medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Manuscript title:

The fragility index in randomised controlled trials of interventions for aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage: a systematic review

Authors

1. **Aravind V Ramesh** BM BCh, MA(Cantab), MRCP(UK). ST5 Intensive Care Medicine, North Bristol NHS Trust.
2. **Henry N P Munby** MB BChir, MA (Cantab), MRCP(UK), PGCert. ST5 Intensive Care Medicine, North Bristol NHS Trust
3. **Matt Thomas** MB ChB, MA, MRCP(UK), DICM, FFICM, Dip Stat. Consultant Intensive Care Medicine, North Bristol NHS Trust.

Institution where work carried out: **North Bristol NHS Trust, Bristol, UK**

Address for corresponding author
Dr Matt Thomas
Intensive Care Unit
Southmead Hospital
Southmead Road
Bristol
BS10 5NB

Email: matt.thomas@nbt.nhs.uk

Word count: 2291 (including abstract)

Number of Figures and tables: 2 Figures, 2 Tables and 2 Supplementary Tables

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The fragility index in randomised controlled trials of interventions for aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage: a systematic review

Abstract

Background

Fragility analysis supplements the p-value and risk of bias assessment in the interpretation of results of randomised controlled trials. In this systematic review we determine the fragility index (FI) and fragility quotient (FQ) of randomized trials in aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage.

Methods

This is a systematic review registered with PROSPERO (ID: CRD42020173604). Randomised controlled trials in adults with aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage were analysed if they reported a statistically significant primary outcome of mortality, function (e.g. modified Rankin Scale), vasospasm or delayed neurological deterioration.

Results

We identified 3809 records with 17 randomized trials selected for analysis. The median fragility index was 3 (inter-quartile range 0-5) and the median fragility quotient was 0.012 (IQR 0-0.034). Six of nineteen trial outcomes (31.6%) had an fragility index of 0. In seven trials (36.8%), the number of participants lost to follow-up was greater than or equal to the fragility index. Only 17.6% of trials are at low risk of bias.

Conclusions

Randomised controlled trial evidence supporting management of aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage is weaker than indicated by conventional analysis using p-values alone. Increased use of fragility analysis by clinicians and researchers could improve the translation of evidence to practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

"The history of subarachnoid haemorrhage is similar to other areas of medicine in which anecdote leads to adoption of management that is of unproven efficacy and safety until shown in high-quality randomised trials"[1]. The minimum standard of proof of efficacy and safety in traditional frequentist analysis is usually taken to be a p value of less than 0.05, subject to further interpretation of the entire body of evidence from the trial in question. However, if the p-value threshold for statistical significance is not met it is unlikely that the intervention studied will be adopted by clinicians[2,3].

What is less often appreciated is that crossing the arbitrarily defined threshold for statistical significance, and hence the minimum standard for adoption into clinical practice, may rest on as few as one or two actual events even in high quality randomised trials[4,5]. The number of events that need to change groups to render a statistically significant result non-significant is an indicator of the fragility of that result[6]. The "fragility index" is intended to supplement rather than replace the p-value; it may caution against the over simple classification of trials into positive and negative, and for positive trials, may offer an additional tool to gauge the strength of a result.

Previous application of fragility analysis to the field of neurocritical care has been limited. A review of cerebrovascular studies limited by date and database showed the median fragility index (FI) of seven randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage (aSAH) to be 5[7]. No studies of nimodipine, the only drug demonstrated to have a neuroprotective effect in SAH[1], were included in the review. Although the authors proposed a system of classification of RCTs using fragility index, no assessment of the risk of bias of the primary study, another key component of study appraisal, was included.

Our hypothesis is that RCT evidence supporting clinical practice in aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage may be fragile. Our aim in this systematic review is to determine the Fragility Index of randomised controlled trials of interventions in aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage that report a statistically significant patient centred primary outcome. The primary objective is to present FI for trials meeting the criteria described. Secondary objectives are to analyse the risk of bias, to compare the Fragility Index with the number of participants lost to follow up in the trial, and to calculate the Fragility Quotient (FQ)[8].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted following the 'Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis' (PRISMA) statement[9] and the Synthesis Without Meta-analysis (SWiM) reporting guideline[10]. It was prospectively registered on the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO 2020 – ID: CRD42020173604).

