

1     **ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION**

2     **Title**

3     **Effects of individual components of remote monitoring for implantable**  
4     **cardioverter defibrillators or cardiac resynchronisation therapy defibrillators:**  
5     **protocol for a systematic review and component network meta-analysis**

6

7     **Registration**

8     In accordance with the guidelines, our systematic review protocol was registered with  
9     the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) on 7 March  
10    2024 (registration number CRD42024517406).

11

12    **Authors**

13    Makiko Okazaki<sup>1,2</sup>, Natsuko Sekiguchi<sup>3</sup>, Yuki Sahashi<sup>4,5</sup>, Hisashi Noma<sup>6</sup>, Takahiro  
14    Mihara<sup>1</sup>

15

16    <sup>1</sup> Department of Health Data Science, Yokohama City University Graduate School of  
17    Data Science, Yokohama, Japan

18    <sup>2</sup> Department of Clinical Engineering, Sakakibara Heart Institute, Fuchu, Japan

19    <sup>3</sup> Division of Nursing, Higashigaoka Faculty of Nursing, Tokyo Healthcare University,  
20    Meguro, Japan

21    <sup>4</sup> Department of Cardiology, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, USA

22    <sup>5</sup> Department of Cardiology, Gifu University, Gifu, Japan

23    <sup>6</sup> Department of Data Science, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tachikawa,  
24    Japan

25

26 Corresponding author: Takahiro Mihara

27 Department of Health Data Science, Yokohama City University Graduate School of

28 Data Science, Yokohama 236-0027, Japan

29 Phone number: +81-45-787-2800

30 E-mail: meta.analysis.r@gmail.com

31

### 32 **Funding**

33 This research did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies in the public,  
34 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

35

### 36 **Conflict of interest statement**

37 None declared.

38

39 **ABSTRACT**

40

41 **Introduction:** Currently, the standard of care for patients with cardiac implantable  
42 electronic devices (CIEDs) such as implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (ICD) and  
43 cardiac resynchronisation therapy-defibrillators (CRT-D) involves a combination of  
44 in-person outpatient visits and remote monitoring (RM). RM consists of scheduled  
45 remote device interrogation and automated transmission of prespecified alerts (alert  
46 transmission) at varying frequencies depending on manufacturers and institutions.  
47 However, the effects of RM factors on prognosis remain unclear. This systematic review  
48 and component network meta-analysis (CNMA) will aim to investigate which RM  
49 components (device interrogation, alert transmission, and data transmission frequency)  
50 have the greatest impact on prognosis in patients with ICD or CRT-D.

51 **Methods and analysis:** A systematic review will be conducted using MEDLINE  
52 (PubMed), Embase, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, the Web of  
53 Science, ClinicalTrials.gov, the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform  
54 (ICTRP), the European Union Clinical Trials Register (EU-CTR), and the University  
55 Hospital Medical Information Network Clinical Trials Registry (UMIN-CTR). We will  
56 include randomised controlled trials (RCTs) assessing the effect of RM on patient  
57 outcomes in individuals with ICD or CRT-D. The primary outcome will be  
58 hospitalisation due to cardiovascular disease, heart failure, and device-related  
59 complications. Two authors will independently conduct literature screening, data  
60 extraction, and risk of bias assessment. Random-effects model pairwise meta-analysis,  
61 random-effects network meta-analysis (NMA), and additive CNMA will be applied in  
62 data synthesis. To assess the quality of evidence, we will employ the Grading of

63 Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach for  
64 pairwise meta-analysis and the Confidence in Network Meta-Analysis (CINeMA)  
65 approach for NMA.

66 **Ethics and dissemination:** Ethics approval is not required as this study will use  
67 existing published data. The results will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed  
68 journal.

69 **PROSPERO registration number:** CRD42024517406.

