The efficacy and safety of the prasugrel, ticagrelor, and clopidogrel dual antiplatelet therapies following an acute coronary syndrome: A systematic review and

Bayesian network meta-analysis

Stephen A. Kutcher MSc PhD(c)^{1,2}, Leah Flatman, MSc, PhD (c)¹,

Rachelle Haber, MSc, PhD (c)¹, Nandini Dendukuri, PhD^{2,3}, Sonny Dandona, MD³,

James M. Brophy MD PhD^{1,2,3}

¹Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, McGill University,

Montreal, Canada; ²Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Research Institute of McGill

University Health Center, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, ³Department of Medicine, McGill

University, Montreal, Canada

Address for Correspondence

Stephen A. Kutcher MSc PhD(c)

Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, McGill University

2001 McGill College, Suite 1200, Montreal, QC H3A 1G1 Canada

Email: Stephen.kutcher@mail.mcgill.ca

Abstract: 446 words

Word count: 3505 words

1 ABSTRACT

Background: The dual-antiplatelet therapies (DAPT) of clopidogrel, prasugrel, or ticagrelor in
 concomitant use with acetylsalicylic acid are the contemporary treatment regimens for acute
 coronary syndromes (ACS). Systematic comparative effectiveness and safety analyses currently
 lack clinically meaningful interpretations of the summarized evidence.

6 Methods: We systematically searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, and clinicaltrials.gov

- for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that reported on either the efficacy or safety between
 clopidogrel, prasugrel, or ticagrelor DAPTs in ACS patients. The primary efficacy endpoint was a
- 9 composite of all-cause mortality, a recurrent non-fatal myocardial infarction, or non-fatal stroke.
- 10 The primary safety endpoint was study-reported major bleeding events. A Bayesian network meta-
- 11 analysis was performed using a generalized linear model logit transformation with a log-
- 12 transformation of 'time' for varying lengths of study follow-up. Studies published in either English
- 13 or French with a minimum of 6 months of follow-up and a "low" rating from the Cochrane risk of
- bias assessment tool were included in the main analyses. Fixed and random effects models fit was
- assessed by the deviance information criterion (DIC) and node-splitting methods were used to
- 16 assess the consistency of direct and indirect network evidence. An HR >0.9 and <1.11 were set as
- 17 our clinically important thresholds, and represented the range of practical equivalence (ROPE).
- 18 *Results:* From a total of 15,232 articles identified, 138 were selected for full-text review. From a total of 29 identified RCT's, 17 trials, representing 57,814 subjects, were identified as a "low" risk
- total of 29 identified RCT's, 17 trials, representing 57,814 subjects, were identified as a "low" risk
 of bias and were included in the final Bayesian network meta-analysis. Compared to clopidogrel,
- 20 of blas and were included in the final Bayesian network meta-analysis. Compared to clopidogref, 21 prasugrel and ticagrelor reduced major acute coronary events (MACE) endpoints by a median of
- 13% (Hazard ratio [HR]_{PC}, 0.87; 95% credible interval [95% CrI]: 0.74, 1.06) and 5% (HR_{TC}, 0.95;
- 95% CrI: 0.81, 1.14), respectively. The HR posterior distributions estimated that prasugrel had a
- 24 67.5% chance of producing a clinically meaningful greater than 10% (HR<0.9) decrease in the
- risk of MACE outcomes, while ticagrelor only had a 22.4% chance of exceeding the clinically
- 26 important threshold. The primary safety outcome found prasugrel (HR_{PC}, 1.23; 95% CrI: 1.04,
- 27 1.40) and ticagrelor (HR_{TC}, 1.07; 95% CrI: 0.99, 1.17) DAPTs to be associated with a median
- 28 increase in events relative to clopidogrel. This translates to a probability of a clinically meaningful
- 29 increase (HR>1.11) in major bleeding of 83.7% for prasugrel and 67.7% for ticagrelor, when
- 30 compared to clopidogrel.
- 31 *Conclusion:* When compared with ACS patients assigned to clopidogrel, prasugrel and ticagrelor
- 32 were associated with moderate and modest probabilities respectively in clinically meaningful
- 33 MACE reductions. Prasugrel and ticagrelor had high and modest probabilities respectively of
- 34 clinically meaningful increases in bleeding. Despite guideline recommendations, the net clinical
- 35 benefit for these drugs compared to clopidogrel appears uncertain.
- 36

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT), consisting of the concomitant use of acetylsalicylic acid 3 (ASA) and clopidogrel, is standard secondary prevention following an acute coronary syndrome (ACS) hospitalization. The most recent American,¹ Canadian,² and European³ ACS guidelines 4 suggest the use of ticagrelor and prasugrel DAPT over clopidogrel for the treatment of ACS, unless 5 6 patients are at high-risk of bleeding. These ACS guidelines largely rely on evidence from two large multinational randomized controlled trials, PLATO⁴ and TRITON-TIMI-38,⁵ that reported a 7 clinical efficacy benefit of ticagrelor (hazard ration[HR]: 0.84, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.77 8 9 to 0.92; P<0.001) and prasugrel (HR: 0.81, 95%CI: 0.73 to 0.90; P<0.001), respectively, when 10 compared to clopidogrel.

11 However, if one desires to personalize DAPT choice, for example by considering the 12 geographic region where the patient is treated the situation becomes less clear. Two publications report on the pre-specified PLATO regional analysis. One study includes the 1,413 patients from 13 the United States (HR_{US}: 1.27, 95%CI: 0.92 to 1.75)⁶ and another by the Food and Drug 14 Administration (FDA) on the whole 1,814 North American subjects (HR_{NA}: 1.25, 95%CI: 0.93 to 15 1.67),⁷ find no benefit for the efficacy outcome, major acute coronary events (MACE), from 16 17 ticagrelor over clopidogrel. In fact, the sub-analyses suggest the potential for an increase in MACE 18 outcomes with reported HRs greater than one. These North American sub-population estimates 19 deviate substantially from the overall pooled effect reported for the entire study population 20 (HR_{PLATO}: 0.84).

It may be argued that there is *one* overall "true" treatment effect (a fixed effect) and that the results within North American patients are simply due to random chance. Alternatively, it can be viewed that the observed HR discrepancies are due to inherent and meaningful population

differences and healthcare practices across the study regions; patients were recruited from a total 1 2 of 43 and 21 countries in PLATO and TRITON-TIMI-38, respectively. It is plausible that the effect 3 estimates from these large RCTs rather come from a distribution of effects (a random effect) and the added uncertainty from regional variability should be accounted for in the analyses.⁸ A recent 4 discussion⁹ describing the utility of Bayesian analytical methodologies, re-analyzed the PLATO 5 6 data applying a hierarchical (random effects) approach accounting for the regional differences. 7 They reported a pooled HR of 0.87 with a 95% credible interval (CrI) from 0.70 to 1.15. The superiority of ticagrelor over clopidogrel became less confident using the hierarchical model, as 8 9 the interpretation of the effect estimate was not robust – the 95%CrI crosses the null (HR=1.0) – 10 to a simple change in a modelling assumption (fixed versus random effects). This signal was not dismissed in the FDA report,⁷ as multiple reviewers made calls for further evidence prior to the 11 drug's approval. 12

The purpose of this paper is to systematically search the literature for RCTs comparing clopidogrel, ticagrelor, or prasugrel in ACS patients that include MACE and/or major bleeding outcomes with a minimum of 6 months follow-up. A Bayesian network meta-analysis will be performed to compare the direct and indirect evidence on the efficacy and safety across the three DAPTs, with a particular focus on identifying RCT evidence from North American study populations.

METHODS

Following the PRISMA extension for network meta-analyses¹⁰ we performed a systematic search of EMBASE, MEDLINE, the Cochrane controlled register of trials (CENTRAL), and clinicaltrials.gov, last updated on August 1st, 2022. The PRISMA checklist can be found in the appendix. The complete search strategy is also described in the appendix but briefly, we searched

for RCTs using the terms "acute coronary syndrome" or "myocardial ischemia" or "unstable 1 2 angina" or "ST segment elevation myocardial infarction" or "non-ST segment elevation 3 myocardial infarction" or "unstable angina" and related keywords. Additionally, we searched for "dual antiplatelet therapy" or "DAPT" or a combination of "prasugrel" and "clopidogrel" and 4 5 "ticagrelor". A hand-search of the references from relevant articles was further performed. Article 6 inclusion criteria were: (1) patients diagnosed with ACS with or without percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) or coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgeries; (2) patients assigned to two 7 of the following DAPT treatment regimens: clopidogrel, ticagrelor, or prasugrel – with a minimum 8 9 of 6-month planned treatment duration and follow-up; (3) randomized controlled trials of human 10 subjects; (4) reporting at on the main composite outcome of MACE (defined as mortality, recurrent 11 MI, or stroke); and, (5) studies published in either English or French.

12 Due to likely variations in reporting definitions of major acute coronary events (MACE), we adopted a "hard" MACE definition for the primary efficacy outcome, a composite measure of 13 14 reported all-cause mortality, non-fatal MI, or stroke. Secondary efficacy endpoints include the individual MACE outcomes, all-cause mortality, non-fatal MI, or non-fatal stroke, as well as 15 16 cardiovascular-caused mortality, if available. The primary safety endpoint of interest was major 17 bleeding as defined by the trial. Our expectation was that most studies will report Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) major bleeding, PLATO-defined major bleeding, and Bleeding 18 19 Academic Research Consortium (BARC) types 3-5, but we will accept the bleeding definition 20 provided by the included study (Table 1). The secondary safety endpoint included minor bleeding 21 as defined by TIMI, PLATO, and BARC (types 1 and 2), or other reported minor bleeding 22 definitions.