Data sources and search strategy

The databases of Cochrane Central, MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL and the trials registries of ClinicalTrials.gov and the World Health Organisation International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP) were searched on 11th March 2020 to identify studies meeting the eligibility criteria below. The search strategy (Supplemental Table 1) was designed by an academic librarian in MEDLINE without date or language restrictions, and then adapted to other databases.

Eligibility Criteria

We included randomised clinical trials of acute hospital therapeutic interventions in adults older than 18 years of age with confirmed diagnosis of aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage (aSAH) on neuroimaging or CSF analysis which met the following criteria: parallel group 1:1 randomisation, statistically significant dichotomous primary outcome (defined as $p<0.05$) that was one of mortality, functional outcome (e.g. dichotomised modified Rankin Scale or Glasgow Outcome Scale), vasospasm or delayed neurological deterioration. Where an outcome was reported at more than one time point the latest reported time point was used for analysis. Where available the intention to treat analysis of primary outcome was used to determine statistical significance for the purpose of inclusion.

Studies without an English language abstract reporting the primary outcome, or of traumatic subarachnoid haemorrhage or animals were excluded. Studies of diagnosis, rehabilitation or organisational aspects of aSAH management were excluded. Studies available only on pre-print servers rather than peer reviewed journals were excluded.

Study selection

Two reviewers screened the titles and abstracts of articles. The full texts of potentially eligible studies were independently assessed by two reviewers; disagreements in each case were resolved through referral to the third reviewer.

Data extraction and study appraisal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Two reviewers independently extracted data from eligible articles using a standardised data extraction form with discrepancies resolved by the third reviewer.

Risk of bias assessment for each study was performed independently by two reviewers with disagreements resolved by the third reviewer. The Cochrane Risk of Bias tool 2.0[11] was used to assess methodological quality.

Data synthesis and analysis

The Fragility Index (FI) and Fragility Quotient (FQ) were calculated for each study as previously described[6,8].

The median (and interquartile range) value for FI is given for all studies meeting inclusion criteria and also by studies grouped according to intervention and primary outcome.

No quantitative data synthesis (meta-analysis) or further subgroup analysis was performed. All statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism version 9.0.0 for Windows.

Results

3809 citations were initially identified by the search strategy, with 17 studies involving 4151 participants included in qualitative data analysis (Figure 1).

Study characteristics

Study and participant characteristics are provided in Supplemental Table 2. Settings included Europe (six studies)[11–16], Asia (eight studies)[17–24], North America (two studies)[15,25], South America (one study)[26] and North Africa (one study)[27]. There were nine single centre studies[13,14,16,17,23–27] and eight multi-centre studies[11,12,15,18–22]. Publication dates ranged from 1989 to 2019. Thirteen studies looked at pharmacological interventions for aSAH[11,12,25–27,14,16–19,21–23]; the other four studies looked at surgical or interventional radiology treatments[15,20,24]. Eleven studies used vasospasm (angiographic or symptomatic) as their primary outcome[11,16,27,17–20,22,24–26], four studies used delayed ischaemic neurological deficit (DIND) or cerebral infarction[12–14,21] and three studies looked at clinical outcome using the Glasgow outcome scale (GOS) or the modified Rankin scale (mRS)[15,18,23].

Fragility Index analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Nineteen outcomes across the seventeen studies met criteria for fragility index (FI) analysis (Table 1). The median FI for all trial primary outcomes was 3 (IQR 0-5). Six trial outcomes (31.6%) had an FI of 0. Only six trial outcomes (31.5%) had a FI of greater than three (Figure 2). The median fragility quotient (FQ) was 0.012 (IQR 0-0.034).

