

Title

Disease-modifying therapies for T1 hypointense lesions (Black Holes) volume in patients with multiple sclerosis: Protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors

- I. Dr. Mohammad Reza Fattahi, M.D., Tehran University of Medical Sciences
mrfatahi93@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0770-0654>
- II. Prof. Mohammad Ali Sahraian, M.D., Tehran University of Medical Sciences
sahraian1350@yahoo.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3224-8807>
- III. Prof. Amir Reza Azimi, M.D., Tehran University of Medical Sciences
a-azimi@sina.tums.ac.ir
- IV. Dr. Maryam Sadeghi, M.D., Zahedan University of Medical Sciences
maryam.sadeghi1993@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2186-4628>
- V. Dr. Mehrnush Torbati, M.D., Islamic Azad University of Zahedan
M.storbati@yahoo.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2524-9315>
- VI. Dr. Amir Valizadeh, M.D., Tehran University of Medical Sciences
thisisamirv@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5983-8527>

Contact

Dr. Amir Valizadeh

M.D., Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Building no.1, Northern gate of the university,
Poursina St. Qods St. Enqelab St.

Fax: 0982166404377

Email: thisisamirv@gmail.com

Administrative information

Registration

Submitted in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) under the submission number: 262883.

Contributions

MF is the leading author for protocol development, analyses, and dissemination. MF is also the first reviewer. AV is the corresponding author. All authors will contribute to data interpretation and article drafts.

Amendments

Important protocol amendments post registration will be recorded and included in dissemination.

Support

This study is not funded.

Conflicts of interest

All authors declare there are no conflicts of interest regarding this study or its possible results.

Abstract

Rationale: A major part of diagnosis and follow-up in patients with multiple sclerosis is based on MRI evaluations. As T1-hypointense lesions represent neural destruction or axonal loss and anticipate irreversible disability in the patients, evaluation of the effects of Disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) on the volume of black holes seems necessary.

Objectives: To evaluate the effects of FDA approved disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) on T1 hypointense lesions (Black Holes) volume in patients with multiple sclerosis (MS)

Data sources: We will search MEDLINE (through Ovid), Embase, and CENTRAL. We won't consider any timeframe, language, or geographical restrictions.

Methods: We will include only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that have evaluated the effects of DMTs on black holes mean volume in adult patients diagnosed with any phenotype of multiple sclerosis (MS) in comparison to the placebo, routine care, or no treatment regimen. We will assess the risk of bias in the primary studies using the Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB2). Data will be synthesized based on the random-effects model and results will be plotted on a forest plot. Heterogeneity will be assessed using I^2 statistics. If feasible, we will also perform subgroup analyses for each DMT.

Funding: This study is not funded.

Registration: PROSPERO submission ID: 262883.

Introduction

Rationale

Black holes (BH) are hypointense areas in cerebral T1 weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) which represent axonal loss, neural degeneration, disease activity, or tissue destruction in patients with multiple sclerosis (MS). These lesions are called acute black holes (ABH) when an enhancement takes place simultaneously and are considered as persisting (PBH) when after the enhancement is finished (Bagnato et al., 2003).

Although neuronal destruction and axonal loss demonstrate irreversible disability in MS patients, due to the challenges of doing regular follow-up MRI to monitor BH volume progression in patients, there has not been a comprehensive evaluation on the influence of approved disease-modifying therapies (DMT) on the size of these lesions (Sahraian et al., 2010). Nevertheless, some studies have evaluated the effect of DMTs like interferon β -1b and Glatiramer acetate on BH size in follow-up MRI images with interesting findings (Filippi et al., 2011).

This systematic review aims to evaluate the efficacy of DMTs on BH size in MS patients to present an explicit summary of the findings up to this date.

Objectives

To evaluate the effects of FDA approved disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) on T1 hypointense lesions (Black Holes) volume in patients with multiple sclerosis (MS)

Methods

Design and methods used for this protocol comply with Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD's) Guidance For Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009) and is reported in line with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) (Moher et al., 2015).

Eligibility criteria

(P) Population: adult patients diagnosed with any phenotype of multiple sclerosis (MS) based on the McDonald criteria (McDonald et al., 2001) or Definite MS based on the Poser criteria (Poser et al., 1983).

(I) Index: all disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) that are approved by FDA, at any dose, frequency, or administration route. Concomitant interventions are allowed if they were used equally in all intervention groups in the trial. These include: Beta-1a interferon, Beta-1a peginterferon, Glatiramer acetate, Fumaric acid dimethyl ester, Teriflunomide, Fingolimod, Siponimod, Ozanimod, Natalizumab, Alemtuzumab, Ocrelizumab, Rituximab, Daclizumab, Mitoxantrone, Cladribine, and Diroximel fumarate.