1 Data extraction was performed by S.K. and quality assessment of eligible studies was 2 carried out simultaneously by S.K., L.F., and R.H. Information on the year of publication, sample size, the loading and maintenance dosages of treatment regimens, length of planned treatment 3 4 duration, the mean age, body mass index (BMI), proportion of males, and those who underwent 5 PCI or CABG, as well as the description of the study population and country of origin were 6 collected. The Cochrane revised tool to assess risk of bias in randomized trials (RoB 2.0)¹¹ was used to assess allocation concealment, blinding of participants and trial personnel, reporting on 7 completeness and selection of outcomes, and other biases. The scoring system for each component 8 9 of the RoB 2.0 includes a "low", "some concerns" or "high" risk of bias. Studies with a score of 10 "low" across all five categories were considered low risk of bias and included in the analyses. A 11 funnel plot will be used to visually assess publication bias.

12 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Mixed treatment, or network meta-analyses (NMA), is a technique that allows for the synthesis of multiple treatment strategies from independent research studies, using direct (headto-head) and indirect (common node/comparator) comparisons.^{12,13} Direct effects come from the head-to-head comparisons of the treatments. Indirect effects come from comparing the non-headto-head comparisons by using the information from across the studies that have a common node, or comparator.

Due to the potential for variations in reporting practices of the outcomes of interest, we chose a Bayesian random effect generalized linear model with a logit outcome transformation.¹⁴ The further potential for trials reporting differing lengths of follow-up, a complementary log-log (cloglog) link function was included to the model, by adding a log(follow-up time) variable, to account for these variations in follow-up times. The cloglog model estimates log-hazard ratios and

assumes that hazards are constant over the duration of follow-up and is homogenous across each
 trial.¹⁴

3 Both fixed and random effects binomial likelihood models with a cloglog link function were applied to the data using the "gemtc" R package¹⁵ with Bayesian posterior distribution 4 5 sampling from the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) which was estimated via the Just Another Gibbs Sampler (JAGS) using the "rjags" R package.¹⁶ The models were estimated using a 6 7 minimum of 50,000 iterations with a 10,000 burn-in period run on 3 chains. Model diagnostics 8 were verified by examining traceplots (via monitoring of MCMC sampling), posterior distributions and a multivariate potential scale reduction factor (mpsrf) above 1.1.^{17,18} In the case of model 9 10 inconsistencies, the burn-in and number of iterations were increased. The gemtc default noninformative priors were used for all model parameters. Statistical analyses were performed using 11 R version 4.0.2 from the R Project for Statistical Computing.¹⁹ 12

The random effects (RE) model was selected as our primary analysis as the fixed effect 13 14 (FE) assumption of a homogeneous population-level effect across multiple study populations seems improbable. Nonetheless, the assessment of model fit was performed using the lowest 15 16 deviance information criterion (DIC) – the sum of the models' residual deviance and its' leverage 17 - which penalizes models with more parameters. Some have suggested that when a FE and a RE model are within five DIC units,¹⁴ the model with fewer parameters (FE) should be favoured. To 18 19 be comprehensive, we also reported the FE estimates for comparative purposes. Further, the 20 network consistency – the agreement between the direct, indirect and total network evidence across the pair-wise comparisons – was visually assessed using the node splitting methods.¹² 21

The use of a Bayesian analytical approach allows for direct probability statements for theinterpretation of the summarized evidence for the efficacy and safety endpoints. It eliminates the

need for null hypothesis significance testing and the commonly misunderstood P-value.²⁰ Instead, 1 2 probability statements, about the likely benefit or harm of the antiplatelet strategy relative to the 3 reference, clopidogrel, will be presented. In addition, probability statements will be provided for a 4 net "clinical" benefit or harm, which has been arbitrarily set at a 10% decrease (HR=0.9) or an 5 equivalent increase (HR=1.11) in the effect estimate. The proportion of the posterior distribution 6 that falls within the region of practical equivalence (ROPE), between HR = [0.9, 1.11], will also be reported.²¹ In short, we are presenting readers the proportion of the HR posterior distribution 7 that lies above, below, and between the "important" clinical thresholds. 8

9 As the study material consisted only of previously published material IRB and/or ethics
10 committee approvals were not required.

11

12 **RESULTS**

A total of 9,196 titles and abstracts were screened following the removal of duplicates and 13 14 research abstracts from the 15,232 records identified from the systematic search. This resulted in a full-text assessment of 138 articles from which 29 trials,^{4,5,22-48} for a total of 60,278 study 15 16 participants, met the inclusion criteria for the primary efficacy or safety endpoint. A flowchart 17 (Figure 1) presents a summary of the screening process, and a description of the included studies are presented in Table 1. Seventeen^{4,5,22–36} of the 29 articles were assessed a "low" risk of bias 18 19 score, across all five RoB 2.0 assessment categories, and included in the Bayesian network meta-20 analysis.

For this triangular NMA a total of nine (52.9%),^{4,22–29} of the included RCTs compared the DAPTs' clopidogrel with ticagrelor, while five (29.4%)^{5,30–33} trials compared clopidogrel to prasugrel and three (17.6%)^{34–36} contrasted ticagrelor with prasugrel (Figure 2). The majority of

the included RCTs built-in 12 months of follow-up time, with two^{23,26} studies following patients
for 6 months, and another two trials^{5,30} following subjects for up to 15 and 30 months, respectively.
The average or median age of the included study populations ranged from 47.9 years ²⁷ to 80
years,³² in 13 (76.5%) of the median age was between 60 to 69. Twelve (70.6%) of the study
populations had planned invasive ACS management and reported that greater than 80% of patients
underwent a PCI. All but one RCT (5.9%)²⁶ reported studying a majority (>60%) of male patients.

7 PRIMARY OUTCOMES

8 *Major acute coronary events*

9 The seventeen included studies, with a total of 57,814 subjects, reported a total of 6,897 10 (11.9%) "hard" MACE outcomes. The RE model ($DIC_{RE}=56.60$) was considered a better overall 11 fit relative to the FE model ($DIC_{FE}=65.29$). Visual inspection of the node-splitting models favoured 12 the RE model, with more concordance between the direct, indirect, and network evidence (Figure 13 3E-F), suggesting heterogeneity of the efficacy estimates across the included pairwise RCTs.

14 The ticagrelor to clopidogrel HR estimand for MACE outcomes was 0.95 (95% CrI: 0.81,

15 1.14) (Table 2; Figure 5). This translated to 22.4% of the posterior distribution being below the

16 10%, clinically important reduction threshold (HR<0.9) (Table 2; Figure 3C). The majority of the

17 HR_{TC} distribution (73.2%) for MACE outcomes fell within the ROPE (HR = [0.9 to 1.11]).

The prasugrel to clopidogrel HR estimand for MACE outcomes was, 0.87 (95% CrI: 0.74,
1.06) (Table 2; Figure 5). This extrapolated to 67.5% of the posterior distribution of the HR falling
beyond the meaningful clinical threshold (HR<0.9) for a reduction in MACE outcomes, with
31.4% of the distribution captured within the ROPE (Table 2;Figure 3C).

22 Major bleeding

The primary safety outcome, reported major bleeding (Table 1), was available in the 17
(57,110 patients) trials for a total of 2,858 (5.0%) recorded events. The RE model (DIC_{RE}=52.82)
was considered a similar fit overall relative to the FE model (DIC_{FE}=54.40). Visual inspection of
the node-splitting models found superior concordance between estimates from the direct, indirect,
and network in the RE model (Figure 4 E-F), across all 3 pairwise comparisons.

In comparison to clopidogrel, the ticagrelor HR estimand for major bleeding, as defined
within the included trial, was 1.16 (95% CrI: 0.98, 1.48) (Table 2; Figure 5). This translated to
67.7% of the posterior surpassing a clinically meaningful increase in major bleeding events in
those exposed to clopidogrel, relative to ticagrelor, while 31.9% of the posterior fell within the
ROPE (Table 2; Figure 4E).

The prasugrel to clopidogrel HR estimand for major bleeding events was 1.23 (95% CrI:
0.99, 1.57) (Table 2; Figure 5). This extrapolated to 83.7% of the posterior surpassing the clinically
important threshold for an increase in bleeding, with 15.7% found within the ROPE (Table 2;
Figure 4E).

15 SECONDARY OUTCOMES

16 *All-cause mortality*

The 17 RCTs reported a total of 2,688 (4.6%) mortality outcomes. The FE (DIC=51.38)
and RE (DIC=51.60) models had comparable fits, though, node-splitting models identified some
potential inconsistency (disagreement) between the indirect, direct, and network model estimates.
The HR estimand for all-cause mortality, comparing ticagrelor to clopidogrel, was 0.87 (95% CrI:
0.75, 1.07), where 64.2% of the posterior fell below the clinically important reduction threshold
(HR<0.9). Meanwhile, the HR estimand, for prasugrel relative to clopidogrel, was 0.94 (95% CrI:

0.79, 1.14), with 30.5% of the posterior found below the clinically meaningful threshold
 (Supplemental Table 2).

