



## 25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** Multiple sclerosis is a chronic disease of the central nervous system  
27 characterized by autoimmune demyelination. Various immunomodulatory medications  
28 are available for its treatment, among which anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies have  
29 demonstrated superior efficacy compared to other disease-modifying therapies.

30 However, there is a lack of direct comparison between the four available anti-CD20  
31 monoclonal antibodies. Therefore, this study aims to systematically assess the relative  
32 efficacy and safety of anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies for treating relapsing multiple  
33 sclerosis.

34 **Materials and Methods:** We will conduct a systematic review of phase IIb and phase  
35 III clinical trials of anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies for the treatment of relapsing  
36 multiple sclerosis, following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and  
37 Meta-Analysis guidelines. A comprehensive review of the Cochrane Central Register of  
38 Controlled Trials; MEDLINE; Embase; ClinicalTrials; International Clinical Trials  
39 Registry Platform; OpenGray; and MedRxiv will be performed. Two independent  
40 reviewers will select titles, abstracts, and eligible full texts to execute the data  
41 extraction. The risk of bias will be assessed with the Cochrane RoB 2 tool. Data on pre-  
42 specified outcomes will be analyzed for the selected articles using a random-effects  
43 network meta-analysis with a frequentist framework. Summary statistics, along with  
44 95% confidence intervals will be presented, and the effectiveness and safety of each  
45 intervention will be ranked using the surface under the cumulative ranking curve. A  
46 missing data and a sensitivity analysis will be conducted. We will use the GRADE  
47 approach to assess the certainty of the direct, indirect, and network estimate for all  
48 outcomes.

49 **Results and Conclusion:** The results will provide evidence of the relative efficacy and  
50 safety of anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies for the treatment of relapsing multiple  
51 sclerosis.

52 **Systematic review registration:** PROSPERO registration number CRD42023437996

## 53 **Introduction**

54 Multiple sclerosis (MS) is a chronic inflammatory disease of the central nervous system  
55 (CNS) that affects millions of people worldwide [1,2]. MS is characterized by the loss  
56 of myelin, which leads to impaired nerve function and disability. Demyelination was  
57 traditionally considered to be caused by autoreactive T lymphocytes [3], but the role of  
58 B lymphocytes in the MS pathogenesis has been increasingly recognized during the last  
59 two decades [4]. As a result, B cell depleting anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies have  
60 emerged as promising disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) for MS [5–8]. Early phase 1  
61 and phase 2 trials showed reduction in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) activity (in  
62 the form of new/enlarging FLAIR/T2 lesions and gadolinium-enhancing [Gd+] lesions)  
63 and a discrete reduction in the long-term clinical outcome in people with inflammatory  
64 activity in MRI after treatment with rituximab [9,10].

65

66 Three new anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies have been approved by regulatory  
67 agencies for the use in relapsing-remitting MS (ocrelizumab, ofatumumab and  
68 ublituximab), and primary progressive MS (ocrelizumab). All three have been studied in  
69 phase 3 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) [11–14]. These have had active comparator  
70 and placebo arms and have shown to be effective in reducing the disease relapsing rates.  
71 but, to our knowledge, no direct comparison between each other, or with rituximab has  
72 been published. As a result, to date it is not clear whether the anti-CD20 are similar in  
73 their beneficial effects and potential harms. Since head-to-head RCTs comparing the  
74 interventions among them may take years if not decades, the alternative is to conduct  
75 evidence synthesis methods that allow us to estimate the relative efficacy using indirect  
76 evidence in the cases when direct evidence is not available.

## 77 **Materials and Methods**

### 78 **Study registration**

79 This protocol is reported in accordance to the Preferred Reporting Items for Meta-  
80 Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines (S1 Table) [15] and has been registered in  
81 the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO)  
82 (registration number CRD42023437996).

83

### 84 **Objective**

85 Assess the comparative efficacy, safety, and tolerability of anti-CD20 monoclonal  
86 antibodies for treating relapsing MS, through a systematic review and network meta-  
87 analysis (NMA).