(C) Comparator: placebo, routine care, or no treatment regimen

(O) Outcome: BH lesion mean volume on cerebral MRI

(T) Timing: to reduce the impact of confounding factors, we won't consider the outcome in case it was measured within a considerable time gap after the initiation of the intervention. We define a considerable time gap as 6 months at maximum.

(S) Setting: inpatient or outpatient

We will include only randomized controlled trials (RCTs), including parallel-group randomized trials, cluster-randomized trials, and cross-over randomized trials.

Information sources

Online databases

The search will employ sensitive topic-based strategies designed for each database with no time frame limitations. There will be no language or geographical restrictions either. We will perform our search on the 20th of March, 2021.

Databases:

- ☐ MEDLINE through Ovid
- ☐ Embase
- ☐ Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials

Citation searching

We also examined the forward and backward citations of the included studies using Scopus.

Search strategy

Our search strategies for all the databases included in our study, namely MEDLINE (through Ovid), Embase, and CENTRAL are presented in [Appendix A](#). Our search will include highly sensitive search filters for clinical trials from the InterTASC Information Specialists' Sub-Group

(ISSG) (Glanville et al., 2021) and Cochrane Collaboration (Higgins et al., 2019). To be more specific, we use a filter developed by Glanville 2019 for finding clinical trials in Embase and a filter developed by Lefebvre 2008 for the same purpose in Ovid MEDLINE. We will not apply filters to our search in CENTRAL.

Study records

Data management

Records will be managed through EndNote version X9; specific software for managing bibliographies.

Selection process

Two reviewers (AV and MM) will independently screen the title and abstract of identified studies for inclusion. We will link publications from the same study to avoid including data from the same study more than once. If any study cannot be clearly excluded based on its title and abstract, its full text will be reviewed. A study will be included when both reviewers independently assess it as satisfying the inclusion criteria from the full text. A third reviewer (MF) will act as arbitrator in the event of disagreement following discussion. We will prepare a flow diagram of the number of studies identified and excluded at each stage following the PRISMA flow diagram of study selection (Page et al., 2020).

Data collection process

Using a standardized form, two reviewers (AV and MM) will extract the data independently. We will resolve any disagreements by discussion or, if required, by consultation with a third review author (MF). We will attempt to extract data presented only in graphs and figures whenever possible but will include such data only if two reviewers independently obtain the same result. If studies are multi-center, then where possible we will extract data relevant to each.

We have decided to use endpoint data and only use change-from-baseline data if the former is not available. We will also combine endpoint and change-from-baseline data in the analysis, as we want to use mean differences (MDs) (Higgins et al., 2019).

In the case of missing data, if possible, we will try to contact the original investigators to request missing information. In case of any missing data, we will try to contact the authors to receive information. In case that was unsuccessful, we will use data where attrition for a continuous outcome is between 0% and 25%, and data only from people who complete the study to that point are reported. If the standard deviation (SD) of the endpoint data was

missing, we will try to impute it by standard methods using the available data (Higgins et al., 2019). That means, in case standard error (SE) was available, we will impute the SD using the formula $SD = SE * \sqrt{}$. In case confidence intervals (CI) were available, we will use the formula $SD = (\sqrt{ * (upper\ limit - lower\ limit) / 2Z\ score}$ (if the sample size was less than 60, we will use t-score instead of Z-score). In cases where P-values for differences in means were available, first, we will calculate the corresponding t-score with the degree of freedom (df) $df = \text{Number of participants in the intervention group } (n_e) + \text{Number of participants in the comparator group } (n_c) - 2$. Then we will convert the t-score to SE using the formula $SE = |MD / t|$. Finally, we will convert the SE to SD using the formula $SD = SE / \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_e} + \frac{1}{n_c}}$.

Data items

Data extracted will include the following summary data: sample characteristics, sample size, study methods, inclusion and exclusion criteria, MRI settings used, founding sources, declarations of interests, and results.

Outcomes and prioritization

Our main outcome of interest is the mean difference (MD) of T1 hypointense lesion volume after receiving DMTs between the intervention and comparator groups.

Risk of bias in individual studies

Two review authors (AR and MS) will assess the risk of bias for each included study. In case of disagreement between the two, a third author (MF) will act as arbitrator. We will also calculate Cohen's kappa to assess the agreement between the two main bias assessors. We will use the Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB2) for this purpose. The tool, alongside the conditions to meet the answer “yes” for each signaling question in our review is presented in [Appendix B](#). This tool consists of five domains: bias arising from the randomization process, bias due to deviations from the intended interventions, bias due to missing outcome data, bias in the measurement of the outcome, and bias in the selection of the reported results. This tool is specifically designed for parallel-groups randomized controlled studies. To assess the risk of bias in the clustered randomized controlled trials and cross-over randomized controlled trials, we will use two variants of this tool specifically designed for such studies. These three tools are identical in all domains, except that the formers also assess the randomization methods specific for cluster or cross-over. Using these three tools alongside

each other does not introduce any methodological deficiency. The answer for each signaling question can be: yes, probably yes, probably no, no, and no information provided. We will judge the overall risk of bias for each domain as either high, some concerns, or low according to the manual of the tools.

