Statistical analysis plan (SAP)

Section 1: Administrative information

1.1	Title and trial registration number	Risk of revision for different types of cup fixation in elderly patients with primary hip osteoarthritis. A study of XXX,XXX primary total hip arthroplasties from the Nordic Arthroplasty Register Association (NARA).
1.2	Names, affiliations	Roshan Latifi
	and roles of SAP contributers	Simon Kornvig
		Maziar Mohaddes Ardebili
		Claus Varnum
		Søren Overgaard
		In collaboration with authors from Sweden, Norway, and Finland as part of the Nordic Arthroplasty Register Association (NARA)
1.3	Principal investigator/project lead	Roshan Latifi
1.4	Statistician/data analyst	Simon Kornvig
1.5	Reference to protocol version being used	
1.6	SAP version and revision history	3
1.7	Date for approval of final SAP version	
1.8	Timeframe for conducting the proposed analysis	Q2 2024

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

2: Introduction

2.1	Describe briefly background, research questions and rationale behind the study	It is debated wether uncemented or cemented cup fixation should be used in older patients in total hip arthroplasty.	
2.2	Describe briefly objectives and/or hypotheses	 Overall aim: The overall aim was to compare the risk of THA revision with cemented and uncemented acetabular cups. The overall aim will be divided into 3 sub-aims: 1 Compare the risk of cup revision due to any reason after THA with cemented vs. uncemented acetabular cups 1.1 Perform analysis 1) stratified by sex, 5-year age groups and type of bearing (PE vs. XLPE) 1.2 Perform analysis 1) the first 2 years and the subsequent years after surgery 2 Compare the overall cause-specific risk of cup revision after THA with cemented vs. uncemented acetabular cups 2.1 Perform analysis 2) stratified by sex, 5-year age groups and type of bearing (PE vs. XLPE) 2.2 Perform analysis 2) stratified by sex, 5-year age groups and type of bearing (PE vs. XLPE) 2.2 Perform analysis 2) the first 2 years and the subsequent years after surgery 3 Compare the risk of cup and/or stem revision to any reason after THA with cemented vs. uncemented acetabular cups 3.1 Perform analysis 3) stratified by sex, 5-year age groups and type of bearing (PE vs. XLPE) 3.2 Perform analysis 3) stratified by sex, 5-year age groups and type of bearing (PE vs. XLPE) 3.2 Perform analysis 3) the first 2 years and the subsequent years after surgery 	

Section 3: Study methods

3.1	Study design	International register-based multicenter study
	Describe type of study (i.e. experimental/observational, parallel group/cross over, singlecenter/multicenter ect.) and describe briefly interventions	
3.2	<u>Randomization details</u> (if applicable)	N.A.
	Describe randomization i.e. allocation ratio, potential factors randomization will be stratified for and describe how and when randomization will be performed	
3.3	Sample size	Approx. XXX,XXX THA procedures performed
	Describe calculation of sample size or reference to sample size calculation in study protocol	between 1995-2019
3.4	Hypotheses framework	N.A (two-sided testing)
	Describe hypotheses framework i.e. superiority, equivalence or noninferiority hypothesis testing and which group comparisons will be analysed	
3.5	<u>Statistical interim analyses</u> and stopping guidelines (if applicable)	N.A.
	Describe how and when interim analyses will be performed, and potential planned adjustment of significance level due to interim analyses. Describe guidelines for stopping the trial early.	
3.6	Timing of outcome assessments and follow-up	N.A. (register-based follow-up)
	Describe time points at which outcomes/covariates will be measured (consider	

	a figure to visualize the time windows of measurements – see appendix)	
3.7	Timing of final analysis i.e. all outcomes analysed collectively or analyses performed according to planned follow-ups	Collectively

Section 4: Statistical principles and protocol deviations

4.1	Confidence intervals and	95% CI will be applied		
	<u>P-values</u> Specification of level of statistical significance and confidence intervals to be reported. Describe, if relevant, rationale for adjustment for multipel testing and how type 1 error will be controlled for	 P-values <0.05 will be considered statistically significant. All hypothesis-testings will be two-sided. In case of multiple testing, Holm-Bonferroni correction will be applied to control type 1 error rate. 		
4.2	Adherence/compliance and protocol deviations	N.A.		
	Define adherence/compliance and how this is assessed in the study. Define protocol deviations and which protocol deviations will be summarized and presented			
4.3	Analysis populations	Complete-case		
	Define analysis population i.e. intention-to-treat, per- protocol, complete case, safety population			

Section 5: Study population

5.1	Screening (if applicable)	N.A.
	Describe screening data to determine eligibility (i.e. scoring and scales)	
5.1	Eligibility Summarize in- and exclusion criteria	 Inclusion Primary THA during January 1, 1995 to December 31, 2018. Performed on the indication primary osteoarthritis (coded 1), idiopatic femoral head necrosis/Perthes disiase (coded 5, 12, 13), developmental dysplasia of the hip (coded 10) and epifysiolysis capitis femoris (coded 11, 13) Exclusion Age < 65 years Inverse hybrid Dual mobility cup Resurfacing (variable Fixtype) Implant used < 50 times in each country Missing data on confounders Patients registred with negative survival years Second THA in case of bilateral
5.2	Recruitment and flow chart Specification of steps in the recruitment process i.e. enrollment, screening allocation for use in flow chart (see appendix)	Roshan will draft the flow-chart – see appendix for the STROBE template. Simon will provide the numbers.
5.3	Withdrawal/loss to follow- up Specification on how reason and timing of withdrawal or loss to follow-up will be recorded and presented (i.e. in the flow chart – see appendix)	Loss to follow-up may not have been registred in case of immigration etc., however survived years has been calculated as time from primary surgery date to death or end of follow up (December 31, 2020)

5.4	Baseline patient characteristics	Roshan is responsible for drafting the tables – see appendix for suggestions.
	List of baseline characteristics and how these data will be descriptively summarized in a "Table 1" (see appendix)	Simon will provide the numbers.