88

### 89 **Eligibility criteria**

#### 90 **Type of studies and participants**

91 We will include phase 2b and phase 3 placebo-controlled, and active-comparator RCTs.  
92 Active comparators will include any other anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody or any other  
93 DMT, such as, but not restricted to: alemtuzumab, cladribine, dimethyl fumarate,  
94 fingolimod, glatiramer acetate, interferon beta-1a, interferon beta-1b, pegylated  
95 interferon beta-1a, natalizumab, ozanimod, siponimod, and teriflunomide. Patients 18  
96 years of age and older with MS confirmed with 2010 or 2017 McDonald criteria  
97 [16,17], and with a relapsing-remitting course according to the current classification  
98 will be included [18]. Studies published in English or Spanish will be included, with no  
99 restriction regarding the year of publication. Quasi-randomized, open-label, cluster and  
100 cross-over trials will not be included.

101

## 102 **Type of interventions**

103 The interventions to be assessed are anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies (ocrelizumab,  
104 ofatumumab, rituximab, ublituximab) irrespective of dose, dosage form, route of  
105 administration, administration frequency, duration of treatment, and previous exposure  
106 to any active interventions.

107

## 108 **Type of outcomes**

109 Considering the prioritized outcomes suggested by the MS Core Outcome Set [19], the  
110 primary efficacy outcome will be the annualized relapse rate (ARR) defined as the  
111 number of confirmed relapses of multiple sclerosis per participant-year. The secondary  
112 efficacy outcomes will be the proportion of patients with disability progression  
113 confirmed at 12 week- and 24 week- (confirmed disability progression defined as an  
114 increase from the baseline EDSS [Expanded Disability Status Scale] score of at least 1.0  
115 point or 0.5 points if the baseline EDSS score was >5.5) [20], and the number of Gd+  
116 lesions and the new/enlarging FLAIR/T2 lesions.

117 The primary safety outcome will be the proportion of patients with any adverse event  
118 (AE) as defined by the study authors. The proportion of patients with serious adverse  
119 events (SAE) and infusion-related reactions will be considered as secondary safety  
120 outcomes.

121

## 122 **Information sources and search strategy**

### 123 **Data sources and search strategy**

124 We will search the following databases from their inception: Cochrane Central Register  
125 of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, Embase, ClinicalTrials (<https://clinicaltrials.gov>),

126 International Clinical Trials Registry Platform ([https://www.who.int/clinical-trials-](https://www.who.int/clinical-trials-registry-platform/the-ictrp-search-portal)  
 127 [registry-platform/the-ictrp-search-portal](https://www.who.int/clinical-trials-registry-platform/the-ictrp-search-portal)) , OpenGray  
 128 (<https://easy.dans.knaw.nl/ui/home>), and MedRxiv (<https://www.medrxiv.org>). We will  
 129 also review the reference lists of included studies and relevant reviews for additional  
 130 studies not included after the main searches.

131

132 To build the search strategy a list of MeSH terms and keywords related to “anti-CD20”,  
 133 “Antibodies, Monoclonal”, “drug-modifying therapy”, “multiple sclerosis”, “Multiple  
 134 Sclerosis, Relapsing-Remitting”, “ocrelizumab”, “ofatumumab”, “rituximab” and  
 135 “ublituximab” will be considered. We will use the validated RCT filter created by the  
 136 McMaster University Health Information Research Unit for MEDLINE and Embase  
 137 through the Ovid platform. These filter provide a good balance between sensitivity and  
 138 specificity [21].

139

140 The preliminary and the final search strategy will be based on the recommendations  
 141 provided by the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [22],  
 142 tailored to be specific for each database. A draft of the MEDLINE search strategy is  
 143 shown in Table 1. We will export all the searches results to Mendeley® version 1.19.8  
 144 and will remove duplicates.

145

146 **Table 1. Draft of search strategy in MEDLINE (via Ovid)**

Search	Terms
1	exp Multiple Sclerosis/ or Multiple Sclerosis.mp. or (exp Multiple Sclerosis, Relapsing-Remitting/ or Multiple Sclerosis, Relapsing-Remitting.mp.)
2	(multiple sclerosis and (relapsing-remitting or relapsing remitting)).tw.