3 Cardiovascular-related mortality

Fifteen trials (57,438 patients) reported 2,182 (3.80%) cardiovascular-related deaths (CVdeaths). In comparison to clopidogrel, the HR estimand of CV-related mortality for ticagrelor was
0.85 (95% CrI: 0.73, 1.04). It was estimated that 75.3% of the posterior was below the clinically
meaningful threshold. Meanwhile, the HR estimand comparing prasugrel to clopidogrel was 0.90
(95% CrI: 0.76, 1.07), where 51.6% of the posterior distribution was below the threshold of clinical
importance (Supplemental Table 2).

10 Myocardial infarction

11 The 17 RCTs (57,148 patients) reported a total of 3,539 (6.1%) non-fatal MIs. The RE 12 model (DIC=52.09) was borderline a statistical improvement (<5 DIC units), relative to the FE 13 model (DIC=57.00). However, moderate qualitative inconsistency from the node-splitting method 14 reinforced the RE model assumptions. When compared to clopidogrel, the HR for MI outcomes for ticagrelor was found to be 0.94 (95% CrI: 0.76, 1.17), with 32.8% of the posterior being 15 16 represented below a clinically meaningful threshold and 61.2% within the ROPE. The HR 17 estimand, comparing prasugrel to clopidogrel, was estimated as 0.81 (95% CrI: 0.65, 1.00) 18 (Supplemental Table 2). A total of 87.4% of the prasugrel posterior was beyond the threshold of a 19 clinical important reduction in MI's.

20 *Stroke*

A total of 12 studies (56,521 patients) reported on 670 (1.2%) stroke outcomes. Nodesplitting models suggested the network to be unstable with inconsistent direct, indirect, and network estimates across all three (C-T, C-P, and T-P) pair-wise comparisons. The posterior

1 distributions for ticagrelor (HR, 1.02; 95% CrI: 0.72, 1.33) and prasugrel (HR, 0.88; 95% CrI: 0.64, 1.18), when compared with clopidogrel are presented (Supplemental Table 2). 2 3 Minor bleeding 4 Twelve (49,677 patients) RCTs reported a total of 1,352 (2.7%) minor bleeding events. 5 Node-splitting models, under both FE and RE assumptions, suggested the network to be somewhat 6 unstable regarding the inconsistent direct, indirect, and network estimates across all three (C-T, C-7 P, and T-P) pair-wise comparisons. The RE posterior distributions for minor bleeding outcomes for ticagrelor (HR, 1.35; 95% CrI: 1.08, 1.71) and prasugrel (HR, 1.42; 95% CrI: 1.08, 1.94), when 8 9 compared with clopidogrel are provided (Supplemental Table 2). 10 The FE results for both the primary and secondary, efficacy and safety outcomes were 11 reported in the appendix (Supplemental Tables 1 & 3). 12 DISCUSSION The main efficacy findings from this large (n=57,814) Bayesian network meta-analysis of 13 14 DAPT strategies following an ACS hospitalization are: (1) ticagrelor is associated with a small decrease in MACE outcomes but that is unlikely to provide a meaningfully clinically important 15 16 (>10%) reduction in endpoints; (2) prasugrel, when compared with clopidogrel, is associated with 17 a larger (13%) reduction in MACE but only a moderate probability (67.5%) of providing a 18 clinically relevant reduction. The primary safety findings from the NMA include: (3) that

ticagrelor compared to clopidogrel is associated with an increase in major bleeding events, but only a small probability (21.3%) that this exceeds a clinically meaningful increase. And, (4) prasugrel, when compared with clopidogrel, is also associated increased in major bleeding with a

22 moderate to high probability (85.3%) that this exceeds a clinically meaningful threshold.

1 The results from our Bayesian NMA do not fully align with the recommendations of the published North American guidelines^{1,2} and other previous NMAs.^{49,50} While the summary 2 3 estimates for prasugrel and ticagrelor show a reduction in MACE outcomes, they do not 4 demonstrate the same degree of certainty as the PLATO and TRITION-TIMI trials or NMAs, on 5 which the guidelines rely. Using classic confidence limits of 95%, neither prasugrel (95%CrI: 0.74, 6 1.06) nor ticagrelor (95%CrI: 0.81, 1.14) establish superiority over clopidogrel. Further, our results 7 estimate that there is a 32.5% and 77.6% chance that prasugrel and ticagrelor, respectively, do not provide a clinically meaningful reduction in MACE endpoints when compared with clopidogrel. 8 9 There is some concordance in the guidelines with respect to the primary safety outcome, major 10 bleeding, and exercising caution when using these more potent platelet inhibitors – prasugrel (95% 11 CrI: 0.99, 1.17) and ticagrelor (95% CrI: 1.04, 1.40) – in subjects with a higher risk of bleeding. It 12 remains a balance of weighing the benefits and harms of the treatments and secondary patient 13 outcomes.

14 The strength of our findings are built upon the mixed-treatment models of the BNMA, which optimizes evidence synthesis, under certain assumptions, by permitting the use of both 15 16 direct and indirect evidence across the three guidelines approved DAPTs – clopidogrel, ticagrelor, 17 and prasugrel -in ACS patients. The inclusion of only low-risk RCTs bolsters the internal validity 18 of the current findings, which is supported by a large ACS patient population (n=57,814). The 19 Bayesian approach in this study allows for direct probability statements to be made for the 20 interpretation of the treatment effect estimates, thus avoiding the often-misinterpreted P-value. This BNMA goes beyond others^{49,50} by also providing probability statements regarding the 21 22 chances of observing a clinically meaningful change (>10%) in the benefits or harms, an important 23 factor for clinical decision-makers.

1 As with all research, our study comes with limitations. Our findings do not account for the potential challenges previously identified internal modelling decisions (RE vs FE) found in the 2 large multinational RCTs^{4,5,22,30} included in this BNMA. This study assumed that the within study 3 4 variance was properly specified in the individual RCTs when the between-study and between-5 study-arm variance were modelled. Meaning, we likely underestimated the size of the credible 6 intervals of the posterior estimates. Further, our BNMA models included only those studies that received a "low" risk of bias score across the five RoB 2.0 bias assessment tool. Twelve studies 7 (2,464 patients)^{37–40,42–48} received at minimum a "some concerns" reviewer score in at least one 8 9 RoB 2.0 assessment category. Of note, all twelve excluded studies recruited 200 or fewer patients, and only two^{37,48} of the excluded RCTs (16.7%) reported a RCT registration number versus all 10 11 seventeen (100%) of the included trials. Conditioning the analyses on could also impact funnel 12 plot symmetry for bias assessment. Although our analyses did not elucidate any concerns regarding 13 the distribution of effect sizes (Supplemental Figure 1), it has been suggested that this is difficult to assess with fewer than 10 studies⁵¹ – T vs. C (n=9); P vs. C (n=5); and, P vs. T (n=3). Transitivity 14 (between network arms) and homogeneity (between study arms) can be assessed qualitatively by 15 16 comparing the similarity of study populations and treatments. There were some minor differences 17 across some of the study populations, such as age, percent PCI, percent male characteristics, and 18 outcome definitions, which could represent some between study heterogeneity of which could 19 impact the transitivity and consistency assumptions. Overall, the populations represented patients 20 with acute cardiac symptoms (STEMI, NSTEMI, and/or UA) and received well defined 21 medications. Reporting differences for the efficacy outcome was minimized through adopting a 22 "hard" MACE outcome, to include the more objective clinical outcomes of death, MI, or stroke.

1	In conclusion, ticagrelor was estimated to have a 22.4% chance of decreasing MACE and
2	a probability of 21.3% of increased major bleeding, while prasugrel was associated with a 67.5%
3	probability in reducing MACE and an 85.3% increased chance of major bleeding outcomes, when
4	compared with ACS patients assigned to clopidogrel. The results of this BNMA do not provide
5	robust evidence regarding the superiority of ticagrelor and prasugrel, over clopidogrel, as the 95%
6	credible intervals include the null and are substantially captured within the ROPE region. We were
7	also unable to identify a recent RCT on North American subjects. Further research is required to
8	better understand the heterogeneity in the effects of DAPTs within diverse ACS populations,
9	especially with limited North American evidence.