Data synthesis

We will use the R version 4 (Team, R.C, 2013) “meta” package (Schwarzer, 2007) and “rob.summary” (Harrer et al., 2019) package as the software for our data synthesis. We expect our outcome of interest to be reported in means (μ) after receiving the intervention for both the intervention and comparator group. Because these outcomes are expected to be reported in the same unit (millimeters), we will use mean differences (MDs) for the statistical analysis. We will calculate the variance and standard error of those MDs. Because of the nature of our intervention of interest, we expect some variability in the studies. Thus, we will perform a meta-analysis on those values based on the random-effects model. We seek our effect of interest as the effect of assignment to the intervention (Intention-to-treat effect). If the authors applied such a strategy, we will use their results. If the original authors presented only the results of the per-protocol, we will assume that those participants lost to follow-up would have had the same percentage of events as those who remained in the study.

Cluster trials

If authors fail to account for intra-class correlation in clustered studies, it will lead to a unit-of-analysis error whereby P values are spuriously low, CIs unduly narrow, and statistical significance overestimated (Divine et al., 1992). Where clustering has been incorporated into the analysis of primary studies, we will present these data as if from a non-cluster randomized study but will adjust for the clustering effect. If cluster studies have been appropriately analyzed and intra-class correlation coefficients and relevant data documented in the report taken into account, synthesis with other studies will be possible using the generic inverse variance technique. We will try to contact the first authors of studies to obtain intra-class correlation coefficients for their clustered data and to adjust for this (Gulliford et al., 1999). In case we couldn't account for the intra-class correlation coefficients, we will use the standard methods reported by Higgins et al. (Higgins et al., 2019) and will mark these studies in the analysis with an asterisk (*).

Cross-over trials

The major concern of cross-over trials is the carry-over effect. This means that the treatment's effect in the first phase is carried over to the second phase (Elbourne et al., 2002). As this is very likely for DMTs, we will only use data from the first phase of cross-over studies.

Other analyses

Assessment of heterogeneity

We will inspect our data visually to investigate the possibility of statistical heterogeneity. We will also perform I^2 statistics alongside the Chi^2 P-value (Deeks, 2001). I^2 statistic quantifies inconsistency across studies to assess the impact of heterogeneity on the meta-analysis (Higgins & Thompson, 2002). Chi^2 statistics will be considered substantial if there was a low P-value (less than 0.10). We planned to interpret the I^2 statistic as follows:

- ☐ 0% to 40%: might not be important;
- ☐ 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity;
- ☐ 50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity;
- ☐ 75% to 100%: represents considerable heterogeneity.

If we find moderate (or more) heterogeneity, we will attempt to determine possible reasons for it by subgroup analyses.

Subgroup analyses

If at least 5 studies are available for each DMT, we will perform a subgroup analysis for it. Reasons for heterogeneity in the outcome will also be explored by the restricted-maximum-likelihood-random-effect meta-regressions.

Sensitivity analyses

We will undertake a sensitivity analysis testing how prone the outcome is to change when data only comes from the studies that presented the data as intention-to-treat analysis, compared with when we also have studies with the effect of adhering to the intervention (Per-protocol effect) analyses in our final analysis.

In case we had cluster trials that we couldn't account for the intra-class correlation coefficients in, we will perform a sensitivity analysis on trials that have no the same issue to test how prone the outcome is to change when data is not affected by unit-of-analysis issues.

If we had to impute the missing information for primary studies, we will examine the validity of the imputations in a sensitivity analysis that excludes imputed values.

We will also analyze the effects of excluding trials that are judged to be at high risk of bias across one or more of the “Risk of bias” domains.

Meta-bias

To evaluate the risk of reporting bias across studies, a contour-enhanced funnel plot alongside a test for funnel plot asymmetry will be conducted. Contour lines will correspond to perceived ‘milestones’ of statistical significance ($P = 0.01, 0.05, \text{ and } 0.1$). These contours may help differentiate asymmetry due to non-reporting biases from that due to other factors. If studies appear to be missing in areas where results would be statistically non-significant and unfavorable to the experimental intervention then this adds credence to the possibility that the asymmetry is due to non-reporting biases. If the supposed missing studies are in areas where results would be statistically significant and favorable to the experimental intervention, this would suggest the cause of the asymmetry is more likely to be due to factors other than non-reporting biases. The test for funnel plot asymmetry examines whether the relationship between estimated effect size and study size is greater than chance (Higgins et al., 2019).