3	1 or 2
4	exp Antibodies, Monoclonal/ or Antibodies, Monoclonal.mp. or (exp Rituximab/ or Rituximab.mp.)
5	(monoclonal antibod* or antiCD20 or anti CD20 or anti-CD20 or rituximab or ocrelizumab or ofatumumab or ublituximab).tw.
6	4 or 5
7	3 and 6
8	randomized controlled trial.pt.
9	randomized.mp.
10	placebo.mp.
11	8 or 9 or 10
12	7 and 11

147

## 148 **Selection process, data collection and management**

### 149 **Study selection**

150 Two independent reviewers (CEN, JM) will independently and in duplicate screen all the  
151 retrieved titles and abstracts to determine their eligibility according to a prespecified and  
152 piloted screening format. We will retrieve the full-text references of studies that at least  
153 one review author considers to be eligible during the screening. The full-text records  
154 will then be reviewed to determine the eligibility criteria using a prespecified and  
155 piloted screening format. Disagreements between the reviewers will be resolved by  
156 consensus. In the event of persistence of discrepancy between the two reviewers a third  
157 evaluator will determine the eligibility (IDF). We will report a PRISMA flow diagram  
158 of included and excluded articles [23]. The “*Characteristics of excluded studies*”  
159 section will detail the primary reason for exclusions.



160

## 161 **Data extraction**

162 Two authors (CEN, JM) will extract data from the eligible studies using a standardized  
163 data extraction form independently and in duplicate. This will include 1) characteristics  
164 of the study: trial registry ID number, first author, year of publication, single or  
165 multicenter study, study design, inclusion/exclusion criteria, sample size per arm,  
166 recruitment and sampling procedures used, enrolment start and end dates, length of  
167 participant follow-up, methods used to prevent and control for confounding, source(s)  
168 of funding, authors' financial relationship and other potential conflicts of interest; 2)  
169 characteristics of participants: age in years, sex, time since symptom onset, disease  
170 duration, disability measured by EDSS, pre-intervention mean number of relapses,  
171 mean baseline number of FLAIR/T2 and Gd+ T1 lesions, previous DMT used; 3)  
172 details of the intervention and comparator: intervention, dose, formulation, frequency  
173 and mode of application, duration of administration; and 4) outcome results: outcome,  
174 timing of outcome measurements, number of participants randomly assigned and  
175 included in the analysis, number of participants who withdrew, were lost to follow-up or  
176 were excluded, number of any adverse event occurred, number of serious adverse events  
177 and number of infusion-related reactions. For dichotomous outcomes we will extract the  
178 number of events and number of participants randomized and for continuous outcomes,  
179 the mean and standard deviations (SD) per arm.

180

## 181 **Risk of bias assessment**

182 Two independent reviewers (CEN, JM) will assess the risk of bias in duplicate of the  
183 included studies using the Cochrane RoB 2 tool [24] , which includes the following  
184 domains: bias arising from the randomization process, bias due to deviations from

185 intended interventions, bias due to missing outcome data, bias in the measurement of  
186 the outcome; and bias in the selection of the reported result. For each domain, we will  
187 reach a risk of bias judgment, assigning one of three levels to each domain: low risk of  
188 bias; some concerns; or high risk of bias. The overall risk of bias domain will be  
189 classified as: ‘low risk of bias’ when all domains are judged as low risk, ‘some  
190 concerns’ when at least one domain is some concern but was not high risk for any  
191 domain and ‘high risk’ if at least one domain was high risk or if multiple domains were  
192 judged as some concerns [24]. Any discrepancies will be resolved through discussion or  
193 by a third reviewer (IDF). Studies will not be excluded based on the risk of bias  
194 assessments, but we will conduct sensitivity analyses to explore the potential effects of  
195 high risk of bias in the meta-analyses. Industry funding will be considered as a potential  
196 source of bias [25].

197

## 198 **Data synthesis**

199 We will summarize trial and population characteristics, using descriptive statistics. For  
200 each separate outcome, we will present a network plot of available trial data to be  
201 included in the analysis. Network nodes will represent interventions compared within  
202 trials and edges will represent trials directly comparing the corresponding interventions.  
203 We are primarily interested in the following nodes: rituximab, ocrelizumab,  
204 ofatumumab and ublituximab. We anticipate some degree of variability in the way in  
205 which the interventions are administered. Namely, some interventions may have been  
206 evaluated at different doses and regimens of administration. Therefore, if we identify  
207 heterogeneity at the pairwise comparisons levels and this seems to be related to  
208 differences in the doses or methods of administration, we will split some interventions  
209 into two or more nodes to represent these differences. The size of each node will be

210 proportional to the number of participants in the underlying intervention, and each line  
211 edges will be weighted according to the number of studies comparing the interventions  
212 it connects. To identify the most influential comparisons in the network, we will present  
213 the contribution matrix describing the contribution of each direct estimate to the entire  
214 network of trials [26].