1 REFERENCES

- 2
- Levine GN, Bates ER, Bittl JA, et al. 2016 ACC/AHA Guideline Focused Update on
 Duration of Dual Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients With Coronary Artery Disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2016;68(10):1082-1115. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2016.03.513
- Mehta SR, Bainey KR, Cantor WJ, et al. 2018 Canadian Cardiovascular Society/Canadian
 Association of Interventional Cardiology Focused Update of the Guidelines for the Use of
 Antiplatelet Therapy. *Can J Cardiol.* 2018;34(3):214-233. doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2017.12.012
- Bueno H, Byrne RA, Collet JP, et al. 2017 ESC focused update on dual antiplatelet therapy
 in coronary artery disease developed in collaboration with EACTS. :48.
- 4. Wallentin L, Becker RC, Budaj A, et al. Ticagrelor versus Clopidogrel in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndromes. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361(11):1045-1057.
 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0904327
- Wiviott SD, Braunwald E, McCabe CH, et al. Prasugrel versus Clopidogrel in Patients with
 Acute Coronary Syndromes. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(20):2001-2015.
 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0706482
- Mahaffey KW, Wojdyla DM, Carroll K, et al. Ticagrelor Compared With Clopidogrel by Geographic Region in the Platelet Inhibition and Patient Outcomes (PLATO) Trial.
 Circulation. 2011;124(5):544-554. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.111.047498
- Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Complete Response Review Addendum Sponsor
 Safety Reporting Submissions: NDA 22-433 and IND 65,808 SD 632 Drug: Ticagrelor
 (BrilintaTM),
- 23 *Https://Www.Accessdata.Fda.Gov/Drugsatfda_docs/Nda/2011/022433orig1s000medr.Pdf.*
- Brophy JM. Multicenter trials, guidelines, and uncertainties Do we know as much as we
 think we do? *Int J Cardiol*. 2015;187:600-603. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2015.04.004
- Brophy JM. Key issues in the statistical interpretation of randomized clinical trials. *Can J Cardiol*. Published online January 2021:S0828282X20311806.
 doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2020.12.014
- 10. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA Extension Statement for Reporting of
 Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses of Health Care Interventions:
 Checklist and Explanations. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(11):777-784. doi:10.7326/M14-2385
- 32 11. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in
 33 randomised trials. *Br Med J*. 2019;366:I4898.
- Dias S, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Ades AE. Checking consistency in mixed treatment
 comparison meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2010;29(7-8):932-944. doi:10.1002/sim.3767

- 13. Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Caldwell DM, Lu G, Ades AE. Evidence Synthesis for 1 2 Decision Making 4: Inconsistency in Networks of Evidence Based on Randomized 3 Controlled Trials. Med Decis Making. 2013;33(5):641-656. doi:10.1177/0272989X12455847 4 14. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Evidence Synthesis for Decision Making 2: A 5 Generalized Linear Modeling Framework for Pairwise and Network Meta-analysis of 6 Randomized Controlled Trials. Med Decis Making. 2013:33(5):607-617. 7 doi:10.1177/0272989X12458724 8 15. Gert van Valkenhoef and Joel Kuiper (2021). gemtc: Network Meta-Analysis Using 9 Bayesian Methods. R package version 1.0-1. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gemtc. 10 16. Martyn Plummer (2022). rjags: Bayesian Graphical Models using MCMC. R package version 4-13. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rjags. 11 12 17. Brooks SP, Gelman A. General Methods for Monitoring Convergence of Iterative 13 Simulations. J Comput Graph Stat. 1998;7(4):434-455. 14 doi:10.1080/10618600.1998.10474787 18. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DB, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. Bayesian Data Analysis 15 16 Third edition (with errors fixed as of 15 February 2021). 19. R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R 17 18 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/. 19 20. Wijeysundera DN, Austin PC, Hux JE, Beattie WS, Laupacis A. Bayesian statistical 20 inference enhances the interpretation of contemporary randomized controlled trials. J Clin Epidemiol. 2009;62(1):13-21.e5. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2008.07.006 21 22 21. Kruschke JK. Bayesian Analysis Reporting Guidelines. Nat Hum Behav. 2021;5(10):1282-23 1291. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01177-7 24 22. Berwanger O, Lopes RD, Moia DDF, et al. Ticagrelor Versus Clopidogrel in Patients With 25 STEMI Treated With Fibrinolysis. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019;73(22):2819-2828. 26 doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2019.03.011 23. Gasecka A, Nieuwland R, Budnik M, et al. Ticagrelor attenuates the increase of extracellular 27 vesicle concentrations in plasma after acute myocardial infarction compared to clopidogrel. J 28 29 Thromb Haemost JTH. 2020;18(3):609-623. doi:10.1111/jth.14689 30 24. Gimbel M, Qaderdan K, Willemsen L, et al. Clopidogrel versus ticagrelor or prasugrel in patients aged 70 years or older with non-ST-elevation acute coronary syndrome (POPular 31 32 AGE): the randomised, open-label, non-inferiority trial. The Lancet. 2020;395(10233):1374-
- 33 1381. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736%2820%2930325-1
- 34 25. Goto S, Huang CH, Park SJ, Emanuelsson H, Kimura T. Ticagrelor vs. Clopidogrel in
 35 Japanese, Korean and Taiwanese Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome Randomized,

Double-Blind, Phase III PHILO Study -. Circ J. 2015;79(11):2452-2460. 1 2 doi:10.1253/circj.CJ-15-0112 26. He P, Luo X, Li J, et al. Clinical Outcome between Ticagrelor versus Clopidogrel in Patients 3 4 with Acute Coronary Syndrome and Diabetes. Puthanveetil P, ed. Cardiovasc Ther. 5 2021;2021:1-9. doi:10.1155/2021/5546260 6 27. Mohareb MW, AbdElghany M, Zaki HF, El-Abhar HS. Diabetes and CYP2C19 7 Polymorphism Synergistically Impair the Antiplatelet Activity of Clopidogrel Compared 8 With Ticagrelor in Percutaneous Coronary Intervention-treated Acute Coronary Syndrome 9 Patients. J Cardiovasc Pharmacol. 2020;76(4):478-488. 10 doi:10.1097/FJC.00000000000881 11 28. Park DW, Kwon O, Jang JS, et al. Clinically Significant Bleeding With Ticagrelor Versus 12 Clopidogrel in Korean Patients With Acute Coronary Syndromes Intended for Invasive 13 Management: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Circulation. 2019;140(23):1865-1877. 14 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.119.041766 29. Wu X, You W, Wu Z, et al. Ticagrelor versus clopidogrel for prevention of subclinical stent 15 thrombosis detected by optical coherence tomography in patients with drug-eluting stent 16 17 implantation-a multicenter and randomized study. *Platelets*. 2021;32(3):404-412. 18 doi:10.1080/09537104.2020.1754381 30. Roe M.T., Armstrong P.W., Fox K.A.A., et al. Prasugrel versus clopidogrel for acute 19 20 coronary syndromes without revascularization. N Engl J Med. 2012;367(14):1297-1309. 21 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1205512 22 31. Saito S, Isshiki T, Kimura T, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Adjusted-Dose Prasugrel 23 Compared With Clopidogrel in Japanese Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome: - The 24 PRASFIT-ACS Study -. Circ J. 2014;78(7):1684-1692. doi:10.1253/circj.CJ-13-1482 32. Savonitto S, Ferri LA, Piatti L, et al. Comparison of Reduced-Dose Prasugrel and Standard-25 26 Dose Clopidogrel in Elderly Patients With Acute Coronary Syndromes Undergoing Early 27 Percutaneous Revascularization. Circulation. 2018;137(23):2435-2445. 28 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.117.032180 29 33. Yabe T., Noike R., Okubo R., Amano H., Ikeda T. Infarct Size and Long-Term Clinical 30 Outcomes of Prasugrel versus Clopidogrel in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndrome 31 Undergoing Coronary Artery Stenting: A Prospective Randomized Study. Int J Angiol. 32 2022;((Yabe, Noike, Okubo, Amano, Ikeda) Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, Toho 33 University, Faculty of Medicine, 6-11-1 Omorinishi, Ota-ku, Tokyo 143-8541, Japan). 34 doi:10.1055/s-0042-1746417 35 34. Motovska Z, Hlinomaz O, Kala P, et al. 1-Year Outcomes of Patients Undergoing Primary 36 Angioplasty for Myocardial Infarction Treated With Prasugrel Versus Ticagrelor. J Am Coll 37 Cardiol. 2018;71(4):371-381. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2017.11.008

- Schupke S, Neumann FJ, Menichelli M, et al. Ticagrelor or Prasugrel in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndromes. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(16):1524-1534.
- 3 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1908973
- 4 36. van der Hoeven NW, Janssens GN, Everaars H, et al. Platelet Inhibition, Endothelial
- 5 Function, and Clinical Outcome in Patients Presenting With ST-Segment-Elevation
- 6 Myocardial Infarction Randomized to Ticagrelor Versus Prasugrel Maintenance Therapy:
- 7 Long-Term Follow-Up of the REDUCE-MVI Trial. J Am Heart Assoc. 2020;9(5):e014411.
- 8 doi:10.1161/JAHA.119.014411
- 9 37. Jin CD, Kim MH, Song K, et al. Pharmacodynamics and Outcomes of a De-Escalation
 10 Strategy with Half-Dose Prasugrel or Ticagrelor in East Asians Patients with Acute Coronary
 11 Syndrome: Results from HOPE-TAILOR Trial. *J Clin Med.* 2021;10(12).
 12 doi:10.3390/jcm10122699
- 38. Li DT, Li SB, Zheng JY, et al. Analysis of Ticagrelor's Cardio-protective Effects on Patients
 with ST-segment Elevation Acute Coronary Syndrome Accompanied with Diabetes. *Open Med Wars Pol.* 2019;14(101672167):234-240. doi:10.1515/med-2019-0017
- 39. Lu Y, Li Y, Yao R, et al. Clinical effect of ticagrelor administered in acute coronary syndrome patients following percutaneous coronary intervention. *Exp Ther Med*.
 2016;11(6):2177-2184.
- 40. Tang X, Li R, Jing Q, et al. Assessment of Ticagrelor Versus Clopidogrel Treatment in Patients With ST-elevation Myocardial Infarction Undergoing Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol*. 2016;68(2):115-120.
 doi:10.1097/FJC.00000000000390
- 41. Wang H, Wang X. Efficacy and safety outcomes of ticagrelor compared with clopidogrel in
 Chinese elderly patients with acute coronary syndrome. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.* 2016;Volume 12:1101-1105. doi:10.2147/TCRM.S108965
- 42. Wang X, Li X, Wu H, et al. Beneficial effect of ticagrelor on microvascular perfusion in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction undergoing a primary percutaneous coronary intervention. *Coron Artery Dis.* 2019;30(5):317-322.
 doi:10.1097/MCA.0000000000707
- 43. Wu HB, Tian HP, Wang XC, et al. Clinical efficacy of ticagrelor in patients undergoing
 emergency intervention for acute myocardial infarction and its impact on platelet
 aggregation rate. Am J Transl Res. 2018;10(7):2175-2183.
- 44. Yang B, Zheng C, Yu H, et al. Comparison of Ticagrelor and Clopidogrel for Patients
 Undergoing Emergency Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. *Iran J Public Health*.
 2018;47(7):952-957.
- 45. Yao G, Su G, Li K, Li B, Dong H. Comparative study of ticagrelor and clopidogrel in
 therapeutic effect of acute myocardial infarction patients undergoing percutaneous coronary
 intervention. *Saudi J Biol Sci.* 2017;24(8):1818-1820. doi:10.1016/j.sjbs.2017.11.020