70

71 **Keywords:** Remote Monitoring; Defibrillators, Implantable; Cardiac Resynchronisation  
72 Therapy Devices; Network Meta-Analysis; Outpatients; Hospitalization; Randomized  
73 Controlled Trials

74

75 **INTRODUCTION**

76

77 **Rationale**

78 Implantable cardioverter-defibrillator (ICD) and cardiac resynchronisation  
79 therapy-defibrillator (CRT-D) implantation improves cardiac function and prevents  
80 sudden arrhythmic death [1, 2]. The current post-implantation standard of care involves  
81 a combination of in-person outpatient visits and remote monitoring (RM) [3, 4]. To date,  
82 several studies have examined the safety and efficacy of RM [4-6] and reported that RM  
83 reduces the number of in-person outpatient visits without compromising safety [5],  
84 decreases all-cause mortality [6], and reduces emergency clinic visits in patients with  
85 heart failure and ICD or CRT-D implants [7]. These studies have predominantly  
86 compared RM with conventional in-person outpatient care.

87 RM involves scheduled remote device interrogation and automated transmission of  
88 prespecified alerts (alert transmission) [8]. Furthermore, the frequency of remote data  
89 transmission varies depending on the manufacturers and institutions involved in  
90 reported studies [9]. The combination of in-person outpatient visits, scheduled remote  
91 device interrogation, and alert transmission demands substantial staff time [10].  
92 Therefore, identifying which of these RM components have the greatest impact on  
93 patient outcomes is crucial to understanding which component should be prioritised in  
94 patient management. However, the effects of RM components on outcomes and patient  
95 management remain unclear.

96 Component network meta-analysis (CNMA) allows the estimation of the individual  
97 effects of multiple components within complex interventions [11]. Therefore, the study  
98 will utilise CNMA to elucidate the relative effects of remote device interrogation, alert

99 transmission, and data transmission frequency on patient outcomes.

100

## 101 **Objectives**

102 The objective of this systematic review will be to evaluate which components of RM

103 have the greatest impact on prognosis in patients with ICD or CRT-D.

104

## 105 **METHODS**

106

### 107 **Study design**

108 The study will be a systematic review incorporating CNMA. This protocol follows the

109 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols

110 (PRISMA-P) guidelines [12]. The systematic review will be reported using the PRISMA

111 guidelines extension for systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of

112 health care interventions (PRISMA-NMA) [13] to structure the contents of the final

113 report. We will conduct CNMA according to PRISMA-NMA guidelines and the

114 *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.4 [13, 14]. This

115 protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic

116 Reviews (PROSPERO) (registration number: CRD42024517406).

117

### 118 **Eligibility criteria**

119 We will include randomised controlled trials (RCTs), including re-analyses of

120 previously published RCTs that did not originally include the outcomes covered by this

121 study. We will exclude quasi-experimental studies.

122

123 Participants

124 We will include studies examining patients who underwent ICD or CRT-D implantation  
125 and studies involving other cardiac implantable electronic devices (CIEDs) if ICD or  
126 CRT-D data are reported separately.

127

128 Interventions

129 RM involving data transmission without in-person interaction will be included. RM will  
130 comprise scheduled interrogation and alert transmission. Moreover, scheduled  
131 interrogations will be classified as daily or interval interrogations as described by the  
132 device manufacturer. Thus, in CNMA intervention components will be classified as  
133 daily remote interrogation, interval remote interrogation, or alert transmission.

134

135 Comparators

136 Conventional in-person outpatient visits will be the reference component as these are  
137 the most common comparators reported in published studies and are routinely  
138 performed in clinical practice.