215

## 216 **Statistical analysis**

217 We will conduct a network meta-analysis (NMA) using a frequentist framework. We  
218 will use a random-effects model to estimate the treatment effect for each drug compared  
219 to placebo and with other DMT [27,28]. We will also compare the efficacy and safety of  
220 each drug to each other using a network meta-analysis (NMA) using multivariate  
221 distributions to allow for the simultaneous analysis of multiple interventions and  
222 account for correlations induced by multi-arm trials [29]. We will calculate odds ratio  
223 (OR) for dichotomous outcomes and mean differences (MD) or standardized mean  
224 differences (SMD) for continuous outcomes, both with their corresponding 95%  
225 confidence intervals (95% CIs). If a study does not provide enough data for conducting  
226 the statistical analysis, we will try contacting the study authors. If this is not feasible, or  
227 we do not obtain any response from them, and the required data is crucial for the  
228 analysis (eg, mean results for continuous outcomes) we will exclude the study from the  
229 pooled data and present the information narratively. In case authors provide variability  
230 measures in a different format (eg, standard error, or 95%CI), we will follow the  
231 recommendations by the Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews to estimate the  
232 required standard deviation [22]. When studies report median and ranges or interquartile  
233 ranges, we will use the methods by Wan to estimate the best mean and SD [30].

234

## 235 **Pairwise meta-analysis**

236 We will conduct pairwise meta-analysis of the available direct comparisons. We will  
237 conduct an inverse variance random-effects meta-analysis to estimate overall effect  
238 using OR for dichotomous data and MD or SMD for continuous outcomes. We will  
239 assess heterogeneity by visually comparing clinical and methodological characteristics  
240 of the included studies and by visual inspection of study effect sizes and their variation  
241 in the forest plots. We will also calculate the Chi square test for heterogeneity, and the  $I^2$   
242 statistic. We will consider an  $I^2$  value  $>50\%$  to be indicative of substantial heterogeneity  
243 [31]. We will perform subgroup or sensitivity analyses to explore the potential reasons  
244 behind substantial or considerable heterogeneity, namely, the potential effect modifiers.

245

246 *A priori*, we have identified the following variables might be effect modifiers: age,  
247 relapses in the 12 months prior to randomization, disease severity according to EDSS,  
248 presence of GD+ lesions in MRI, and previous use of other DMT. We hypothesize that  
249 patients with younger age, high number of relapses at baseline, milder disability, the  
250 presence of Gd+ lesions and no prior treatment show larger effect. To assess the  
251 credibility of an apparent effect modification, we will use the Instrument for assessing  
252 the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) [32].

253

## 254 **Network meta-analysis**

255 We will conduct an inverse variance random-effects meta-analysis to estimate overall  
256 effect sizes, that is respectively ORs or MDs/SMDs for dichotomous or continuous  
257 outcomes, along with their corresponding 95% CIs, under the assumption that different  
258 trials are estimating different but related true effects. We will use the Hartung-Knapp-  
259 Sidik-Jonkman method to calculate a 95% CI for the overall effect size to handle meta-

260 analyses with a small number of studies [33]. We will rank the drugs according to their  
261 efficacy and safety based on P-scores.

262

263 For a connected network of trials, we will conduct a random-effects NMA [34] , if we  
264 consider that the assumptions of transitivity and consistency are justifiable. For  
265 transitivity, we are assuming that participants are equally likely to be randomized to any  
266 of the included interventions and that trials are sufficiently similar across comparisons  
267 with respect to their effect modifiers distribution. We will consider the same effect  
268 modifiers described above as potential causes of heterogeneity. To explore variability in  
269 intervention definitions, we will split them into separate nodes according to the doses  
270 administered in the included trials.