Confidence in cumulative evidence

The strength of the overall body of evidence will be assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) framework (GRADE Working Group, 2004), which takes into account seven criteria: Risk of bias, Consistency of effect, Imprecision, Indirectness, and Publication bias. Two review authors (MS and AR) will rate the certainty of the evidence for the outcome as 'high', 'moderate', 'low', or 'very low'. We will resolve any discrepancies by consensus, or, if needed, by arbitration by a third review author (MF).

Appendices

Appendix A, Search Strategies

Database and date	Search algorithm
-------------------	------------------

Embase

Elsevier
<1994 to 20.03.2021>

#1 'randomized controlled trial'/de
#2 'controlled clinical study'/de
#3 #1 OR #2
#4 random*:ti,ab
#5 'randomization'/de
#6 'intermethod comparison'/de
#7 placebo:ti,ab
#8 (compare:ti OR compared:ti OR comparison:ti)
#9 ((evaluated:ab OR evaluate:ab OR evaluating:ab OR assessed:ab OR assess:ab)
AND
(compare:ab OR compared:ab OR comparing:ab OR comparison:ab))
#10 (open NEXT/1 label):ti,ab
#11 ((double OR single OR doubly OR singly) NEXT/1 (blind OR blinded OR
blindly)):ti,ab
#12 'double blind procedure'/de
#13 (parallel NEXT/1 group*):ti,ab
#14 (crossover:ti,ab OR 'cross over':ti,ab)
#15 ((assign* OR match OR matched OR allocation) NEAR/6 (alternate OR group
OR
groups OR intervention OR interventions OR patient OR patients OR subject OR
subjects
OR participant OR participants)):ti,ab
#16 (assigned:ti,ab OR allocated:ti,ab)
#17 (controlled NEAR/8 (study OR design OR trial)):ti,ab
#18 (volunteer:ti,ab OR volunteers:ti,ab)
#19 'human experiment'/de
#20 Trial:ti
#21 #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR
#15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #20
#22 #21 NOT #3
#23 (((random* NEXT/1 sampl* NEAR/8 ('cross section*' OR questionnaire* OR
survey OR surveys OR database or databases)):ti,ab) NOT ('comparative study'/de
OR
'controlled study'/de OR 'randomised controlled':ti,ab OR 'randomized
controlled':ti,ab
OR 'randomly assigned':ti,ab))
#24 ('cross-sectional study'/de NOT ('randomized controlled trial'/de OR
'controlled
clinical study'/de OR 'controlled study'/de OR 'randomised controlled':ti,ab OR
'randomized controlled':ti,ab OR 'control group':ti,ab OR 'control groups':ti,ab))
#25 ('case control*':ti,ab AND random*:ti,ab NOT ('randomised controlled':ti,ab
OR
'randomized controlled':ti,ab))
#26 ('systematic review':ti NOT (trial:ti OR study:ti))
#27 (nonrandom*:ti,ab NOT random*:ti,ab)

#28 'random field*':ti,ab
#29 ('random cluster' NEAR/4 sampl*):ti,ab
#30 (review:ab AND review:it NOT trial:ti)
#31 ('we searched':ab AND (review:ti,tt OR review:it))
#32 'update review':ab
#33 (databases NEAR/5 searched):ab
#34 ((rat:ti,tt OR rats:ti OR mouse:ti OR mice:ti OR swine:ti OR porcine:ti OR murine:ti OR sheep:ti OR lambs:ti OR pigs:ti OR piglets:ti OR rabbit:ti OR rabbits:ti OR cat:ti OR cats:ti OR dog:ti OR dogs: ti OR cattle:ti OR bovine:ti OR monkey:ti OR monkeys:ti OR trout: ti OR marmoset*:ti) AND 'animal experiment'/de)
#35 ('animal experiment'/de NOT ('human experiment'/de OR 'human'/de))
#36 #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35
#37 #22 NOT #36
#38 'multiple sclerosis'/exp
#39 'multiple sclerosis':ab,ti,kw
#40 #38 OR #39
#41 ('black hole*':ab,ti,kw) OR ('blackhole*':ab,ti,kw)
#42 (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1):ab,ti,kw OR (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1-weighted):ab,ti,kw
OR (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1 weighted):ab,ti,kw OR (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1-w):ab,ti,kw OR (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1w):ab,ti,kw
#43 (t1 NEAR/6 lesion*):ab,ti,kw OR (t1-weighted NEAR/6 lesion*):ab,ti,kw OR (t1 weighted NEAR/6 lesion*):ab,ti,kw OR (t1-w NEAR/6 lesion*):ab,ti,kw OR (t1w NEAR/6 lesion*):ab,ti,kw
#44 #41 OR #42 OR #43
#45 'beta 1a interferon'/exp OR 'beta 1a interferon':ab,ti,kw OR 'interferon beta-1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'interferon beta 1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'interferon beta1a':ab,ti,kw OR avonex:ab,ti,kw OR rebif:ab,ti,kw OR extavia:ab,ti,kw OR betaseron:ab,ti,kw
#46 'peginterferon beta1a'/exp OR 'peginterferon beta1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'peginterferon beta-1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'beta1a peginterferon':ab,ti,kw OR 'beta-1a peginterferon':ab,ti,kw OR 'pegylated interferon beta-1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'pegylated interferon beta1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'pegylated interferon beta 1a':ab,ti,kw OR 'beta-1a pegylated interferon':ab,ti,kw OR 'beta1a pegylated interferon':ab,ti,kw OR 'beta 1a pegylated interferon':ab,ti,kw
OR
plegridy:ab,ti,kw
#47 'glatiramer'/exp OR glatiramer:ab,ti,kw OR copaxone:ab,ti,kw OR glatopa:ab,ti,kw