Median trial size was 110 participants (IQR 67.5-186). In seven trials (36.8%), the number of participants lost to follow-up was greater than or equal to the fragility index.

The median FI for Vasospasm (both angiographic and symptomatic) was also 3 (11 trials, IQR 0-5), with a median FQ of 0.018 (0-0.046). The only trial reporting mortality as a primary outcome had an FI of 0. Four trials looked at delayed ischaemic neurological deficit (DIND) or cerebral infarction, with median FI 3.5 (IQR 2-8.75) and median FQ 0.015 (IQR 0.01-0.38). Three trials looked at clinical outcome using an outcome scale, with median FI 3 and median FQ 0.011.

Trials reporting on pharmacological interventions had a median FI of 3 (15 trials, IQR 0-5) and median FQ of 0.011 (IQR 0-0.034). Trials reporting on procedural interventions had a median FI of 5 (4 trials, IQR 2-30.5) and median FQ of 0.018 (IQR 0.012-0.088).

Study quality assessment

Results of study quality assessment are shown in Table 2 (Cochrane risk of bias tool 2.0). Three studies (17.6%) were rated overall as low risk of bias, six studies (35.3%) as some concerns, and eight studies (47%) as high risk of bias.

Discussion

The median fragility index in our systematic appraisal of randomized trials in aSAH is 3, with an interquartile range of 0 to 5. This is comparable to findings in critical care generally[4] and similar to a previous analysis of cerebrovascular trials[7], but is lower than that in cardiovascular studies, where the median fragility index was 13[5]. The fragility quotient relates the FI to the size of the trial and can be interpreted as the number of patients per 100 required to experience a different event to render the result non-significant. Our analysis shows a median FQ of 0.012, or 1.2 patients per 100, a figure comparable to trials supporting VTE guidelines[28], higher than in cardiovascular trials[5] and not previously reported in trials of aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage.

Six of nineteen trial outcomes (31.6%) are extremely fragile with an FI of 0, meaning simply recalculating the result using Fisher's Exact Test is sufficient to render the p-value non-significant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

without any switch in patient events. These findings show that conclusions of trials in aSAH rest on a very low number of events, a fact perhaps not appreciated by clinicians and indicative of a weakness in the trial not apparent from the p-value alone.

Analysis by outcome does not show that fragility is notably different in one particular type of trial or with one type of outcome. Unlike Khan et al.[5] we did not demonstrate higher FI in pharmaceutical trials. We also note that the majority of trials included in our analysis use a surrogate outcome (e.g. vasospasm) and not a patient centred outcome. Again this suggests that the body of evidence currently used to inform management of aSAH is lacking in crucial respects.

In more than one third of trials the fragility index is exceeded by the number of patients lost to follow up, indicating that the outcomes for lost participants could have changed the result to a non-significant one. It further emphasises that an FI of 3 is low and RCTs in aSAH are fragile. Our finding is in agreement with those of Khan et al, and Adeeb et al, in cardiovascular and cerebrovascular RCTs respectively[5,7]. Taken together this suggests the problem is not restricted to a single speciality within medicine but is generic to clinical research.

Only a minority of trials are at low risk of bias assessed by the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool 2.0, which provides additional support to the suggestion that the quality of evidence for interventions in aSAH is generally low. We have not formally analysed the relationship between risk of bias and fragility index, but note that studies we consider at high risk of bias have a higher FI but lower FQ than other studies (median 3 vs. 2 and 0.011 vs. 0.018 respectively). The lack of a clear relationship indicates that FI analysis provides additional information over and above to usual methods.

Our study has the following strengths: we use a systematic search with no restriction by date or database and analyse the risk of bias alongside fragility to provide a more rounded assessment of trial evidence than p-value alone. We have identified and analysed more trials than previous work in the area. Limitations of our study include exclusion of key trials that do not fit the strict inclusion criteria for fragility analysis, a recognised drawback for the technique. We acknowledge that this drawback means fragility analysis cannot be recommended for all studies at present, although identifying ways to extend the method to studies with multiple groups or non-dichotomous outcomes is an avenue for research.