271

272 The statistical manifestation of intransitivity can create inconsistency between direct  
273 and indirect evidence. We will assess consistency within each network using both  
274 global and local statistical approaches. We will evaluate each network using the design-  
275 by-treatment interaction test, and accounting for multiple sources of inconsistency due  
276 to disagreements in trials with different designs [35–37]. We will also evaluate  
277 consistency in each loop of interventions in each network using the loop-specific  
278 approach, and between each direct and indirect evidence using the node-splitting  
279 approach [38,39]. We will plot all consistency estimates and their 95%CIs to make  
280 inferences about the presence of inconsistency locally in the network.

281

## 282 **Missing data and sensitivity analysis**

283 We will conduct sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our findings for the  
284 primary outcomes. First, we will conduct an analysis by excluding studies with an

285 overall high risk of bias. If the results are very different from the analyses including all  
286 studies, we will prioritize the results obtained from the studies with 'low risk' and 'some  
287 concerns' analyses for our primary findings. Second, we will perform an analysis  
288 excluding trials for which we imputed data. Lastly, we will perform an analysis using  
289 the intention to treat denominators, in the case of trials that had data imputed. In case of  
290 missing participant data, we will capture the type of data imputation used by the trial  
291 authors in our extraction form, to assess the appropriateness of the data imputation  
292 method. For missing outcome data, we will try to contact authors for more information.  
293 If the trial authors do not respond, we will consider alternatives such as imputation  
294 approaches. If the missing data from the studies are significant, we will consider this in  
295 the 'Bias due to missing outcome data' criterion of the RoB 2 assessment.

296

297 We will use comparison-adjusted funnel plots to assess the likelihood of reporting bias  
298 and small-study effects for the NMA when at least 10 studies per outcome are available  
299 [40–42]. In the case of funnel plot asymmetry, we will explore possible sources of it,  
300 including poor methodological quality in smaller trials, true heterogeneity, non-  
301 reporting biases, and baseline risk differences.

302

303 In the cases in which the key assumptions are not met (transitivity and consistency), we  
304 will provide only pairwise estimates and a narrative description of the results. We will  
305 use R software version 4.3.2 (The R Foundation, Wien, Austria) for the analyses.

306

307 **Summary of findings and assessment of the certainty of the**  
308 **evidence**

309 We will use the GRADE approach to assess the certainty of the direct, indirect, and  
310 network estimate for all outcomes. Two review authors (CEN, JM) will independently  
311 assess the certainty of the evidence for each outcome. Where necessary, we will resolve  
312 any disagreements between authors through discussion or by consultation with a third  
313 review author (IDF).

314

315 For the direct evidence, the assessment starts by considering evidence from RCTs to be  
316 of high certainty, and the body of summarized evidence is assessed against five criteria:  
317 study limitations (risk of bias) [43], inconsistency [44], indirectness [45] imprecision  
318 [46], and publication bias [47]. For the “study limitations” criterion, we will use the  
319 overall risk of bias assessment judgment obtained from the RoB 2 tool [24]. For the  
320 specific NMA GRADE assessment we will use the specific approach that considers  
321 intransitivity [48] and incoherence criteria [49] and we will apply the approach to draw  
322 conclusions from the NMA using a minimally-contextualized framework [50].

323

## 324 **Ethical consideration**

325 This study does not require ethical approval as it is a secondary analysis of published  
326 data. We will disseminate the results of this study through publication in a peer-  
327 reviewed journal and presentation at relevant conferences.

## 328 **Discussion and conclusion**

329 This protocol outlines a network meta-analysis comparing the efficacy and safety of  
330 anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies for treating relapsing multiple sclerosis.

331

332 Anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies have shown remarkable results in terms of efficacy  
333 for treating MS, which has led to their inclusion in an application to the World Health  
334 Organization essential medicines list [51]. However, their relative efficacy between  
335 them has not been assessed in controlled trials to date. Several RCTs aiming to  
336 demonstrate the non-inferiority of rituximab in comparison to ocrelizumab are  
337 underway [52–55], but results are expected for 2025 at the earliest. Further, to the best  
338 of our knowledge there are no studies underway comparing the efficacy of the newer  
339 anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies. Therefore, the results of this study will provide  
340 valuable information to guide clinical decision-making, to inform future research in this  
341 area, and to develop new health economic evaluations related to these DMTs [56].