#48 'fumaric acid dimethyl ester'/exp OR 'fumaric acid dimethyl ester':ab,ti,kw OR
'dimethyl fumarate':ab,ti,kw OR tecfidera:ab,ti,kw
#49 'teriflunomide'/exp OR teriflunomide:ab,ti,kw OR aubagio:ab,ti,kw
#50 'fingolimod'/exp OR fingolimod:ab,ti,kw OR gilenia:ab,ti,kw OR
gilenya:ab,ti,kw
#51 'siponimod'/exp OR siponimod:ab,ti,kw OR mayzent:ab,ti,kw
#52 'ozanimod'/exp OR ozanimod:ab,ti,kw OR zeposia:ab,ti,kw
#53 'natalizumab'/exp OR natalizumab:ab,ti,kw OR tysabri:ab,ti,kw
#54 'alemtuzumab'/exp OR alemtuzumab:ab,ti,kw OR lemtrada:ab,ti,kw
#55 'ocrelizumab'/exp OR ocrelizumab:ab,ti,kw OR ocrevus:ab,ti,kw
#56 'rituximab'/exp OR rituximab:ab,ti,kw OR mabthera:ab,ti,kw
#57 'mitoxantrone'/exp OR mitoxantrone:ab,ti,kw OR novantrone:ab,ti,kw
#58 'cladribine'/exp OR cladribine:ab,ti,kw OR mavenclad:ab,ti,kw
#59 'ofatumumab'/exp OR ofatumumab:ab,ti,kw OR arzerra:ab,ti,kw
#60 'daclizumab'/exp OR daclizumab:ab,ti,kw OR zinbryta:ab,ti,kw
#61 'diroximel fumarate'/exp OR 'diroximel fumarate':ab,ti,kw OR
vumerity:ab,ti,kw
#62 'disease modifying therap*':ab,ti,kw OR 'disease-modifying therap*':ab,ti,kw
OR
dmt*:ab,ti,kw
#63 #45 OR #46 OR #47 OR #48 OR #49 OR #50 OR #51 OR #52 OR #53 OR #54 OR
#55 OR #56 OR #57 OR #58 OR #59 OR #60 OR #61 OR #62
#64 #37 AND #40 AND #44 AND #63