Section 6: Analysis

(6.1	Exposure and outcome	Exposure:	
		Describe details on exposure i.e. assessment, definitions, units and thresholds or the intervention/treatment under study.	All analyses will compare patients with cemented cups vs. uncemented acetabular cups. The exposure groups will be defined as:	
			Cemented = fixtype "cemented" (coded 1) Uncemented = fixtype "uncemented" (coded 2) and "hybrid" (3)	
		List and describe details on primary and secondary outcomes i.e. definition of outcome and timing, specific clinical measurements and units (i.e. mmol/mol) or any calculation or transformation of data to derive the outcome (i.e. sum score, change from baseline, logarithm, quality- of-life scoring algorithm)	Outcome:	
			Sub-aim 1) and 2) will consider cup revision defined as surgery procedure "Both cup and stem replaced", "Only cup replaced" and "Definitive extraction (Girdlestone)".	
			For sub-aim 2, cause-specific revision will be defined as Dislocation (coded as RevCause 5), Aseptic Loosening (RevCause 1) and Others (RevCause 2,3,7,9 and missing).	
			Sub-aim 3) will consider both cup and/or stem revision defined as the above-mentioned and in addition "Only stem replaced", "others" and "missing".	
			Only first revision will be considered.	
(6.2	Primary analysis methods Describe in details which statistical methods will be used (i.e. regression), how treatment effects will be presented (i.e. which effect measure - OR, HR etc.) and if estimates will be adjusted for covariates	The following analysis will be performed according to the listed sub-aims:	
			 Compare the risk of cup revision due to any reason after THA with cemented vs. uncemented acetabular cups 	
			Crude cumulative incidence function will be calculated and plotted using the Aalen-Johansen method for cemented cups and uncemented cups.	
		(see appendix). If analyses will be adjusted for covariates, describe	Risk of cup revision will be analysed using Cox regression models and reported as Hazard ratios (HR) with corresponding 95% CI. HRs will be	



		vs. uncemented acetabular cups
		Crude cumulative incidence function will be calculated and plotted using the Aalen-Johansen method for cemented cups and uncemented cups.
		Risk of revision will be analysed using Cox regression models and reported as HR with corresponding 95% CI. HRs will be reported crude and adjusted for potential confounders. A minimal adjustment set for the multivariate model is defined using DAGs (same as in 1)).
		Assumptions will be checked according to 1).
		 3.1 Perform analysis 3) stratified by sex, 5-year age groups and type of bearing (PE vs. XLPE) 3.2 Perform analysis 3) the first 2 years and the subsequent years after surgery
		Age groups will be defined with 5-year intervals accoding to age at primary surgery: 65-69 years, 70-74 years, 75-79 years and 80+
6.3	Additional analysis	Sensitivity analyses:
	methods Describe any planned sensitivity and subgroup analysis including how subgroups will be defined (see appendix).	Aim 1) and 3) will be analysed in Fine&Grey regression models taking into account the competing risk from mortality.
6.4	Missing data	Proportion and patterns of missing data will be
	Describe how missing data will be explored and which assumptions and methods will be used to handle missing data (i.e. multiple imputation)	explored, and in case of <5% missing data analyses will be performed as complete case. If the amount of missing data is comprehensive (>5%) or suggestive for biased estimates, appropriate methods of imputation will be applied depending on the patterns of missingness.
6.5	Harms (only applicable in experimental studies)	N.A.
	Describe the collection of safety data i.e. data on severity, expectedness, causality. Describe grouping and analyses planned i.e. incidence analyses on grade 3-4 events only.	
6.6	<u>Statistical software:</u> Specify statistical packages to be used for the analyses	STATA 17 or newer

Appendix: Figure and table templates

5.2-3 Flow chart template for observational studies





5.4 Baseline table ("Table 1") template

	Intervention	Control	All	Missing
	(N = xx)	(N = xx)	(N = xx)	
Age, mean ±SD	xx (xx)	xx (xx)	xx (xx%)	xx (xx%)
Sex, N (%F)	xx (xx%)	xx (xx%)	xx (xx%)	xx (xx%)
BMI, median (IQR)	xx (xx-xx)	xx (xx-xx)	xx (xx-xx)	xx (xx-xx)
missing	xx (x%)	XX (X%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)
Smoking status, N(%)				
Current	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)
Past	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)
Never	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)
Missing	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)
Chemotherapy,N(%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)	xx (x%)
etc.				
etc.				

Table 1: Characteristics of the study population

6.2 Table example for reporting relative effect measures

	7 1		
	Crude RR (95% CI)	Adjusted RR (95% CI)	P-value
Primary exposure			
No	1 (ref)	1 (ref)	
Yes	xx (xx-xx)	xx (xx-xx)	XX
Secondary exposure			
No	1 (ref)	1 (ref)	
Yes	xx (xx-xx)	xx (xx-xx)	XX

Table 2: Relative effect measures on binary exposure and outcome

6.3 Table example for reporting subgroup-analysis

Table 3: Subgroup-analysis on ordinal exposure and binary outcome reported with relative effect measure

	Subgr	Subgroup A		roup B
	(N=	XX)	(N=XX)	
	Crude HR (95% CI)	Adjusted HR (95% CI)	Crude HR (95% CI)	Adjusted HR (95% CI)
Exposure groups				
No smoking	1 (ref)	1 (ref)	1 (ref)	1 (ref)
<5 pack years	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)
5-20 pack years	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)
>20 pack years	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)	x (xx-xx)