342

343 We expect difficulties for the completion of this study, for we anticipate that we will  
344 find a limited number of RCTs, with high heterogeneity which probably will affect the  
345 results of the meta-analysis.



## 346 **References**

- 347 1. Filippi M, Bar-Or A, Piehl F, Preziosa P, Solari A, Vukusic S, et al. Multiple  
348 sclerosis. *Nat Rev Dis Prim.* 2018;4: 43. doi:10.1038/s41572-018-0041-4
- 349 2. Walton C, King R, Rechtman L, Kaye W, Leray E, Marrie RA, et al. Rising  
350 prevalence of multiple sclerosis worldwide: Insights from the Atlas of MS, third  
351 edition. *Mult Scler J.* 2020;26: 1816–1821. doi:10.1177/1352458520970841
- 352 3. Frohman EM, Racke MK, Raine CS. Multiple sclerosis - The plaque and its  
353 pathogenesis. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354: 942–955. doi:10.1056/NEJMra052130
- 354 4. von Büdingen H-C, Palanichamy A, Lehmann-Horn K, Michel BA, Zamvil SS.  
355 Update on the autoimmune pathology of multiple sclerosis: B-cells as disease-  
356 drivers and therapeutic targets. *Eur Neurol.* 2015;73: 238–246.  
357 doi:10.1159/000377675
- 358 5. Xu X, Chi S, Wang Q, Li C, Xu B, Zhang J, et al. Efficacy and safety of  
359 monoclonal antibody therapies for relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis: A  
360 network meta-analysis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2018;25: 322–328.  
361 doi:10.1016/j.msard.2018.08.026
- 362 6. Filippini G, Kruja J, Del Giovane C. Rituximab for people with multiple  
363 sclerosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2021;11: CD013874.  
364 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013874.pub2
- 365 7. Huygens S, Versteegh M. Modeling the cost-utility of treatment sequences for  
366 multiple sclerosis. *Value Heal.* 2021;24: 1612–1619.  
367 doi:10.1016/j.jval.2021.05.020
- 368 8. Chen C, Zhang E, Zhu C, Wei R, Ma L, Dong X, et al. Comparative efficacy and  
369 safety of disease-modifying therapies in patients with relapsing multiple  
370 sclerosis: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *J Am Pharm Assoc.*

- 371 2023;63: 8-22.e23. doi:10.1016/j.japh.2022.07.009
- 372 9. Bar-Or A, Calabresi PAJ, Arnold D, Markowitz C, Shafer S, Kasper LH, et al.  
373 Rituximab in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol.* 2008;63: 395–  
374 400. doi:10.1002/ana.21363
- 375 10. Hauser SL, Waubant E, Arnold DL, Vollmer T, Antel J, Fox RJ, et al. B-cell  
376 depletion with rituximab in relapsing–remitting multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.*  
377 2008;358: 676–688. doi:10.1056/nejmoa0706383
- 378 11. Montalban X, Hauser SL, Kappos L, Arnold DL, Bar-Or A, Comi G, et al.  
379 Ocrelizumab versus placebo in primary progressive multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J*  
380 *Med.* 2017;376: 209–220. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1606468
- 381 12. Hauser SL, Bar-Or A, Comi G, Giovannoni G, Hartung H-P, Hemmer B, et al.  
382 Ocrelizumab versus interferon beta-1a in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J*  
383 *Med.* 2017;376: 221–234. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1601277
- 384 13. Hauser SL, Bar-Or A, Cohen JA, Comi G, Correale J, Coyle PK, et al.  
385 Ofatumumab versus teriflunomide in multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;383:  
386 546–557. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1917246
- 387 14. Steinman L, Fox E, Hartung H-P, Alvarez E, Qian P, Wray S, et al. Ublituximab  
388 versus teriflunomide in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* 2022;387:  
389 704–714. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2201904
- 390 15. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al.  
391 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols  
392 (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4: 1–9. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- 393 16. Polman CH, Reingold SC, Banwell B, Clanet M, Cohen JA, Filippi M, et al.  
394 Diagnostic criteria for multiple sclerosis: 2010 Revisions to the McDonald  
395 criteria. *Ann Neurol.* 2011;69: 292–302. doi:10.1002/ana.22366