MEDLINE

Ovid

<1946 to 20.03.2021>

1 randomized controlled trial.pt.
2 controlled clinical trial.pt.
3 randomized.ab.
4 placebo.ab.
5 clinical trials as topic.sh.
6 randomly.ab.
7 trial.ti.
8 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
9 exp animals/ not humans.sh.
10 8 not 9
11 multiple sclerosis.mp.
12 (black hole* or blackhole*).mp.
13 ((hypointens* adj6 t1) or (hypointens* adj6 t1-weighted) or (hypointens* adj6 t1 weighted) or (hypointens* adj6 t1-w) or (hypointens* adj6 t1w)).mp.
14 ((t1 adj6 lesion*) or (t1-weighted adj6 lesion*) or (t1 weighted adj6 lesion*) or (t1-w adj6 lesion*) or (t1w adj6 lesion*)).mp.
15 12 or 13 or 14
16 (Interferon beta-1a or beta 1a interferon or beta1a interferon or interferon beta 1a or interferon beta1a or avonex or rebif or extavia or betaseron).mp.
17 (peginterferon beta1a or peginterferon beta-1a or beta1a peginterferon or beta-1a peginterferon or pegylated interferon beta-1a or pegylated interferon beta1a or pegylated interferon beta 1a or beta-1a pegylated interferon or beta1a pegylated interferon or beta 1a pegylated interferon or plegridy).mp.
18 (Glatiramer Acetate or glatiramer or copaxone or glatopa).mp.
19 (Dimethyl Fumarate or fumaric acid dimethyl ester or tecfidera).mp.
20 (teriflunomide or aubagio).mp.
21 (Fingolimod Hydrochloride or fingolimod or gilenia or gilenya).mp.
22 (siponimod or mayzent).mp.
23 (ozanimod or zeposia).mp.
24 (Natalizumab or tysabri).mp.
25 (Alemtuzumab or lemtrada).mp.
26 (ocrelizumab or ocrevus).mp.
27 (Rituximab or mabthera).mp.
28 (Mitoxantrone or novantrone).mp.
29 (Cladribine or mavenclad).mp.
30 (ofatumumab or arzerra).mp.
31 (Daclizumab or zinbryta).mp.
32 (diroximel fumarate or vumerity).mp.
33 (disease modifying therap* or disease-modifying therap* or dmt*).mp.

34 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29
or 30 or
31 or 32 or 33
35 10 and 11 and 15 and 34

The Cochrane Library

10.02.2021

- #1 MeSH descriptor: [Multiple Sclerosis] explode all trees
 - #2 (multiple sclerosis):ti,ab,kw
 - #3 #1 OR #2
 - #4 (black hole*):ti,ab,kw OR (blackhole*):ti,ab,kw
 - #5 ((hypointens* NEAR/6 t1) OR (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1 weighted) OR (hypointens* NEAR/6 t1w)):ti,ab,kw
 - #6 ((t1 NEAR/6 lesion*) OR (t1 weighted NEAR/6 lesion*) OR (t1w NEAR/6 lesion*)):ti,ab,kw
 - #7 #4 OR #5 OR #6
 - #8 MeSH descriptor: [Interferon beta-1a] explode all trees
 - #9 (Interferon beta-1a OR beta 1a interferon OR beta1a interferon OR interferon beta 1a OR interferon beta1a OR avonex OR rebif OR extavia OR betaseron):ti,ab,kw
 - #10 (peginterferon beta1a OR peginterferon beta-1a OR beta1a peginterferon OR beta-1a peginterferon OR pegylated interferon beta-1a OR pegylated interferon beta1a OR pegylated interferon beta 1a OR beta-1a pegylated interferon OR beta1a pegylated interferon OR beta 1a pegylated interferon OR plegridy):ti,ab,kw
 - #11 MeSH descriptor: [Glatiramer Acetate] explode all trees
 - #12 (glatiramer OR copaxone OR glatopa):ti,ab,kw
 - #13 MeSH descriptor: [Dimethyl Fumarate] explode all trees
 - #14 (dimethyl fumarate OR fumaric acid dimethyl ester OR tecfidera):ti,ab,kw
 - #15 (teriflunomide OR aubagio):ti,ab,kw
 - #16 MeSH descriptor: [Fingolimod Hydrochloride] explode all trees
 - #17 (fingolimod OR gilenia OR gilenya):ti,ab,kw
 - #18 (siponimod OR mayzent):ti,ab,kw
 - #19 (ozanimod OR zeposia):ti,ab,kw
 - #20 MeSH descriptor: [Natalizumab] explode all trees
 - #21 (natalizumab OR tysabri):ti,ab,kw
 - #22 MeSH descriptor: [Alemtuzumab] explode all trees
 - #23 (alemtuzumab OR lemrada):ti,ab,kw
 - #24 (ocrelizumab OR ocrevus):ti,ab,kw
 - #25 MeSH descriptor: [Rituximab] explode all trees
 - #26 (rituximab OR mabthera):ti,ab,kw
 - #27 MeSH descriptor: [Mitoxantrone] explode all trees
 - #28 (mitoxantrone OR novantrone):ti,ab,kw
 - #29 MeSH descriptor: [Cladribine] explode all trees
 - #30 (cladribine OR mavenclad):ti,ab,kw
 - #31 (ofatumumab OR arzerra):ti,ab,kw
 - #32 MeSH descriptor: [Daclizumab] explode all trees
 - #33 (daclizumab or zinbryta):ti,ab,kw
 - #34 (diroximel fumarate OR vumerity):ti,ab,kw
-

#35 (disease modifying therap* OR dmt*):ti,ab,kw
#36 #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR
#18 OR #19 OR #20 OR #21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28
OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35
#37 #3 AND #7 AND #36