139

140 Outcomes

141 Studies including at least one of the following outcomes are eligible including outcomes  
142 reported as a component of a composite outcome:

- 143 · hospitalisation (cardiovascular, heart failure, device-related)
- 144 · mortality (all-cause, cardiovascular)
- 145 · unscheduled outpatient visits
- 146 · unscheduled hospitalisation

147

148 Timing

149 No restrictions on follow-up periods will be applied.

150

151 Setting

152 No restrictions on setting will be applied.

153

154 Language

155 We will not impose language restrictions in our literature searches.

156

157 **Information sources**

158 We will use MEDLINE (PubMed), Embase, the Cochrane Central Register of

159 Controlled Trials, and the Web of Science. The reference lists of the relevant articles

160 will also be searched. Further, we will conduct searches via Clinical Trials.gov, the

161 WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP), the European Union

162 Clinical Trials Register (EU-CTR), and the University Hospital Medical Information

163 Network Clinical Trials Registry (UMIN-CTR).

164

165 **Search strategy**

166 Search strategies will be developed using medical subject headings (MeSH) and free

167 text words relating to ICD, CRT-D, and RM. The proposed search strategy for

168 MEDLINE is presented in Table 1. Search strategies for other databases, registries, and

169 websites are explained in Supplementary File 1.

170



171 Table 1 Search strategy for PubMed

Number	Search terms
#1	<p>"defibrillators, implantable"[MeSH Terms] OR</p> <p>("implantable"[Title/Abstract] AND "cardioverter*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("implantable"[Title/Abstract] AND "defibrillator*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("implantable"[Title/Abstract] AND "cardioverter"[Title/Abstract] AND "defibrillator*"[Title/Abstract]) OR "cardiac resynchronization therapy devices"[MeSH Terms] OR ("cardiac"[Title/Abstract] AND "resynchronization"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("cardiac"[Title/Abstract] AND "resynchronisation"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("resynchronization"[Title/Abstract] AND "therapy"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("resynchronisation"[Title/Abstract] AND "therapy"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("resynchronization"[Title/Abstract] AND "device*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("resynchronisation"[Title/Abstract] AND "device*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>"biventricular"[Title/Abstract] OR "CIED*"[Title/Abstract] OR</p> <p>("biventricular"[Title/Abstract] AND "implantable"[Title/Abstract] AND "cardioverter"[Title/Abstract] AND "defibrillator*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("cardiac"[Title/Abstract] AND "implantable"[Title/Abstract] AND "electronic"[Title/Abstract] AND "device*"[Title/Abstract])</p>
#2	<p>("remote"[Title/Abstract] AND "monitor*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("remote"[Title/Abstract] AND "manag*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("remote"[Title/Abstract] AND "follow up"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("remote"[Title/Abstract] AND "transmission"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p>

	<p>("wireless"[Title/Abstract] AND "monitor*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("wireless"[Title/Abstract] AND "manag*"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("wireless"[Title/Abstract] AND "follow up"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>("wireless"[Title/Abstract] AND "transmission"[Title/Abstract]) OR</p> <p>"homemonitor*"[Title/Abstract] OR</p> <p>"remotemanagement"[Title/Abstract] OR "home</p> <p>monitor*"[Title/Abstract] OR "telemonitor*"[Title/Abstract] OR</p> <p>"Telemetry"[MeSH Terms] OR "Telemetry"[Title/Abstract] OR</p> <p>"telemedicine"[MeSH Terms] OR "telemedicine"[Title/Abstract]</p>
#3	<p>("randomized controlled trial"[Publication Type] OR "controlled clinical</p> <p>trial"[Publication Type] OR "randomized"[Title/Abstract] OR</p> <p>"placebo"[Title/Abstract] OR "drug therapy"[MeSH Subheading] OR</p> <p>"randomly"[Title/Abstract] OR "trial"[Title/Abstract] OR</p> <p>"groups"[Title/Abstract]) NOT ("animals"[MeSH Terms] NOT</p> <p>"humans"[MeSH Terms])</p>
#4	#1 AND #2 AND #3

172

173 **Study records**

174 Data management

175 Database citations will be exported using Mendeley Reference Manager

176 (<https://www.mendeley.com/reference-management/reference-manager>; Elsevier,

177 Amsterdam, Netherlands). The search results will be uploaded to Rayyan

178 (<http://rayyan.qcri.org>; Rayyan Systems, Cambridge, MA, USA), a free web and mobile

179 application that facilitates abstract and title screening and collaboration among

180 reviewers [15].