- 396 17. Thompson AJ, Banwell BL, Barkhof F, Carroll WM, Coetzee T, Comi G, et al.  
397 Diagnosis of multiple sclerosis: 2017 revisions of the McDonald criteria. *Lancet*  
398 *Neurol.* 2018;17: 162–173. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(17)30470-2
- 399 18. Lublin FD, Reingold SC, Cohen JA, Cutter GR, Sorenson PS, Thompson AJ, et  
400 al. Defining the clinical course of multiple sclerosis: The 2013 revisions.  
401 *Neurology.* 2014;83: 278–286. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000000560
- 402 19. Daniels K, Frequin STFM, van de Garde EMW, Biesma DH, van der Wees PJ,  
403 van der Nat PB, et al. Development of an international, multidisciplinary, patient-  
404 centered Standard Outcome Set for Multiple Sclerosis: The S.O.S.MS project.  
405 *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2023;69: 104461. doi:10.1016/j.msard.2022.104461
- 406 20. Kurtzke JF. Rating neurologic impairment in multiple sclerosis: An expanded  
407 disability status scale (EDSS). *Neurology.* 1983;33: 1444–1444.  
408 doi:10.1212/WNL.33.11.1444
- 409 21. Health Information Research Unit (HIRU). Search filters for MEDLINE in Ovid  
410 syntax and the PubMed translation. 2023. Available:  
411 <https://hiruweb.mcmaster.ca/hkr/hedges/medline/>
- 412 22. Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, et al. *Cochrane*  
413 *Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.* 2nd ed. Chichester, UK:  
414 John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- 415 23. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al.  
416 The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews  
417 incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: Checklist and  
418 explanations. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162: 777–784. doi:10.7326/M14-2385
- 419 24. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB  
420 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2019; 14898.

- 421           doi:10.1136/bmj.14898
- 422   25.   Lundh A, Sismondo S, Lexchin J, Busuioc OA, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and  
423           research outcome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012; MR000033.  
424           doi:10.1002/14651858.MR000033.pub2
- 425   26.   Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JPT, Papakonstantinou T, Chaimani A, Giovane C  
426           Del, Egger M, et al. Assessing confidence in the results of network meta-analysis  
427           (Cinema). *bioRxiv.* 2019; 597047. doi:10.1101/597047
- 428   27.   Rücker G. Network meta-analysis, electrical networks and graph theory. *Res*  
429           *Synth Methods.* 2012;3: 312–324. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1058
- 430   28.   Rücker G, Schwarzer G. Ranking treatments in frequentist network meta-analysis  
431           works without resampling methods. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2015;15: 58.  
432           doi:10.1186/s12874-015-0060-8
- 433   29.   Rücker G, Cates CJ, Schwarzer G. Methods for including information from  
434           multi-arm trials in pairwise meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods.* 2017;8: 392–403.  
435           doi:10.1002/jrsm.1259
- 436   30.   Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard  
437           deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. *BMC*  
438           *Med Res Methodol.* 2014;14: 135. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-135
- 439   31.   Higgins JPT. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ.* 2003;327: 557–  
440           560. doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
- 441   32.   Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, Schmid CH, Devasenapathy N, Hayward  
442           RA, et al. Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect  
443           Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized controlled trials and meta-  
444           analyses. *Can Med Assoc J.* 2020;192: E901–E906. doi:10.1503/cmaj.200077
- 445   33.   Veroniki AA, Jackson D, Bender R, Kuss O, Langan D, Higgins JPT, et al.