The number of trials we exclude is a high proportion of all studies identified by our search. While this might be taken as a limitation as above, we believe that as a large number of these exclusions were for methodological weaknesses (e.g. failing to specify a primary outcome in advance) this supports

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

our general conclusion that overall the evidence supporting practice in aSAH is weaker than that suggested on the basis of p-values alone.

We must stress that we do not propose fragility analysis is used in isolation to dismiss trials from consideration, especially as there are no defined thresholds for a low FI or FQ, but that it supplements the usual methods. Lower FI values, particularly where the loss to follow up exceeds the FI, might help flag up concerns about trial reliability and act as an additional gauge of uncertainty of effect. The FQ represents another useful tool to further assess effect strength – consider 2 trials, one with an FI of 6 and an FQ of 0.2 (n=30), and the other with an FI of 30 and an FQ of 0.015 (n = 2000). The higher FI of the second trial might indicate it is more robust, but its lower FQ suggests it may well be less robust than the first in relation to its sample size.

In conclusion fragility analysis is a useful adjunct to critical appraisal of randomised controlled trial evidence in aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage. We caution against over-reliance on p-values and a false dichotomy into "positive" and negative" trials and call for future research to investigate extending fragility analysis to more trial designs and to define thresholds for interpretation.

Funding and Disclosures

The authors received no support for this manuscript. The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1 Macdonald RL, Schweizer TA. Spontaneous subarachnoid haemorrhage. *Lancet* 2017;**389**:655–66. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30668-7

2 Pocock SJ, Stone GW. The Primary Outcome Is Positive — Is That Good Enough? *N Engl J Med* 2016;**375**:971–9. doi:10.1056/nejmra1601511

3 Pocock SJ, Stone GW. The Primary Outcome Fails — What Next? *N Engl J Med* 2016;**375**:861–70. doi:10.1056/nejmra1510064

4 Ridgeon EE, Young PJ, Bellomo R, *et al.* The fragility index in multicenter randomized controlled critical care trials. *Crit Care Med* 2016;**44**:1278–84. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000001670

5 Khan MS, Ochani RK, Shaikh A, *et al.* Fragility Index in Cardiovascular Randomized Controlled Trials. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2019;**12**:e005755. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.005755

6 Walsh M, Srinathan SK, McAuley DF, *et al.* The statistical significance of randomized controlled trial results is frequently fragile: A case for a Fragility Index. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;**67**:622–8. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.10.019

7 Adeeb N, Terrell DL, Whipple SG, *et al.* The Reproducibility of Cerebrovascular Randomized Controlled Trials. *World Neurosurg* 2020;**140**:e46–52. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2020.04.106

8 Ahmed W, Fowler RA, McCredie VA. Does Sample Size Matter When Interpreting the Fragility Index? *Crit Care Med* 2016;**44**:e1142–3. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000001976

9 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009;**62**:1006–12. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005

10 Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, *et al.* Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: Reporting guideline. *BMJ* 2020;**368**:l6890. doi:10.1136/bmj.l6890

11 Vajkoczy P, Meyer B, Weidauer S, *et al.* Clazosentan (AXV-034343), a selective endothelin A receptor antagonist, in the prevention of cerebral vasospasm following severe aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: Results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter Phase IIa study. *J Neurosurg* 2005;**103**:9–17. doi:10.3171/jns.2005.103.1.0009

12 Pickard JD, Murray GD, Illingworth R, *et al.* Effect of oral nimodipine on cerebral infarction and outcome after subarachnoid haemorrhage: British aneurysm nimodipine trial. *Br Med J* 1989;**298**:636–42. doi:10.1136/bmj.298.6674.636

13 Al-Tamimi YZ, Bhargava D, Feltbower RG, *et al.* Lumbar drainage of cerebrospinal fluid after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: A prospective, randomized, controlled trial (LUMAS). *Stroke* 2012;**43**:677–82. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.625731