- 46. You J, Li H, Guo W, et al. Platelet function testing guided antiplatelet therapy reduces
 cardiovascular events in Chinese patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction
 undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: The PATROL study. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2020;95(S1):598-605. doi:10.1002/ccd.28712
- 47. Zhang Y, Zhao Y, Pang M, et al. High-dose clopidogrel versus ticagrelor for treatment of
 acute coronary syndromes after percutaneous coronary intervention in CYP2C19
 intermediate or poor metabolizers: a prospective, randomized, open-label, single-centre trial. *Acta Cardiol.* 2016;71(3):309-316. doi:10.1080/AC.71.3.3152091
- 48. Kitano D, Takayama T, Fukamachi D, et al. Impact of low-dose prasugrel on platelet
 reactivity and cardiac dysfunction in acute coronary syndrome patients requiring primary
 drug-eluting stent implantation: A randomized comparative study. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv Off J Soc Card Angiogr Interv.* 2020;95(1):E8-E16. doi:10.1002/ccd.28277
- 49. Navarese EP, Khan SU, Kolodziejczak M, et al. Comparative Efficacy and Safety of Oral
 P2Y12 Inhibitors in Acute Coronary Syndrome: Network Meta-Analysis of 52 816 Patients
 From 12 Randomized Trials. *Circulation*. 2020;142(2):150-160.
- 16 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.046786
- 50. Singh S, Singh M, Grewal N, Khosla S. Comparative Efficacy and Safety of Prasugrel,
 Ticagrelor, and Standard-Dose and High-Dose Clopidogrel in Patients Undergoing
 Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: A Network Meta-analysis. *Am J Ther*. Published online
 2016.
- 51. Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, et al. Recommendations for examining and
 interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*.
 2011;343(jul22 1):d4002-d4002. doi:10.1136/bmj.d4002

1 TABLES

Table 1:	The descriptiv	e characteristics	of the twenty-n	ne studies ide	ntified from	the systematic	review.	The first se	eventeen s	tudies were
identifie	d as having a "l	ow" risk of bias	and included in	the meta-anal	ysis.					

Study; First author (year)	Registry	N.Cnts	Sample Size	DAPT, dose (mg)	F-up (mths)	Age (years)	PCI (n, %)	Men (n, %)	ACS population	MACE definition	Major Bleeding definition	RoB 2.0 score	
TREAT;	NCT	10	1886	Clopidogrel, 75	12	58.8	1064, 56.4	1449, 76.8	STEMI, <75yrs, w/	death from vascular causes,	TIM	1	
(2019)	02298088	10	1913	Ticagrelor, 90	12	59	1095, 57.2	1480, 77.4	fibrinolytic therapy	myocardial infarction, or stroke	TIMI major, PLATO major	low	
Gasecka, A.	NCT	1	28	Clopidogrel, 75	6	63	28, 100.0	21, 75	STEMI, NSTEMI;	NT/A	N/D	1	
(2020)	02931045	1	27	Ticagrelor, 90	6	66	27, 100.0	19, 70	PCI	N/A	N/K	low	
POPular AGE; Gimbal M	NCT	1	500	Clopidogrel, 75	12	77	232, 46.4	313, 63	NSTEMI >70vm	death from any cause, nonfatal	TIMI major	low	
(2020)	02317198	1	502	Ticagrelor, 90	12	77	242, 48.2	325, 65	NSTEMI, 270yrs	major and minor bleeding	i nvii major	low	
PHILO; Goto, S.	NCT	3	400	Clopidogrel, 75	12	66	338, 84.5	307, 76.8	NSTEMI, STEMI	CV-related death, MI, and stroke	PLATO major	low	
(2015)	01294462		401	Ticagrelor, 90	12	67	340, 84.8	306, 76.3		nonfatal ML target vessel			
He P (2021)	ChiCTR 18000151	1	133	Clopidogrel, 75	6	64	133, 100.0	47, 35.3	PCI diabetic	revascularization,	BARC types 1 - 5	low	
11e, r. (2021)	04	1	133	Ticagrelor, 90	6	64	133, 100.0	39, 29.3	rehospitalization, stroke, and death from any cause		BARC types 1 - 5	IOW	
Mohareb, M.W.	NCT		472	Clopidogrel, 75	12	47.91	472, 100.0	302, 64.0	DCI	recurrent ACS, namely, acute stent thrombosis, nonacute stent		,	
(2020)	03613857	1	471	Ticagrelor, 90	12	49.84	471, 100.0	318, 67.5	PCI	thrombosis, nonfatal MI, cardiovascular death, and nonfatal stroke	major bleeding events	low	
TICAKOREA;	NCT	1	400	Clopidogrel, 75	12	62.3	342, 85.5	302, 75.5	STEMI, NSTEMI,	death from cardiovascular causes,		1	
(2019)	Park, D-W. 02094963 (2019)		400	Ticagrelor, 90	12	62.5	326, 81.5	297, 74.2	management	nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke	PLATO major	IOW	
PLATO; Wallentin, L. (2009)	NCT	43	9291	Clopidogrel, 75	12	62	5676, 61.1	6658, 71.7	STEMI NSTEMI	death from vascular causes,	PLATO major	low	
	00391872	-15	9333	Ticagrelor, 90	12	62	5687, 60.9	6678, 71.6	STEMI, NOTEMI	myocardial infarction, or stroke	1 EATIO major	10 **	
Wu, X. (2021)	NCT	1	174	Clopidogrel, 75	12	64.1	174, 100.0	124, 70.9	ischemic symptoms,	CV death ML revascularization	PLATO major	low	
	02140801	•	176	Ticagrelor, 90	12	64.5	176, 100.0	134, 75.7	PCI		121110 Indjer	10 11	
TRILOGY ACS;	NCT	52	4663	Clopidogrel, 75	30	66	0, 0.0	2840, 60.9	UA. NSTEMI	death from cardiovascular causes, nonfatal myocardial infarction, or	TIMI major	low	
Roe, M.T. (2012)	00699998		4663	Prasugrel, 10-5	30	66	0, 0.0	2835, 60.8	,	nonfatal stroke	5		
PRASFIT-ACS;	JapicCTI-	1	678	Clopidogrel, 75	12	65.1	637, 94.0	558, 82.3	scheduled PCI,	cardiovascular death, nonfatal	TIMI major	low	
Saito, S. (2014)	101339	1	685	Prasugrel, 3.75	12	65.4	651, 95.0	536, 78.2	>20yrs	nonfatal ischemic stroke	i i wi majoi	10 W	
Elderly ACS II;	NCT	1	730	Clopidogrel, 75	12	80	726, 99.5	448, 61	STEMI, NSTEMI,	all-cause mortality, MI, disabling	DADC turns 2 on 2	law	
(2018)	01777503	1	713	Prasugrel, 5	12	80	707, 99.0	419, 59	PCI	cardiovascular causes or bleeding	BARC type 2 of 3	low	
TRITON-TIMI	NCT	20	6795	Clopidogrel, 75	15	61	N/A, 99.0	N/A, 73	- I - I I - I DOI	cardiovascular death, MI, or		1	
(2007)	00097591	30	6813	Prasugrel, 10	15	61	NA, 99.0	N/A, 75	scheduled PCI	stroke	GUSTO and Thin	low	
Vaba T. (2022)	00004419	1	39	Clopidogrel, 75	12	63.1	39, 100.0	30, 76.9	PCI	cardiac death, nonfatal MI,	TIMI major	low	
1 abe 1. (2022)	3	1	37	Prasugrel, 3.75	12	62.5	37, 100.0	33, 89.1	rei	failure, or TVR	T IWI IIIajoi	IOW	
PRAGUE-18;	NCT	1	596	Ticagrelor, 90	12	61.8	591, 99.2	439, 73.7	ACS DOL	cardiovascular death, nonfatal	TIMI maior	law	
(2018)	02808767	1	634	Prasugrel, 10-5	12	61.8	629, 99.2	489, 77.1	ACS, PCI	MI, or stroke	i iivii major	low	
ISAR-REACT 5;	NCT	2	2012	Ticagrelor, 90	12	64.5	1676, 83.3	1534, 76.2	planned invasive	composite of death, myocardial	BARC type 3 - 5	low	
Schupke, S (2019)	01944800		2006	Prasugrel, 10	12	64.6	1701, 84.8	1528, 76.2	evaluation	infarction, or stroke			
REDUCE-MVI Trial; van der	NCT	2	56	Ticagrelor, 90	12	60.2	N/R	49, 87.5	STEMI	death and recurrent myocardial	BARC type > 2	low	
(2020)	02422888		54	Prasugrel, 10	12	61	N/R	45, 83.3	45, 83.3 infarction	intarction	• •		
HOPE-TAILOR; Jin, C-D (2021)	NCT	1	41	Clopidogrel, 75	9	63	41, 100.0	38, 92.7	DCI	cardiac death, myocardial		hiah	
	02944123	02944123	NCT 02944123	1	39	Prasugrel, 10-5	9	57	39, 100.0	37, 94.9	rU	infarction, target vessel	BARC type > 2