181

182 Study selection

183 Two reviewers will independently screen the titles and abstracts of each study identified

184 using the described search strategies. We will retrieve the full texts of studies that

185 appear to meet the eligibility criteria and those of which eligibility is questioned.

186 Disagreements between reviewers will be resolved through discussion.

187

188 Data collection process

189 Two reviewers will independently extract data in duplicate from each eligible study. To

190 ensure consistency between reviewers, the first 5 titles will be screened via a data

191 collection form and discussion. Discrepancies will be resolved via discussion (including

192 a third reviewer if necessary). If data are missing or presented ambiguously, we will

193 contact the study authors for clarification.

194

195 **Data items**

196 A data collection sheet will be created. The following data will be extracted:

197 1. patient characteristics (age, sex, device type, New York Heart Association

198 functional class, underlying heart disease, and left ventricular ejection fraction)

199 2. intervention and control details (RM interrogation schedule, in-person outpatient

200 visit timing, and alert transmission criteria)

201 3. outcome data (including mortality, hospitalisation, and dropout rate)

202 4. study details (title, author information, year of publication, trial design, trial size,

203 eligibility criteria, exclusion criteria, duration of follow-up, type and source of

204 financial support, study settings, and publication status)

205 Values, for example, means, will be approximated from figures if necessary.

206

## 207 **Outcomes and prioritisation**

208 Primary outcome

209 Hospitalisation including cardiovascular, heart failure, and device-related

210 hospitalisation.

211

212 Secondary outcomes

213 All-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality, unscheduled outpatient visits, and

214 unscheduled hospitalisation.

215

216 If outcomes are reported as a composite endpoint, we will extract individual outcomes

217 of interest from study results if extractable. If not extractable, we will contact the study

218 authors for clarification.

219

## 220 **Risk of bias in individual studies**

221 Two reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias, and disagreement will be

222 resolved through discussion. The revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for RCTs (RoB 2.0;

223 [cochrane.org](http://cochrane.org)) [16] will be used. The tool assesses bias across 5 domains, and the overall

224 risk of bias is determined based on the results of these domains:

225 1. Bias arising from the randomisation process

226 2. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions

227 3. Bias due to missing outcome data

228 4. Bias in the measurement of outcomes

229 5. Bias for selection of the reported result

230 Each domain's risk of bias and overall risk of bias will be described as "low," "some  
231 concern," or "high."

232

### 233 **Data synthesis and analysis**

234 Summary measures (measures of treatment effect)

235 Dichotomous outcomes such as hospitalisation and mortality will be analysed using risk  
236 ratio (RR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Continuous outcomes will be analysed  
237 using mean difference (MD) or standardised mean difference (SMD) if different  
238 measurement scales are used with 95% CI. If data is missing, we will contact the  
239 authors of the study to obtain the relevant missing data.

240

241 Pairwise meta-analysis

242 If multiple studies with conventional in-person outpatient visits as a comparator are  
243 identified, we will conduct pairwise meta-analyses to assess the effectiveness of RM  
244 intervention for each outcome. We will use the DerSimonian and Laird [17]  
245 meta-analysis with random effects method to combine the results and present summary  
246 measures alongside the estimated effects of each study using forest plots. Heterogeneity  
247 will be quantified using  $I^2$  statistics.

248

249 Network meta-analysis

250 *Review of network geometry*

251 We will construct a network diagram and evaluate the network geometry [13].

252 Evaluating the geometry of the network allows for an assessment of the feasibility of  
253 NMA, such as determining whether the network of interventions is connected.  
254 Additionally, this assessment includes the identification of closed loops of treatments  
255 within the network, facilitating the evaluation of inconsistency that is the disagreement  
256 between effects estimated from direct and indirect sources.

257

#### 258 *Transitivity and inconsistency in NMA*

259 We will statistically evaluate both local and global inconsistency. The local assessment  
260 will be performed using the side-splitting method [18] while the global assessment will  
261 be conducted via the design-by-treatment interaction model [19].