14 Westermaier T, Stetter C, Vince GH, *et al.* Prophylactic intravenous magnesium sulfate for treatment of aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: A randomized, placebo-controlled, clinical study. *Crit Care Med* 2010;**38**:1284–90. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181d9da1e

15 Molyneux AJ, Kerr RS, Yu LM, *et al.* International Subarachnoid Aneurysm Trial (ISAT) of neurosurgical clipping versus endovascular coiling in 2143 patients with ruptured intracranial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

aneurysms: A randomised comparison of effects on survival, dependency, seizures, rebleeding, subgroups, and. *Lancet* 2005;**366**:809–17. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67214-5

16 Tseng MY, Czosnyka M, Richards H, *et al.* Effects of acute treatment with pravastatin on cerebral vasospasm, autoregulation, and delayed ischemic deficits after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: A phase II randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Stroke* 2005;**36**:1627–32. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000176743.67564.5d

17 Li G fu, Ma Z hui, Luo W chi. [Clinical observation on the prevention and treatment of perioperative delayed cerebrovasospasm in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage by the comprehensive protocol of integrative medicine]. *Zhongguo Zhong xi yi jie he za zhi Zhongguo Zhongxiyi jiehe zazhi = Chinese J Integr Tradit West Med* 2012;**32**:1345–9.

18 Shibuya M, Suzuki Y, Sugita K, *et al.* Effect of AT877 on cerebral vasospasm after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: Results of a prospective placebo-controlled double-blind trial. *J Neurosurg* 1992;**76**:571–7. doi:10.3171/jns.1992.76.4.0571

19 Matsuda N, Naraoka M, Ohkuma H, *et al.* Effect of Cilostazol on Cerebral Vasospasm and Outcome in Patients with Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2016;**42**:97–105. doi:10.1159/000445509

20 Hamada JI, Kai Y, Morioka M, *et al.* Effect on Cerebral Vasospasm of Coil Embolization Followed by Microcatheter Intrathecal Urokinase Infusion Into the Cisterna Magna: A Prospective Randomized Study. *Stroke* 2003;**34**:2549–54. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000094731.63690.FF

21 Asano T, Takakura K, Sano K, *et al.* Effects of a hydroxyl radical scavenger on delayed ischemic neurological deficits following aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: Results of a multicenter, placebo-controlled double-blind trial. *J Neurosurg* 1996;**84**:792–803. doi:10.3171/jns.1996.84.5.0792

22 Senbokuya N, Kinouchi H, Kanemaru K, *et al.* Effects of cilostazol on cerebral vasospasm after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: A multicenter prospective, randomized, open-label blinded end point trial - Clinical article. *J Neurosurg* 2013;**118**:121–30. doi:10.3171/2012.9.JNS12492

23 Tang XP, Tan M, Zhang T, *et al.* Effects of early hyperbaric oxygen therapy on clinical outcome in postoperative patients with intracranial aneurysm. *Undersea Hyperb Med* 2011;**38**:493–501.

24 Rao W, Zhou C, Wang S. Therapeutic effect of continuous stellate ganglion block on cerebral vasospasm after interventional treatment of intracranial aneurysms. *J Interv Radiol* 2019;**28**:15–8. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1008-794X.2019.01.003

25 Lynch JR, Wang H, McGirt MJ, *et al.* Simvastatin reduces vasospasm after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: Results of a pilot randomized clinical trial. *Stroke* 2005;**36**:2024–6. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000177879.11607.10

26 Macedo S, Bello Y, Silva A, *et al.* Effects of simvastatin in prevention of vasospasm in nontraumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage: preliminary data. *Crit Care* 2009;**13**:P103. doi:10.1186/cc7267

27 Soliman R, Zohry G. Effect of magnesium sulphate and milrinone on cerebral vasospasm after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a randomized study. *Brazilian J Anesthesiol (English*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Ed 2019;**69**:64–71. doi:10.1016/j.bjane.2018.09.004