										revascularization (TVR) and stroke									
L: D T (2010)		1	100	Clopidogrel, 75	6	79.1	100, 100.0	61, 61.0	STEMI dishatas	recurrent myocardial infarction,	hamanihaan	hiah							
LI, D-1. (2019)		1	100	Ticagrelor, 90		70.8	100, 100.0	55, 55.0	STEIMI, diabetes	failure	nemorrnage	mgn							
L. V. (2017)		1	108	Clopidogrel, 75	12	59.6	108, 100.0	60, 55.6	DCI	NT/A	II	some							
Lu, Y. (2016)		1	95	Ticagrelor, 90		59.3	95, 100.0	52, 54.7	PCI	N/A	Hemorrhage	concerns							
T X (2010)			200	Clopidogrel, 75	6	64.2	200, 100.0	146, 73	CTEN (L DOL	death, myocardial infarction		some							
Tang, A. (2016)		1	200	Ticagrelor, 90	6	64.4	200, 100.0	142, 71	STEMI, PCI	revascularization, and stroke.	1 IMI major	concerns							
Wene H (2016)		1	100	Clopidogrel, 75	12	80	71, 71.0	66, 66.0		myocardial infarction (MI),	DI ATO AND	some							
wang, H. (2016)		1	100	Ticagrelor, 90	12	79	75, 75.0	69, 69.0		stroke, or CV death	PLATO major	concerns							
Wene V (2010)		1	148	Clopidogrel, 75	6	59.7	148, 100.0	121, 81.8	STEMI PCI	death, nonfatal myocardial	No. 1.1.1.1 (1.1.1)	some							
wang, A. (2019)		1	150	Ticagrelor, 90	6	60.9	150, 100.0	115, 76.7	STEMI, PCI	revascularization were recorded	major bleeding	concerns							
Wu, H-B. (2018)		1	120	Clopidogrel, 75	12	61.1	120, 100.0	94, 78.3	PCI	recurrent angina, recurrent myocardial infarction, stroke, heart failure in-stent thrombosis	"no massive hemorrhage event	some							
			124	Ticagrelor, 90	12	59	124, 100.0	98, 79.0		other thromboembolic events and cardiovascular death	occurred"	concerns							
		1	60	Clopidogrel, 75	6	58.7	60, 100.0	38, 63.3		target vascular remodeling, recurrence of myocardial									
Yang, B. (2018)			60	Ticagrelor, 90	6	59.6	60, 100.0	35, 58.3	AMI, PCI	infarction, heart failure, re- hospitalization and sudden cardiac death	none	some							
Yao, Z. (2017)	1		1		60	Clopidogrel, 75	6	59.8	60, 100.0	36, 60.0	AMI, undergoing	contained restenosis of target vessel and non-target vessel, thrombosis, recurrent angina,	BARC >=3	some					
/ (· · /			60	Ticagrelor, 90	6	60.4	60, 100.0	38, 63.3	PCI	second myocardial infarction, all- cause death and so forth.		concerns							
PATROL; You, J.	1			,		1	,			195	Clopidogrel, 75	12	68.62	195, 100.0	118, 60.5	5	all-cause death, cardiac death, recurrence of myocardial	PAPC >-2	high
(2020)		I	105	Ticagrelor, 90	12	66.29	105, 100.0	77, 73.3	STEMI, PCI	revascularization (TVR), and ischemic stroke	BARC 2-3	nign							
Zhang, Y. (2016)		1	90	Clopidogrel, 150(7d)-75(6m)	6	71.7	90, 100.0	49, 54.4	PCI (CYP2C19*2 or	death, stroke, recurrent MI, and	PLATO major	some							
<u> </u>			91	Ticagrelor, 90	6	68.8	91, 100.0	42, 46.2	*3 carriers)	stent inrombosis	*	concerns							
PACS Study; Kitano, D. (2020)	UMIN 00001519	JMIN 001519 1	39	Clopidogrel, 75	12	64	39, 100.0	33, 84.6	UA, NSTEMI, STEMI	all-cause death, revascularization, stroke, and bleeding were defined	N/R	some							
Kitano, D. (2020)	2		39	Prasugrel, 3.75	12	65.6	39, 100.0	31, 79.5		as adverse cardiac events	erse cardiac events								

Abbreviations: N.Cnts, number of countries; DAPT, dual-antiplatelet therapy; mg, milligram; F-up, follow-up; mnths, months PCI, pucutaneous coronary intervention; n, number of patients; %, percentage; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; MACE, major acute coronary syndrome; RoB 2.0, risk of bias assessment tool.

					Posterior distribution		
Outcome	DAPT	events	n	HR (95% CrI)	Pr HR<0.9	Pr HR[0.9, 1.11]	Pr HR>1.11
MACE	С	3,402	26,189	1.0 (ref.)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	1,614	16,020	0.95 (0.81, 1.14)	0.224	0.732	0.044
n=57,814	Р	1,811	15,605	0.87 (0.74, 1.06)	0.675	0.314	0.011
Maj. Bleeding	С	1,224	25,959	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	1,251	15,894	1.16 (0.98, 1.48)	0.004	0.319	0.677
n=57,110	Р	383	15,257	1.23 (0.99, 1.57)	0.006	0.157	0.837

Table 2: The results of the random effects Bayesian network meta-analyses for the primary outcomes of MACE and major bleeding.

Abbreviations: dapt, dual-antiplatelet therapy; N, number of studies; n, number of patients; HR, hazard ratio; CrI, credible interval; Pr, probability; MACE, major acute coronary event (composite of death, non-fatal myocardial infarction, and non-fatal stroke); C, clopidogrel; T, ticagrelor; P, prasugrel; ref., reference group; Maj., major.

1 FIGURES



Figure 1: A flowchart describing the systematic screening results.



Figure 2: The network structure of the Bayesian meta-analysis for the 17 trials identified from the systematic review.



Figure 3: The posterior distributions for major acute coronary events (MACE) comparing clopidogrel (reference) to ticagrelor (blue) and prasugrel (yellow) using a **[A]** random effects (RE) and **[B]** fixed effects models. The range of practical equivalence (ROPE) is highlighted in grey across the RE **[C]** and FE **[D]** models. The node splitting results for MACE in the RE **[E]** and FE **[F]** models. *Abbreviations: DAPT, dual anti-platelet therapy; CrI, credible interval.*



Figure 4: The posterior distributions for major bleeding events comparing clopidogrel (reference) to ticagrelor (blue) and prasugrel (yellow) using a **[A]** random effects (RE) and **[B]** fixed effects models. The range of practical equivalence (ROPE) is highlighted in grey across the RE **[C]** and FE **[D]** models. The node splitting results for major bleeding in the RE **[E]** and FE **[F]** models. *Abbreviations: DAPT, dual anti-platelet therapy; CrI, credible interval.*

