalmand J, Frambach P, Penaranda AS, De Bruyne B, Karjalainen PP;  
430 TIDES-ACS Study Group. Titanium-Nitride-Oxide-Coated Versus Everolimus-Eluting Stents in  
431 Acute Coronary Syndrome: The Randomized TIDES-ACS Trial. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2020;  
432 13(14):1697-1705. doi: 10.1016/j.jcin.2020.04.021. PMID: 32703593.
- 433 30. Savović J, Weeks L, Sterne JA, Turner L, Altman DG, Moher D, Higgins JP. Evaluation of  
434 the Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing the risk of bias in randomized trials: focus  
435 groups, online survey, proposed recommendations and their implementation. *Syst Rev.* 2014;  
436 3:37. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-3-37. PMID: 24731537; PMCID: PMC4022341.
- 437 31. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ;  
438 GRADE Working Group. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and  
439 strength of recommendations. *BMJ.* 2008; 336(7650):924-926. doi:  
440 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD. PMID: 18436948; PMCID: PMC2335261.
- 441 32. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Rind D, Devreux PJ,  
442 Montori VM, Freyschuss B, Vist G, Jaeschke R, Williams JW Jr, Murad MH, Sinclair D, Falck-  
443 Ytter Y, Meerpohl J, Whittington C, Thorlund K, Andrews J, Schünemann HJ. GRADE  
444 guidelines 6. Rating the quality of evidence--imprecision. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011; 64(12):1283-  
445 1293. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.01.012. Epub 2011 Aug 11. PMID: 21839614.
- 446 33. GRADEpro GDT: GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool [Software]. McMaster  
447 University, 2015 (developed by Evidence Prime, Inc.). Available from <https://gdt.gradepro.org>
- 448 34. Pogue JM, Yusuf S. Cumulating evidence from randomized trials: utilizing sequential  
449 monitoring boundaries for cumulative meta-analysis. *Control Clin Trials.* 1997; 18(6):580-593;  
450 discussion 661-6. doi: 10.1016/s0197-2456(97)00051-2. PMID: 9408720.
- 451 35. Seeger P, Gabrielsson A. Applicability of the Cochran Q test and the F test for statistical  
452 analysis of dichotomous data for dependent samples. *Psychol Bull.* 1968; 69(4):269-277. doi:  
453 10.1037/h0025667. PMID: 5659656.
- 454 36. Gavaghan DJ, Moore RA, McQuay HJ. An evaluation of homogeneity tests in meta-analyses  
455 in pain using simulations of individual patient data. *Pain.* 2000; 85(3):415-424. doi:  
456 10.1016/s0304-3959(99)00302-4. PMID: 10781914.
- 457 37. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med.* 2002;  
458 21(11):1539-1558. doi: 10.1002/sim.1186. PMID: 12111919.

- 459 38. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-  
460 analyses. *BMJ*. 2003; 327(7414):557-560. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557. PMID: 12958120;  
461 PMCID: PMC192859.
- 462 39. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a  
463 simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997; 315(7109):629-634. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629. PMID:  
464 9310563; PMCID: PMC2127453.
- 465 40. Egger M, Smith GD. Bias in location and selection of studies. *BMJ*. 1998; 316(7124):61-66.  
466 doi: 10.1136/bmj.316.7124.61. PMID: 9451274; PMCID: PMC2665334.
- 467 41. Sterne JAC, Egger M, Davey Smith G. Investigating and dealing with publication and other  
468 biases. In: Egger M, Davey Smith G, Altman DG (eds). *Systematic Reviews in Health Care:  
469 Meta-Analysis in Context*. London: BMJ Publishing Group, 2001:189-208.
- 470 42. Harbord RM, Egger M, Sterne JA. A modified test for small-study effects in meta-analyses  
471 of controlled trials with binary endpoints. *Stat Med*. 2006; 25(20):3443-3457. doi:  
472 10.1002/sim.2380. PMID: 16345038.
- 473

474

475 **Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart**

476 **Figure 2 Effectiveness endpoints**

477 **Figure 3 Safety endpoints**