262 We will perform a random-effects NMA assuming a common between-studies  
263 variance across the whole network. Summary effect measures such as RR will be  
264 estimated along with 95% CI. The results of the estimation will be presented using the  
265 league table and the Surface Under the Cumulative Ranking curve (SUCRA) [20]. We  
266 will use the R package “nma” ([cran.r-project.org/web/packages/NMA/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/NMA/index.html)) [21].

267

#### 268 Component network meta-analysis

##### 269 *Additivity assumption in CNMA*

270 CNMA allows the estimation of component effects of multicomponent interventions. In  
271 this context, an additivity assumption is used, which means that the effect of each  
272 intervention can be expressed as the sum of the effects of its individual components. We  
273 will use the method based on a comparison of treatment estimates from the standard  
274 NMA and the additive CNMA model to assess the additivity assumption [11, 22].

275 If additivity holds, we will use an additive effects-based CNMA model for estimating

276 the relative effects of components. The results of the estimation will be presented using  
277 the league table and the P-score, a frequentist version of SUCRA [23]. We will use the  
278 R package “netmeta” ([cran.r-project.org/web/packages/netmeta/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/netmeta/index.html)) [24].

279

280 **Narrative synthesis**

281 If quantitative synthesis is not feasible due to significant between-studies heterogeneity  
282 or an insufficient number of studies, we will conduct systematic narrative synthesis.

283 This approach will use information from the text and tables to summarise and describe  
284 the characteristics and findings of the included studies.

285

286 **Additional analyses**

287 *Sensitivity analysis*

288 To assess the robustness of our findings based on the primary analysis, we plan to  
289 perform a sensitivity analysis after excluding studies with a high risk of bias.

290

291 *Subgroup analysis*

292 We will conduct a subgroup analysis classified by device type (ICD or CRT-D) to  
293 examine the consistency of results and validate the robustness of our findings.

294

295 Statistical analyses will be performed using the latest versions of R software (R  
296 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) [25] and RStudio (RStudio,  
297 Boston, MA, USA) [26] at the time of analysis.

298

299 **Risk of bias across studies**

300 If a study protocol is available, we will compare outcomes reported in the protocol or  
301 trial registry with those in the published studies to assess the potential risk of reporting  
302 bias. Small study effects will be assessed using Egger's regression to detect funnel plot  
303 asymmetry [27] using a significance threshold of  $p < 0.1$ .

304

### 305 **Confidence in cumulative estimate**

306 We will use the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and  
307 Evaluation (GRADE) approach to assess the certainty of evidence for each outcome in  
308 pairwise meta-analyses [28]. The quality of evidence will be assessed across the  
309 following domains: limitations in study design, risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness,  
310 imprecision of the results, and publication bias. The quality of evidence will be  
311 categorised as high, moderate, low, or very low. The Confidence in Network  
312 Meta-Analysis (CINeMA) approach will be used to evaluate confidence in the NMA  
313 estimates [29-31].

314

### 315 **IMPLICATION AND LIMITATION**

316 In the proposed study, we will aim to estimate the effect size of each RM component on  
317 patient outcomes. The current follow-up practices for CIEDs, including ICDs and  
318 CRT-Ds, recommend RM [3,4] based on known benefits including reductions in  
319 all-cause mortality and emergency clinic visits [6, 7]. However, managing the increasing  
320 population of patients with CIEDs using conventional remote management (periodic  
321 remote interrogation + alert transmission + in-person outpatient visits) is a major  
322 clinical and administrative burden [32]. Therefore, by identifying the most effective  
323 components of RM, follow-up can be optimised without compromising patient



324 outcomes. However, CNMA assumes both consistency and additivity. If these  
325 assumptions are not met, the accuracy of the estimated results will potentially be  
326 compromised, therefore necessitating careful interpretation.