Appendix B, The RoB2 tool and its variants

Signaling questions	Authors' judgment for 'yes'
Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process	
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	The use of randomization methods is clearly stated in the study.
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	Allocation sequence concealment is clearly stated.
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	Age, sex, and ethnicity are not significantly different between the groups.
Domain 1b: Risk of bias arising from the timing of identification or recruitment of participants in a cluster-randomized trial (for Cluster randomized controlled trials only)	
1b.1 Were all the individual participants identified and recruited (if appropriate) before the randomization of clusters?	All participants were identified and recruited before the clusters were randomized, or individual participants were not recruited at all but all were identified before randomization.
1b.2 If N/PN/NI to 1b.1: Is it likely that the selection of individual participants was affected by knowledge of the intervention assigned to the cluster?	Recruiting individuals were aware of cluster allocation before recruitment, or some participants were aware of cluster allocation before their recruitment, or those identifying potential participants (when recruitment is to take place subsequently) are aware of cluster allocation, or those identifying actual participants (when there is no subsequent recruitment) are aware of cluster allocation.
1b.3 Were there baseline imbalances that suggest differential identification or recruitment of individual participants between intervention groups?	Imbalances that are compatible with a chance should not be interpreted as suggesting differential identification or recruitment of participants.
Domain 5: Risk of bias arising from period and carryover effects (for Cross-over randomized controlled trials only)	

S.1 Was the number of participants allocated to each of the two sequences equal or nearly equal?	No: We only include the results from the first phase of a cross-over trial.
S.2 If N/PN/NI to S.1: Were period effects accounted for in the analysis?	No: We only include the results from the first phase of a cross-over trial.
S.3 Was there sufficient time for any carryover effects to have disappeared before outcome assessment in the second period?	No: We only include the results from the first phase of a cross-over trial.
Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention)	
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	The allocation sequence was concealed for patients.
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned interventions during the trial?	The allocation sequence was concealed for care providers.
2.3. <u>If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2:</u> Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?	There is evidence or strong reason to believe that the trial context led to failure to implement the protocol interventions or to implementation of interventions not allowed by the protocol.
2.4 <u>If Y/PY to 2.3:</u> Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	Deviations are likely to affect the outcome.
2.5. <u>If Y/PY/NI to 2.4:</u> Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	Deviations are not balanced between the intervention groups.
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Intention-to-treat (ITT) analyses and modified intention-to-treat (mITT) analyses are appropriate.
2.7 <u>If N/PN/NI to 2.6:</u> Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyze participants in the group to	The number of participants who were analyzed in the wrong intervention group, or excluded from the analysis, was sufficient that there could have been a substantial impact on the result.

<p>which they were randomized?</p>	
<p>Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (effect of adhering to intervention)</p>	
<p>2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?</p>	<p>Participants were not masked.</p>
<p>2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned interventions during the trial?</p>	<p>Care providers were not masked.</p>
<p>2.3. [If applicable:] <u>If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2</u>: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?</p>	<p>Important non-protocol interventions are the additional interventions or exposures that: (1) are inconsistent with the trial protocol; (2) trial participants might receive with or after starting their assigned intervention; and (3) are prognostic for the outcome.</p>
<p>2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?</p>	<p>The intervention was not implemented as intended.</p>
<p>2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?</p>	<p>Non-adherence includes imperfect compliance with a sustained intervention, cessation of intervention, crossovers to the comparator intervention, and switches to another active intervention.</p>
<p>2.6. <u>If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5</u>: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?</p>	<p>Appropriate methods include (1) instrumental variable analyses to estimate the effect of receiving the assigned intervention in trials in which a single intervention, administered only at baseline and with all-or-nothing adherence, is compared with standard care; and (2) inverse probability weighting to adjust for censoring of participants who cease adherence to their assigned intervention, in trials of sustained treatment strategies.</p>
<p>Domain 3: Risk of bias due to missing outcome data</p>	

3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Availability of data from 95% of the participants will be considered sufficient (imputed data will be regarded as missing data).
3.2 <u>If N/PN/NI to 3.1</u> : Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?	Analysis methods corrected for bias, or sensitivity analyses were performed showing that results are little changed under a range of plausible assumptions about the relationship between missingness in the outcome and its true value.
3.3 <u>If N/PN to 3.2</u> : Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	Loss to follow-up, or withdrawal from the study, could be related to participants' health status.
3.4 <u>If Y/PY/NI to 3.3</u> : Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	There are differences between intervention groups in the proportions of missing outcome data. Reported reasons for missing outcome data differ between the intervention groups; or reported reasons for missing outcome data to provide evidence that missingness in the outcome depends on its true value.
Domain 4: Risk of bias in the measurement of the outcome	
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	No: cerebral MRI is the only available method for measuring T1 hypointense lesions.
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	No: cerebral MRI is the only available method for measuring T1 hypointense lesions.
4.3 <u>If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2</u> : Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Outcome assessors were not masked.
4.4 <u>If Y/PY/NI to 4.3</u> : Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	No: our outcome of interest is not susceptible to the judgment of the assessors.
4.5 <u>If Y/PY/NI to 4.4</u> : Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	No: our outcome of interest is not susceptible to the judgment of the assessors.
Domain 5: Risk of bias in the selection of the reported result	