			M	ACE				Major	Bleeding	
study	r/n	r/n			HR (95% CI)	r/n	r/n			HR (95% CI)
DAPT T vs C			1					1		
TREAT	154 / 1913	164 / 1886		-	0.93 (0.74 to 1.15)	20 / 1913	23 / 1886	<		0.86 (0.47 to 1.56)
Gasecka, A.	0/27	0/28			1.04 (0.02 to 52.27)	1/27	1/28		>	1.04 (0.06 to 16.58)
POPular AGE	81 / 502	79/500			1.02 (0.75 to 1.39)	21/502	9 / 500		= >	2.32 (1.06 to 5.07)
PHILO	43/401	28 / 400		-	1.53 (0.95 to 2.47)	40 / 401	26 / 400	+		1.53 (0.94 to 2.51)
He, P.	5/133	4/133	.	• •	1.25 (0.34 to 4.66)	3 / 133	2/133	<	• • •	1.50 (0.25 to 8.98)
Mohareb, M.W.	4/471	9/472	<		0.45 (0.14 to 1.45)	36/471	22/472	+		1.64 (0.96 to 2.79)
TICAKOREA	42 / 400	31 / 400			1.35 (0.85 to 2.15)	29 / 400	16 / 400		• • •	1.81 (0.98 to 3.34)
PLATO	1028 / 9333	1205 / 9291			0.85 (0.78 to 0.92)	961 / 9235	929/9186		_	1.03 (0.94 to 1.13)
Wu, X.	0 / 176	0/174	< +		0.99 (0.02 to 49.83)	2/176	2/174	< •		0.99 (0.14 to 7.02)
	1357 / 13356	1520 / 1328	4			1113/13258	1030 / 1317	9		
DAPT P vs C										
TRILOGY ACS	808 / 4663	854 / 4663			0.95 (0.86 to 1.04)	58 / 4623	48 / 4617			1.21 (0.82 to 1.77)
PRASFIT-ACS	75 / 685	89/678		-	0.83 (0.61 to 1.13)	13 / 685	15/678			0.86 (0.41 to 1.80)
Elderly ACS II	57 / 713	60 / 730			0.97 (0.68 to 1.40)	28/713	20/730			1.43 (0.81 to 2.54)
TRITON-TIMI 38	724/6813	877 / 6795			0.82 (0.75 to 0.91)	146/6741	111/6716	-		1.31 (1.02 to 1.68)
Yabe T.	2/37	2/39			1.05 (0.15 to 7.48)	0/37	0/39			1.05 (0.02 to 53.12)
	1666 / 12911	1882 / 1290	5			245 / 12799	194 / 12780			
DAPT P vs T										
PRAGUE-18	56 / 634	44 / 596		•	1.20 (0.81 to 1.78)	57 / 634	42 / 596			1.28 (0.86 to 1.90)
ISAR-REACT 5	152 / 2006	208/2012	←		0.73 (0.59 to 0.90)	80 / 1773	95 / 1989			0.94 (0.70 to 1.27)
REDUCE-MVI Trial	7 / 54	5/56	<	• •	1.45 (0.46 to 4.57)	1/51	1/51	÷ +		1.00 (0.06 to 15.99)
	215 / 2694	257 / 2664				138 / 2458	138 / 2636			
Pooled: Random Effects					HR (95% Crl)					HR (95% Crl)
T vs C (ref)			-	-	0.95 (0.81 to 1.14)			-		1.16 (0.98 to 1.48)
P vs C (ref) Fixed Effects			-		0.87 (0.74 to 1.06)					1.24 (0.99 to 1.57)
T vs C (ref)			•		0.90 (0.84 to 0.96)				•	1.07 (0.99 to 1.17)
P vs C (ref)			•		0.86 (0.81 to 0.91)			-	-	1.20 (1.04 to 1.40)
			06.08.1.	12 16				06 08 1	12 16	
			HR	1.2 1.0				HR		
			DAPT T/P	DAPT C				DAPT T/P	DAPT C	
			favoured	favoured				favoured	favoured	

Figure 5: Forest plot of summary of the Bayesian network meta-analyses for MACE and major bleeding events in patients taking clopidogrel compared to ticagrelor and clopidogrel. *Abbreviations: MACE, major acute coronary events; r, number of events; n, number of subjects per study arm; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; CrI, Bayesian credible interval; DAPT, dual-antiplatelet therapy; C, clopidogrel; T, ticagrelor; P, prasugrel; ref, reference group.*

1 APPENDIX

Supplemental Table 1: The results of the fixed effects Bayesian network meta-analyses for the primary outcomes of MACE and major bleeding.

					Pos	sterior distribut	ion
Outcome	DAPT	events	n	HR (95% CrI)	Pr _{HR<0.9}	Pr HR[0.9, 1.11]	Pr _{HR>1.11}
MACE	С	3,402	26,189	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	1,614	16,020	0.90 (0.84, 0.96)	0.534	0.466	0.00
n=57,814	Р	1,811	15,605	0.86 (0.81, 0.91)	0.932	0.068	0.00
Maj. Bleeding	С	1,224	25,959	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	1,251	15,894	1.08 (0.99, 1.17)	0.00	0.787	0.213
n=57,110	Р	383	15,257	1.20 (1.04, 1.40)	0.00	0.147	0.853

Abbreviations: dapt, dual-antiplatelet therapy; N, number of studies; n, number of patients; HR, hazard ratio; CrI, credible interval; Pr, probability; MACE, major acute coronary event (composite of death, non-fatal myocardial infarction, and non-fatal stroke); C, clopidogrel; T, ticagrelor; P, prasugrel; ref., reference group; Maj., major.

					Pos	sterior distribut	tion
Outcome	DAPT	events	n	HR (95% CrI)	Pr HR<0.9	Pr HR[0.9, 1.11]	Pr _{HR>1.11}
Mortality	С	1,299	26,189	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	661	16,020	0.87 (0.75, 1.07)	0.642	0.344	0.014
n=57,814	Р	728	15,605	0.94 (0.79, 1.14)	0.305	0.658	0.037
CV Mortality	С	1,076	26,056	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=15	Т	547	15,831	0.85 (0.73, 1.04)	0.753	0.239	0.008
n=57,438	Р	559	15,551	0.90 (0.76, 1.07)	0.516	0.473	0.011
MI	С	1,798	26,189	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	750	16,020	0.94 (0.76, 1.17)	0.328	0.612	0.060
n=57,814	Р	991	15,605	0.81 (0.65, 1.00)	0.874	0.121	0.005
Stroke	С	305	25,543	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=15	Т	203	15,373	1.02 (0.72, 1.33)	0.199	0.552	0.249
n=56,521	Р	162	15,605	0.88 (0.64, 1.18)	0.551	0.388	0.061
Min. Bleeding	С	548	24,729	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=12	Т	550	12,811	1.35 (1.08, 1.71)	0.002	0.034	0.964
n=49,677	Р	254	12,137	1.42 (1.08, 1.94)	0.003	0.031	0.966

Supplemental Table 2: The random effect results of secondary outcomes from the Bayesian network metaanalyses.

Abbreviations: dapt, dual-antiplatelet therapy; N, number of studies; n, number of patients; HR, hazard ratio; CrI, credible interval; Pr, probability; CV, cardiovascular; MI, non-fatal myocardial infarction, and non-fatal stroke); C, clopidogrel; T, ticagrelor; P, prasugrel; ref., reference group; Min., minor.

					Pos	sterior distribut	tion
Outcome	DAPT	events	n	HR (95% CrI)	Pr HR<0.9	Pr HR[0.9, 1.11]	Pr HR>1.11
Mortality	С	1,299	26,189	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	661	16,020	0.84 (0.76, 0.94)	0.890	0.110	0.00
n=57,814	Р	728	15,605	0.93 (0.83, 1.03)	0.305	0.695	0.00
CV Mortality	С	1,076	26,056	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=15	Т	547	15,831	0.83 (0.74, 0.93)	0.918	0.082	0.00
n=57,438	Р	559	15,551	0.90 (0.80, 1.01)	0.517	0.483	0.00
MI	С	1,798	26,189	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=17	Т	750	16,020	0.90 (0.81, 0.99)	0.531	0.469	0.00
n=57,814	Р	991	15,605	0.81 (0.74, 0.88)	0.992	0.008	0.00
Stroke	С	305	25,543	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=15	Т	203	15,373	1.06 (0.86, 1.29)	0.059	0.632	0.309
n=56,521	Р	162	15,605	0.91 (0.73, 1.12)	0.471	0.498	0.031
Min. Bleeding	С	548	24,729	1.0 (ref)	-	-	-
N=12	Т	550	12,811	1.34 (1.18, 1.52)	0.00	0.002	0.998
n=49,677	Р	254	12,137	1.39 (1.15, 1.68)	0.00	0.009	0.991

Supplemental Table 3: The fixed effect results of secondary outcomes from the Bayesian network metaanalyses.

Abbreviations: dapt, dual-antiplatelet therapy; N, number of studies; n, number of patients; HR, hazard ratio; CrI, credible interval; Pr, probability; CV, cardiovascular; MI, non-fatal myocardial infarction, and non-fatal stroke); C, clopidogrel; T, ticagrelor; P, prasugrel; ref., reference group; Min., minor.