327

## 328 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

329 Ethics approval is not required as this study will use existing published data. The results  
330 will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

331 Any significant changes to this protocol will be noted with a description of the change,  
332 the corresponding rationale, and the date of the amendment when the results are  
333 reported.

334

## 335 **Acknowledgments**

336 We would like to thank Editage ([www.editage.com](http://www.editage.com)) for English-language editing.

## 337 **Data availability statement**

338 Data sharing not applicable as no datasets were generated and/or analysed for this study.

## 339 **Funding statement**

340 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
341 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## 342 **Competing interests statement**

343 None declared.

## 344 **Authors' contributions**

345 TM drafted the protocol. MO, TM, and YS led the development of the review protocol  
346 and drafted the manuscript. TM and MO contributed to the development of the selection  
347 criteria, risk of bias assessment strategy and data extraction criteria. TM and MO

348 developed the search strategy. HN provided expertise on statistical analysis. MO, NS,  
349 YS, and TM read all drafts of the manuscript, provided feedback and approved the final  
350 manuscript.  
351

352 **REFERENCES**

- 353 1. Al-Khatib SM, Stevenson WG, Ackerman MJ, et al. 2017 AHA/ACC/HRS  
354 guideline for management of patients with ventricular arrhythmias and the  
355 prevention of sudden cardiac death: A Report of the American College of  
356 Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines  
357 and the Heart Rhythm Society. *Heart Rhythm* 2018;15:e73–189. doi:  
358 10.1016/j.hrthm.2017.10.036
- 359 2. Authors/Task Force Members: McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, et al.; ESC  
360 Scientific Document Group. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment  
361 of acute and chronic heart failure: Developed by the Task Force for the diagnosis  
362 and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of  
363 Cardiology (ESC). With the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association  
364 (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2022;24:4–131. doi: 10.1002/ejhf.2333
- 365 3. Slotwiner D, Varma N, Akar JG, et al. HRS Expert Consensus Statement on remote  
366 interrogation and monitoring for cardiovascular implantable electronic devices.  
367 *Heart Rhythm* 2015;12:e69–100. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2015.05.008
- 368 4. Ferrick AM, Raj SR, Deneke T, et al. 2023 HRS/EHRA/APHRS/LAHR expert  
369 consensus statement on practical management of the remote device clinic. *Heart*  
370 *Rhythm* 2023;20:e92–144. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2023.03.1525
- 371 5. Varma N, Epstein AE, Irimpen A, et al.; TRUST Investigators. Efficacy and safety  
372 of automatic remote monitoring for implantable cardioverter-defibrillator  
373 follow-up: the Lumos-T Safely Reduces Routine Office Device Follow-up  
374 (TRUST) trial. *Circulation* 2010;122:325–32. doi:  
375 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.110.937409

- 376 6. Hindricks G, Taborsky M, Glikson M, et al.; IN-TIME study group. Implant-based  
377 multiparameter telemonitoring of patients with heart failure (IN-TIME): a  
378 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2014;384:583–90. doi:  
379 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61176-4
- 380 7. Landolina M, Perego GB, Lunati M, et al. Remote monitoring reduces healthcare  
381 use and improves quality of care in heart failure patients with implantable  
382 defibrillators: the evolution of management strategies of heart failure patients with  
383 implantable defibrillators (EVOLVO) study. *Circulation* 2012;125:2985–92. doi:  
384 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.111.088971
- 385 8. Boriani G, Da Costa A, Quesada A, et al.; MORE-CARE Study Investigators.  
386 Effects of remote monitoring on clinical outcomes and use of healthcare resources  
387 in heart failure patients with biventricular defibrillators: results of the  
388 MORE-CARE multicentre randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Heart Fail*  
389 2017;19:416–25. doi: 10.1002/ejhf.626
- 390 9. Braunschweig F, Anker SD, Proff J, et al. Remote monitoring of implantable  
391 cardioverter-defibrillators and resynchronization devices to improve patient  
392 outcomes: dead end or way ahead? *Europace* 2019;21:846–55. doi:  
393 10.1093/europace/euz011
- 394 10. Seiler A, Biundo E, Di Bacco M, et al. Clinic Time Required for Remote and  
395 In-Person Management of Patients With Cardiac Devices: Time and Motion  
396 Workflow Evaluation. *JMIR Cardio* 2021;5:e27720. doi: 10.2196/27720
- 397 11. Rücker G, Petropoulou M, Schwarzer G. Network meta-analysis of  
398 multicomponent interventions. *Biom J* 2020;62:808–21. doi:  
399 10.1002/bimj.201800167