<p>5.1 Were the data that produced this result analyzed following a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?</p>	<p>Finalization of the analysis intentions precedes the availability of unblinded outcome data to the trial investigators.</p>
<p>Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, based on the results, from...</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?</p>	<p>No: the volume of cerebral T1 hypointense lesion can only be measured on one scale.</p>
<p>5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?</p>	<p>There is strong evidence that the numerical results have been selected from multiple eligible analyses of the data (e.g. unadjusted and adjusted models; final value vs change from baseline vs analysis of covariance).</p>
<p>5.4 Is a result based on data from both periods sought, but unavailable based on carryover having been identified? (for Cross-over trials only)</p>	<p>No: We include only the results of the first phase of a crossover trial.</p>
<p>Y: Yes; PY: Probably Yes; PN: Probably No; N: No; NI: No Information</p>	

Bibliography

- Bagnato, F., Jeffries, N., Richert, N., Stone, R., Ohayon, J., McFarland, H., & Frank, J. (2003). Evolution of T1 black holes in patients with multiple sclerosis imaged monthly for 4 years. *Brain*, 126(8).
- Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. (2009). *CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in healthcare*. York Publ. Services.
- Deeks, J. (2001). Statistical methods for examining heterogeneity and combining results from several studies in meta-analysis. *Systematic reviews in health care*.
- Divine, G., Brown, J., & Frazier, L. (1992). The unit of analysis error in studies about physicians' patient care behavior. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 7(6).
- Elbourne, D., Altman, D., Higgins, J., Curtin, F., Worthington, H., & Vail, A. (2002). Meta-analyses involving cross-over trials: methodological issues. *International journal of epidemiology*, 31(1).
- Filippi, M., Rocca, M., Camesasca, F., Cook, S., O'Connor, P., Arnason, B., Kappos, L., Goodin, D., Jeffery, D., Hartung, H., & Comi, G. (2011). Interferon β -1b and glatiramer acetate effects on permanent black hole evolution. *Neurology*, 76(14).
- Glanville, J., Lefebvre, C., Manson, P., Robinson, S., & Shaw, N. (2021). *ISSG Search Filter Resource*. The InterTASC Information Specialists' Sub-Group. <https://sites.google.com/a/york.ac.uk/issg-search-filters-resource/home>
- GRADE Working Group. (2004). Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *Bmj*, 328(7454).

Gulliford, M., Ukoumunne, O., & Chinn, S. (1999). Components of variance and intraclass correlations for the design of community-based surveys and intervention studies: data from the Health Survey for England 1994. *American journal of epidemiology*, 149(9).

Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T., & Ebert, D. (2019). *Doing meta-analysis in R: a hands-on guide*. PROTECT Lab Erlangen.

Higgins, J., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M., & Welch, V. (2019). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons.

Higgins, J., & Thompson, S. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine*, 21(11).

McDonald, W., Compston, A., Edan, G., Goodkin, D., Hartung, H., Lublin, F., McFarland, H., Paty, D., Polman, C., Reingold, S., & Sandberg-Wollheim, M. (2001). Recommended diagnostic criteria for multiple sclerosis: guidelines from the International Panel on the diagnosis of multiple sclerosis. *Annals of Neurology: Official Journal of the American Neurological Association and the Child Neurology Society*, 50(1).

Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., Shekelle, P., & Stewart, L. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic reviews*, 4(1).

Page, M., McKenzie, J., Bossuyt, P., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T., & Mulrow, C. (2020). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *MetaArXiv*.

Poser, C., Paty, D., Scheinberg, L., McDonald, W., Davis, F., Ebers, G., Johnson, K., Sibley, W., Silberberg, D., & Tourtellotte, W. (1983). New diagnostic criteria for multiple

sclerosis: guidelines for research protocols. *Annals of Neurology: Official Journal of the American Neurological Association and the Child Neurology Society*, 13(3).

Sahraian, M., Radue, E., Haller, S., & Kappos, L. (2010). Black holes in multiple sclerosis: definition, evolution, and clinical correlations. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*, 122(1).

Schwarzer, G. (2007). meta: An R package for meta-analysis. *R news*, 7(3).

Team, R.C. (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.