28 Edwards E, Wayant C, Besas J, *et al.* How Fragile Are Clinical Trial Outcomes That Support the CHEST Clinical Practice Guidelines for VTE? *Chest* 2018;**154**:512–20. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2018.01.031

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Tables

Table 1: Fragility index, fragility quotient and number lost to follow up for included trials

Table 2: Risk of bias assessment for randomised trials using the Cochrane risk of bias tool 2.0

Figures

Figure 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses flow diagram showing study selection for inclusion in Fragility analysis

Figure 2: Distribution of fragility index of randomized controlled trials in aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage reporting significant effects of an intervention on a prespecified patient-centred outcome

Supplemental content

Supplemental Table 1: Systematic review search strategy designed in Medline

Supplemental Table 2: Table of study characteristics


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through database searching (n = 3805)
Additional records identified through other sources (n =4)
Records after duplicates removed (n = 2433)
Records screened (n = 2433)
Records excluded (n = 2322)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 111)
Full-text articles excluded:
- Did not meet inclusion criteria (n = 68)
- Duplicate reports (n =15)
- Raw data unavailable (n=5)
- English translation unavailable (n=6)
Studies included in RoB assessment and fragility index analysis (n=17)


Number of trials
0
2
4
6
8
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38
Fragility index

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 1: Fragility index, fragility quotient and number lost to follow up for included trials

Study name	Primary outcome	n (total)	Fragility index	Fragility quotient	Number lost to follow-up
Vajcoczy et a 2005	Vasospasm	34	3	0.088	2
Li et al 2012	Vasospasm	63	0	0	0
Soliman et al 2019	Vasospasm	90	3	0.033	0
Shibuya et al 1992	Angiographic vasospasm	267	9	0.034	0
Shibuya et al 1992	Symptomatic vasospasm	267	3	0.011	0
Shibuya et al 1992	GOS	267	3	0.011	0
Matsuda et al 2016	Symptomatic vasospasm	148	0	0	0
Pickard et al 1989	Cerebral infarction	554	10	0.018	0
Hamada et al 2003	Symptomatic vasospasm	113	2	0.018	3
Asano et al 1996	Delayed ischaemic neurological deficit	162	2	0.012	14
Senbokuya et al 2013	Symptomatic vasospasm	109	5	0.046	0
Tang et al 2011	Good outcome (GOS 4-5)	120	0	0	5
Macedo et al 2009	Mortality	21	0	0	0
Al-tamimi et al	DIND	210	2	0.01	0
Westermaier et al 2010	Infarction	110	5	0.045	3
Lynch et al 2005	Vasospasm	39	0	0	0
Tseng et al 2005	Vasospasm	80	0	0	0
Molyneux et al 2005	1 year mRS 3-6	2143	38	0.018	33
Dept of Neurology 2019	Vasospasm	72	8	0.111	0

GOS: Glasgow Outcome Scale; DIND: delayed ischaemic neurological deficit; mRS: modified Rankin Scale

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251154; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Risk of bias assessment for randomised trials using the Cochrane risk of bias tool 2.0

Study (First Author, Year)	Randomization	Assignment or adherence to intervention	Missing outcome data	Outcome measurement	Selective outcome reporting	Overall
Vajcoczy et al 2005	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns
Li et al 2012	Some concerns	High	Some concerns	High	High	High
Soliman et al 2019	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	High
Shibuya et al 1992	Low	Low	High	Low	High	High
Matsuda et al 2016	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Pickard et al 1989	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	High
Hamada et al 2003	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
Asano et al 1996	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns
Senbokuya et al 2013	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Tang et al 2011	Low	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High
Macedo et al 2009	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	Low	Some concerns	High
Al-tamimi et al	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	High
Westermaier et al 2010	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns
Lynch et al 2005	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
Tseng et al 2005	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
Molyneux et al 2005	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Dept of Neurology 2019	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	High	Some concerns	High