- 400 12. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al.; PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting  
401 items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:  
402 elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;350:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647.  
403 Erratum in: *BMJ* 2016;354:i4086.
- 404 13. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for  
405 reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care  
406 interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162:777–84. doi:  
407 10.7326/M14-2385
- 408 14. Chaimani A, Caldwell DM, Li T, et al. Chapter 11: Undertaking network  
409 meta-analyses. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ,  
410 Welch VA, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*  
411 version 6.4 (updated August 2023). London: Cochrane, 2023.  
412 [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook)
- 413 15. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for  
414 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:210. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4
- 415 16. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of  
416 bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4898
- 417 17. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*  
418 1986;7:177–88. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
- 419 18. Noma H, Tanaka S, Matsui S, et al. Quantifying indirect evidence in network  
420 meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2017;36:917–27. doi: 10.1002/sim.7187
- 421 19. White IR, Barrett JK, Jackson D, et al. Consistency and inconsistency in network  
422 meta-analysis: model estimation using multivariate meta-regression. *Res Synth*  
423 *Methods* 2012;3:111–25. doi: 10.1002/jrsm.1045

- 424 20. Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JP. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for  
425 presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial.  
426 *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:163–71. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.03.016
- 427 21. Noma H, Maruo K, Tanaka S, et al. NMA: Network Meta-Analysis Based on  
428 Multivariate Meta-Analysis Models. R Package Version 1.4-1. 2023.  
429 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/NMA/>.
- 430 22. Rucker G, Schmitz S, Schwarzer G. Component network meta-analysis compared  
431 to a matching method in a disconnected network: A case study. *Biom J*  
432 2021;63:447–61. doi: 10.1002/bimj.201900339
- 433 23. Rucker G, Schwarzer G. Ranking treatments in frequentist network meta-analysis  
434 works without resampling methods. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2015;15:58. doi:  
435 10.1186/s12874-015-0060-8
- 436 24. Rucker G, Krahn U, König J, et al. netmeta: Network Meta-Analysis using  
437 Frequentist Methods. R Package Version 2.8-2. 2023.  
438 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/netmeta/index.html>
- 439 25. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R  
440 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2021.  
441 <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 442 26. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston,  
443 MA, USA. 2020. <http://www.rstudio.com/>.
- 444 27. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a  
445 simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629–34. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629
- 446 28. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al.; GRADE Working Group. GRADE: an  
447 emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.

- 448 BMJ 2008;336:924–6. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
- 449 29. Salanti G, Del Giovane C, Chaimani A, et al. Evaluating the quality of evidence  
450 from a network meta-analysis. PLoS One 2014;9:e99682. doi:  
451 10.1371/journal.pone.0099682
- 452 30. Papakonstantinou T, Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JPT, et al. CINeMA: Software for  
453 semiautomated assessment of the confidence in the results of network  
454 meta-analysis. Campbell Syst Rev 2020;16:e1080. doi: 10.1002/cl2.1080
- 455 31. Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JPT, Papakonstantinou T, et al. CINeMA: An approach  
456 for assessing confidence in the results of a network meta-analysis. PLoS Med  
457 2020;17:e1003082. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003082
- 458 32. Seiler A, Biundo E, Di Bacco M, et al. Clinic Time Required for Remote and  
459 In-Person Management of Patients With Cardiac Devices: Time and Motion  
460 Workflow Evaluation. JMIR Cardio 2021;5:e27720. doi: 10.2196/27720