Supplemental Figure 1: Publication bias funnel plots for major acute coronary events and major bleeding outcomes

1 Search Strategies

- 2 <u>MEDLINE:</u>
- 3 1. ((randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial).pt. or randomized.ab. or
- 4 randomised.ab. or placebo.ab. or drug therapy.fs. or randomly.ab. or trial.ab. or groups.ab.) not
- 5 (exp animals/ not humans.sh.)
- 6 2. acute coronary syndrome*.mp. or Acute Coronary Syndrome/ or ((myocardial or heart) adj
- 7 infarction*).mp. or acute mi.mp. or exp Myocardial Infarction/ or ((myocardial or heart muscle)
- 8 adj isch?emi*).mp. or Myocardial Ischemia/ or unstable angina*.mp. or Angina, Unstable/ or
- 9 STEMI.mp. or NSTEMI.mp.
- 10 3. (((percutaneous coronary or heart muscle) adj (intervention* or revasculari#ation*)) or
- 11 pci).mp. or Percutaneous Coronary Intervention/
- 12 4. stent*.mp. or Stents/
- 13 5. coronary artery bypass*.mp. or Coronary Artery Bypass/
- 14 6. 2 or 3 or 4 or 5
- 15 7. (clopidogrel and ticagrelor).mp.
- 16 8. (clopidogrel and prasugrel).mp.
- 17 9. (prasugrel and ticagrelor).mp.
- 18 10. (dual antiplatelet* or dual anti platelet* or DAPT).mp.
- **19** 11. 7 or 8 or 9 or 10
- **20** 12. 1 and 6 and 11
- 21
- **22** <u>EMBASE:</u>
- 23 1. crossover-procedure/ or double-blind procedure/ or randomized controlled trial/ or single-
- 24 blind procedure/ or (random* or factorial* or crossover* or cross over* or placebo* or (doubl*
- 25 adj blind*) or (singl* adj blind*) or assign* or allocat* or volunteer*).tw.
- 26 2. acute coronary syndrome*.mp. or acute coronary syndrome/
- 27 3. ((myocardial or heart) adj infarction*).mp. or heart infarction/
- 28 4. acute mi.mp.
- 29 5. myocardial isch?emi*.mp. or heart muscle ischemia/
- 30 6. unstable angina*.mp. or unstable angina pectoris/
- 31 7. non ST segment elevation myocardial infarction/
- 32 8. ST segment elevation myocardial infarction/
- 33 9. percutaneous coronary intervention.mp. or percutaneous coronary intervention/
- 34 10. heart muscle revascularization/ or ((percutaneous coronary or heart muscle) adj
- 35 revasculari#ation*).mp.
- 36 11. percutaneous coronary revasculari#ation*.mp.
- 37 12. stent*.mp. or stent/
- 38 13. coronary artery bypass*.mp. or coronary artery bypass graft/
- 39 14. 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13
- 40 15. (clopidogrel and prasugrel).mp.
- 41 16. (clopidogrel and ticagrelor).mp.
- 42 17. (prasugrel and ticagrelor).mp.
- 43 18. (dual antiplatelet* or dual anti platelet* or DAPT).mp.
- 44 19. 15 or 16 or 17 or 18
- 45 20. 1 and 14 and 19
- 46

1	CENT	RAL:									
2	ID	Search Hits									
3	#1	MeSH descriptor: [Acute Coronary Syndrome] this term only 1544									
4	#2	(acute coronary syndrome*):ti,ab,kw 5194									
5	#3	MeSH descriptor: [Myocardial Infarction] this term only 9758									
6	#4	((myocardial or heart) NEAR/1 infarction*):ti,ab,kw 25161									
7	#5	((myocardial or "heart muscle") NEAR/1 isch*emi*):ti,ab,kw 5803									
8	#6	(acute MI):ti,ab,kw 2007									
9	#7	MeSH descriptor: [Angina, Unstable] this term only 975									
10	#8	(unstable angina*):ti,ab,kw 2910									
11	#9	MeSH descriptor: [ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction] this term only 226									
12	#10	(STEMI):ti,ab,kw 2364									
13	#11	MeSH descriptor: [Non-ST Elevated Myocardial Infarction] this term only 47									
14	#12	(NSTEMI):ti,ab,kw 339									
15	#13	MeSH descriptor: [Percutaneous Coronary Intervention] this term only 1541									
16	#14	(("percutaneous coronary" or "heart muscle") NEAR/1 (intervention* or									
17	revasci	ulari?ation*)):ti,ab,kw 7932									
18	#15	(PCI):ti,ab,kw 5681									
19	#16	MeSH descriptor: [Stents] this term only 2807									
20	#17	(stent*):ti,ab,kw 11274									
21	#18	MeSH descriptor: [Coronary Artery Bypass] this term only 4919									
22	#19	(coronary artery bypass*):ti,ab,kw 9676									
23	#20	(prasugrel AND clopidogrel):ti,ab,kw 682									
24	#21	(prasugrel AND ticagrelor):ti,ab,kw 343									
25	#22	(clopidogrel AND ticagrelor):ti,ab,kw 743									
26	#23	(dual anti platelet therap*):ti,ab,kw 150									
27	#24	(dual antiplatelet therap*):ti,ab,kw 1279									
28	#25	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or									
29	#15 or	#16 or #17 or #18 or #19 46911									
30	#26	#20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 2256									
31	#27	#25 AND #26 1880									
32											
33	CLINIC.	ALTRIALS.GOV:									
34	Condit	tions or disease									
35	((Acut	e Coronary Syndrome*) OR (myocardial infarction*) OR (myocardial									
36	ischem	nia*) OR (unstable angina*) OR (stemi) OR									
37	(nstemi) OR (percutaneous coronary) OR (stent*) OR (coronary artery bypass*))										

- 38
- 39 Other terms
- 40 ((clopidogrel AND ticagrelor) OR (prasugrel AND ticagrelor) OR (clopidogrel AND
- 41 ticagrelor) OR (dual antiplatelet*) OR (dual anti platelet*) OR (DAPT))
- 42
- 43

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review incorporating a network meta-analysis (or related form of meta-analysis).	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	 Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: Background: main objectives Methods: data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal; and synthesis methods, such as network meta-analysis. Results: number of studies and participants identified; summary estimates with corresponding confidence/credible intervals; treatment rankings may also be discussed. Authors may choose to summarize pairwise comparisons against a chosen treatment included in their analyses for brevity. Discussion/Conclusions: limitations; conclusions and implications of findings. Other: primary source of funding; systematic review registration number with registry name. 	2
INTRODUCTION			
Kationale	3	context of what is already known, <i>including</i> mention of why a network meta- analysis has been conducted	4-5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed, with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists and if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address); and, if available, provide registration information, including registration number.	Not Published
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics	5-6

1 PRISMA NMA Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting A Systematic Review 2

		(e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. <i>Clearly describe eligible treatments</i> <i>included in the treatment network, and note</i>	
		whether any have been clustered or merged into	
Information sources	7	<i>The same node (with Justification).</i> Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	5
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	5, Appendix
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta- analysis).	5
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	6
Geometry of the network	S1	Describe methods used to explore the geometry of the treatment network under study and potential biases related to it. This should include how the evidence base has been graphically summarized for presentation, and what characteristics were compiled and used to describe the evidence base to readers.	7, Figure 2
Risk of bias within individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	6
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Also describe the use of additional summary measures assessed, such as treatment rankings and surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) values, as well as modified approaches used to present summary findings from meta-analyses.	7
Planned methods of analysis	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies for each network meta-analysis. This should include, but not be limited to: • Handling of multi-arm trials;	7

• Selection of variance structure

		• Selection of prior distributions in Bayesian	
		analyses; and	
		Assessment of model fit.	
Assessment of inconsistency	S2	Describe the statistical methods used to evaluate the agreement of direct and indirect evidence in the treatment network(s) studied. Describe efforts taken to	7
Disk of bigs poross	15	Specify any assessment of risk of high that may	5
studies	15	affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	5, Figure 6
Additional analyses	16	 Describe methods of additional analyses if done, indicating which were pre-specified. This may include, but not be limited to, the following: Sensitivity or subgroup analyses; Meta-regression analyses; Alternative formulations of the treatment network; and Use of alternative prior distributions for Bayesian analyses (if applicable). 	5-6
DECILI TC4			
RESULIST States all action	17		7
Study selection	1/	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	7, Figure 1
Presentation of network structure	S3	Provide a network graph of the included studies to enable visualization of the geometry of the treatment network.	Figure 2
Summary of network geometry	S4	Provide a brief overview of characteristics of the treatment network. This may include commentary on the abundance of trials and randomized patients for the different interventions and pairwise comparisons in the network, gaps of evidence in the treatment network, and potential biases reflected by the network structure.	7
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	7, Table 1
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment.	Table 1
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates and confidence intervals. <i>Modified</i> <i>approaches may be needed to deal with</i> <i>information from larger networks</i> .	8-10, Tables 2-3

Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence/credible intervals. <i>In larger</i> <i>networks, authors may focus on comparisons</i> <i>versus a particular comparator (e.g. placebo or</i> <i>standard care), with full findings presented in an</i> <i>appendix. League tables and forest plots may be</i> <i>considered to summarize pairwise comparisons.</i> If additional summary measures were explored (such as treatment rankings), these should also be presented.	8-10, Figure 4
Exploration for inconsistency	S5	Describe results from investigations of inconsistency. This may include such information as measures of model fit to compare consistency and inconsistency models, P values from statistical tests, or summary of inconsistency estimates from different parts of the treatment network.	Figures 3- 4
Risk of bias across	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias	Table 1
studies Results of additional analyses	23	across studies for the evidence base being studied. Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression analyses, alternative network geometries studied, alternative choice of prior distributions for Bayesian analyses, and so forth).	Not Applicable
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy- makers).	11-12
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). <i>Comment on the validity of the</i> <i>assumptions, such as transitivity and consistency.</i> <i>Comment on any concerns regarding network</i> <i>geometry (e.g., avoidance of certain</i> <i>comparisons).</i>	12-13
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	13
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic	None

> review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. This should also include information regarding whether funding has been received from manufacturers of treatments in the network and/or whether some of the authors are content experts with professional conflicts of interest that could affect use of treatments in the network.

- 1 PICOS = population, intervention, comparators, outcomes, study design.
- 2 * Text in italics Indicates wording specific to reporting of network meta-analyses that has been
- 3 added to guidance from the PRISMA statement.
- 4 † Authors may wish to plan for use of appendices to present all relevant information in full detail
- 5 for items in this section
- 6