- 446 Methods to calculate uncertainty in the estimated overall effect size from a  
447 random-effects meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2019;10: 23–43.  
448 doi:10.1002/jrsm.1319
- 449 34. Salanti G. Indirect and mixed-treatment comparison, network, or multiple-  
450 treatments meta-analysis: many names, many benefits, many concerns for the  
451 next generation evidence synthesis tool. *Res Synth Methods*. 2012;3: 80–97.  
452 doi:10.1002/jrsm.1037
- 453 35. Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Barrett JK, Lu G, Ades AE, White IR. Consistency and  
454 inconsistency in network meta-analysis: concepts and models for multi-arm  
455 studies. *Res Synth Methods*. 2012;3: 98–110. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1044
- 456 36. White IR, Barrett JK, Jackson D, Higgins JPT. Consistency and inconsistency in  
457 network meta-analysis: model estimation using multivariate meta-regression. *Res*  
458 *Synth Methods*. 2012;3: 111–125. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1045
- 459 37. Krahn U, Binder H, König J. A graphical tool for locating inconsistency in  
460 network meta-analyses. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2013;13: 35.  
461 doi:10.1186/1471-2288-13-35
- 462 38. Dias S, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Ades AE. Checking consistency in mixed  
463 treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2010;29: 932–944.  
464 doi:10.1002/sim.3767
- 465 39. Veroniki AA, Vasiliadis HS, Higgins JP, Salanti G. Evaluation of inconsistency  
466 in networks of interventions. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2013;42: 332–345.  
467 doi:10.1093/ije/dys222
- 468 40. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a  
469 simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315: 629–634. doi:10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629
- 470 41. Chaimani A, Salanti G. Using network meta-analysis to evaluate the existence of

- 471 small-study effects in a network of interventions. *Res Synth Methods*. 2012;3:  
472 161–176. doi:10.1002/jrsm.57
- 473 42. Chaimani A, Higgins JPT, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G. Graphical tools  
474 for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One*. 2013;8: e76654.  
475 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076654
- 476 43. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al.  
477 GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence - study limitations (risk of  
478 bias). *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64: 407–415. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.07.017
- 479 44. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al.  
480 GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence - inconsistency. *J Clin*  
481 *Epidemiol*. 2011;64: 1294–1302. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.03.017
- 482 45. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al.  
483 GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence - indirectness. *J Clin*  
484 *Epidemiol*. 2011;64: 1303–1310. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.04.014
- 485 46. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Rind D, et al.  
486 GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the quality of evidence - imprecision. *J Clin*  
487 *Epidemiol*. 2011;64: 1283–1293. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.01.012
- 488 47. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE  
489 guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidence - publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol*.  
490 2011;64: 1277–1282. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.01.011
- 491 48. Brignardello-Petersen R, Tomlinson G, Florez I, Rind DM, Chu D, Morgan R, et  
492 al. Grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation  
493 concept article 5: addressing intransitivity in a network meta-analysis. *J Clin*  
494 *Epidemiol*. 2023;160: 151–159. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.06.010
- 495 49. Brignardello-Petersen R, Bonner A, Alexander PE, Siemieniuk RA, Furukawa

496 TA, Rochweg B, et al. Advances in the GRADE approach to rate the certainty in  
497 estimates from a network meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2018;93: 36–44.  
498 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.10.005

499 50. Brignardello-Petersen R, Florez ID, Izcovich A, Santesso N, Hazlewood G,  
500 Alhazanni W, et al. GRADE approach to drawing conclusions from a network  
501 meta-analysis using a minimally contextualised framework. *BMJ.* 2020; m3900.  
502 doi:10.1136/bmj.m3900

503 51. The Lancet Neurology. Towards equitable access to treatment for multiple  
504 sclerosis. *Lancet Neurol.* 2023;22: 189. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(23)00041-8

505 52. Torkildsen Ø, Myhr K-M. Ocrelizumab versus rituximab off-label at the onset of  
506 relapsing MS disease (OVERLORD-MS). 2020. Available:  
507 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT04578639>

508 53. Christensen JR, Sellebjerg F. Non-inferiority study of ocrelizumab and rituximab  
509 in active multiple sclerosis (DanNORMS). 2020. Available:  
510 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT04688788>

511 54. Michel L, Gazzola A. Rituximab versus ocrelizumab in relapsing-remitting  
512 multiple sclerosis (TRIO). 2023. Available:  
513 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05758831>

514 55. Schoof L, Strijbis E. Non-inferiority study of rituximab compared to ocrelizumab  
515 in relapsing MS (Noisy Rebels). 2023. Available:  
516 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05834855>

517 56. Navarro CE, Betancur JE. Cost-utility analysis comparing ocrelizumab vs  
518 rituximab in the treatment of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: The  
519 Colombian perspective. *Value Heal Reg Issues.* 2023;36: 83–91.  
520 doi:10.1016/j.vhri.2023.02.008

521 **Supporting information**

522 **S1 Table. PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-**

523 **Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist**