

---

Flynn D, Francis R, Halvorsud K, Gonzalo-Almorox E, Craig D, Robalino S,  
McMeekin P, Cora A, Balami J, Ford GA, White PM.

[Intra-arterial Mechanical Thrombectomy Stent Retrievers and Modern  
Devices in the Treatment of Acute Ischaemic Stroke: A Systematic Review  
and Meta-Analysis with Trial Sequential Analysis.](#)

*European Stroke Journal* 2017, 2(4), 308-318.

**Copyright:**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Sage Publications Ltd in *European Stroke Journal* on 10/07/2017, available online: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2396987317719362>.

**DOI link to article:**

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2396987317719362>

**Date deposited:**

28/11/2017



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/)

**Intra-arterial Mechanical Thrombectomy Stent Retrievers and [Modern-Aspiration](#)  
Devices in the Treatment of Acute Ischaemic Stroke: A Systematic Review and  
Meta-Analysis with Trial Sequential Analysis**

Short title: Thrombectomy with stent retrievers and [modern-aspiration](#) devices for acute stroke

Darren Flynn, PhD; Richard Francis, PhD; Kristoffer Halvorsrud, PhD; Eduardo Gonzalo-Almorox, MSc; Dawn Craig, MSc; Shannon Robalino, MSc; Peter McMeekin, PhD; Adela Cora MD; Joyce Balami, MD; Gary A. Ford, FRCP; Phil White, MD

Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK (DF, DC, KH, SR); Newcastle University Business School, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK (EG-A); Institute of Neuroscience (Stroke Research Group), Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK (RF, PW, AC, GAF); Centre for Evidence Based Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK (JB); School of Health, Community and Education Studies, Northumbria University, UK (PM); Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust and Oxford University, UK (GAF)

Correspondence to Phil White, Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University 3-4 Claremont Terrace, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX, UK. Tel +44 (0)191 208 6238; Fax: +44 (0)191 222 5540; E-mail:phil.white@ncl.ac.uk

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** Intra-arterial mechanical thrombectomy (MT) combined with appropriate patient selection (image-based selection of has significantly better clinical outcomes compared with intravenous thrombolysis (IVT) for acute ischaemic stroke patients with large artery occlusion) yields improved clinical outcomes. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis, with trial sequential analysis (TSA) to understand the benefits, risks and impact of new trials reporting in 2016 on the magnitude/certainty of the estimates ~~impact of trials reporting in 2016 on for~~ clinical effectiveness and safety of MT.

**Method:** Random effects models were conducted of randomised clinical trials comparing MT (stent retriever or ~~modern~~ aspiration devices) with/without adjuvant intravenous thrombolysis (IVT) with IVT and other forms of best medical/supportive care in the treatment of acute ischaemic stroke. Study inclusion and risk of bias were assessed independently by two reviewers. Functional independence (mRS 0-2) and mortality at 90 days, including symptomatic intracranial haemorrhage (SICH) rate were extracted. TSA established the strength of the evidence derived from the meta-analyses.

**Findings:** Eight trials of MT ~~including with a total sample size of 1,841 (916 patients treated with MT and 925 treated without MT)~~ 916 patients treated using MT fulfilled review inclusion criteria. The three most recent trials ~~increased more precisely defined certainty of the mid-point estimate for the~~ effectiveness of MT (mRS 0 to 2; OR = 2.07,

95% CI = 1.70 to 2.51 based on data from eight trials versus OR = 2.39, 95% CI = 1.88 to 3.04 based on data from five trials). Meta-analyses showed no effect on mortality (OR = 0.81, 95% CI = 0.61 to 1.07) or SICH (OR = 1.22, 95% CI = 0.80 to 1.85) as found in analysis of first five trials. (mRS 0-2; OR = 2.07, 95% CI = 1.70 to 2.51) and mortality. Meta-analyses showed no effect on certainty around SICH. TSA indicated that the information size requirement was fulfilled to conclude the evidence for MT is robust.

**Discussion:** The impact of three recent trials on effectiveness and safety of MT was a more accurate-precise pooled effect size for functional independence. TSA demonstrated sufficient evidence for effectiveness and safety of MT.

**Conclusion:** No further trials of MT versus IVT-no MT alone are indicated to establish clinical effectiveness. Uncertainty remains as to whether MT reduces mortality or increases risk of SICH.

## INTRODUCTION

The benefits of intravenous thrombolysis with recombinant tissue plasminogen activator (IV rt-PA) for acute ischaemic stroke are well-known, time dependent (with earlier treatment within the 4.5 hour treatment window associated with better functional outcomes) and encapsulated by the aphorism ‘Time is Brain’<sup>1-3</sup>.

Despite the efficacy of intravenous thrombolysis (IVT) in reducing post-stroke disability, recanalisation (restoration of blood flow through a blocked artery) occurs in only ~10 to 45% of patients with large artery occlusion (LAO) depending on site/length of occlusion<sup>4,5</sup>. A number of approaches are currently being explored to increase IVT recanalisation rates, including use of more fibrin selective thrombolytic drugs, ultrasound and adjunctive anticoagulant therapy. None are yet proven.

There is overwhelming evidence that MT achieves significantly higher recanalisation rates than IV rt-PA for LAO<sup>6</sup> and better clinical outcomes with a 13 to 31% absolute increase in patients recovering from acute stroke to be independent in activities of daily living. MT is not associated with an increased risk of symptomatic intracranial haemorrhage (SICH) or mortality<sup>7,8</sup>.

Meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) have since been published<sup>9-11</sup>, each of which has taken a slightly different approach to inclusion criteria; all of which find that MT is an effective treatment with reduced disability rates. The most robust of these is likely to be the individual patient meta-analysis, based on data from 1,287 patients (634 MT and 653 standard care). The results suggest that MT led to significantly reduced disability at 90 days compared with controls (adjusted OR = 2.49, 95% CI = 1.76 to 3.53)<sup>11</sup>.

The evidence base to define the safety and effectiveness of MT for selected acute ischaemic stroke patients has grown recently, with THERAPY<sup>12</sup>, THRACE<sup>13</sup> and PISTE<sup>14</sup> RCTs all reporting in 2016. An updated evidence synthesis is therefore warranted to understand the impact of these new trials on our understanding of the clinical effectiveness and safety of MT; in particular with stent retrievers and [modern](#) aspiration devices.

Meta-analyses of RCTs increase the power and precision of the estimated intervention effects. However, RCTs of MT over time have evaluated a range of devices and the population considered eligible for treatment has changed. There is therefore a need to ensure that only those RCTs that reflect the current practice to be considered. Trial sequential analysis (TSA) corresponds to group sequential analysis of a single trial and

can be applied to meta-analysis to evaluate the robustness of the evidence. TSA necessitates the use of an information size to evaluate the strength of the evidence. There is a need to inform/estimate that pre-specified intervention effect, in the same manner as a power calculation in a clinical trial. TSA can help to quantify whether meta-analyses are presenting the best available and/or sufficient evidence.

Therefore we conducted a systematic review with meta-analysis alongside TSA, that aimed to update the evidence-base for MT, and evaluate the [benefits, risks and impact](#) of three recent trials on the [magnitude/uncertainty of the estimate for](#) clinical effectiveness and safety of MT in the treatment of acute ischaemic stroke.

## **METHODS**

The review adhered to a published protocol<sup>15</sup> and the reporting guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement<sup>16</sup>.

[Randomised clinical trials](#) ~~RCTs and non-randomised controlled studies (non-randomised RCTs, controlled before and after studies and cohort studies with prospective assessment)~~ that included a minimum of 10 adult patients (aged  $\geq 18$ ) presenting with acute ischaemic stroke receiving MT (stent retrievers and [modern](#)

aspiration devices) with or without adjuvant IVT or standard medical care were eligible for inclusion in the review. Where applicable, data on comparator interventions (IVT and other forms of best medical or supportive care) of studies evaluating MT were extracted. ~~Single center studies, case control studies, cross sectional studies and case series were excluded.~~

Eligible studies had to include at least one of the following outcomes assessed at  $\geq 90$  days follow-up: modified Rankin Scale (mRS)<sup>17</sup>, Oxford Handicap Scale (OHS)<sup>18</sup>, National Institute of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS)<sup>19</sup> or Barthel ADL Index<sup>20</sup>. Data on secondary outcomes were extracted from eligible studies: length of stay/time in acute care; recanalisation (Treatment in Cerebral Infarction [TICI] score<sup>21</sup> as a reference measure that can be mapped onto analogous measures such as the Thrombolysis in Myocardial Ischemia [TIMI] score<sup>22</sup>) and EQ-5D<sup>23</sup> (or analogous measures of health-related quality of life). Safety of MT was summarised as a function of 90-day mortality, and SICH within 7-days (as per the SITS-MOST definition ‘NIHSS scores worsening  $\geq 4$  within 24 hours and an intracerebral haemorrhage type PH2’<sup>24</sup>).

### **Search strategy**

A search strategy was designed with assistance from an experienced information scientist (SR) using a combination of MeSH/thesaurus terms and keywords. The

following bibliographic databases were searched up to mid-February 2015: MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, SCOPUS, and Web of Science. Additionally several trials registries were searched: ClinicalTrials.gov, International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial Number Register and the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry. Where published protocols for ongoing randomised trials were identified by the search strategy (to mid-Feb 2015), these were included if published by end of 2016 to ensure that the evidence presented in the review is complete and up-to-date.

An example search strategy for MEDLINE can be found in **Appendix 1**. As our focus was on MT with stent retriever devices and modern-current generation aspirational devices, studies published prior to January 2009 were excluded. No restrictions were placed on country of origin. Included studies had to involve humans, and had to have a title and abstract in English. Where available, a search filter for controlled trials<sup>25</sup> was used or adapted as appropriate. Hand searching of reference lists and citation searching of studies that fulfilled the eligibility criteria were undertaken. References lists of directly relevant reviews identified by the search strategy were also hand-searched.

## **Study selection**

In stage 1, two reviewers (RF and EGA) independently assessed the titles and abstracts retrieved via the search strategy for eligibility. In stage 2, studies retained at stage 1 were independently assessed for eligibility by PW, RF and AC using a study selection form (Appendix 2). Disagreements were resolved via discussion or via a third reviewer (PW or AC) adjudicating on inclusion of a study.

### **Data extraction and risk of bias assessment**

A structured data extraction form, with selected items from the template for intervention description and replication [TIDIER] checklist<sup>26</sup> was used to capture information on the study population, intervention(s), comparator(s) and outcomes (Appendix 3). Data extraction was undertaken by one reviewer (PW) with fidelity of data extraction checked by a second reviewer (RF and KH) with disagreements resolved via discussion. The methodological quality assessment framework for RCTs developed by the Cochrane Collaboration<sup>27</sup> was used independently by two reviewers (RF and DF) to assess the risk of bias within studies (low, medium and high). Where applicable, corresponding study authors were contacted to request missing data.

### **Data Synthesis**

Data on clinical outcomes were synthesised using meta-analytic techniques where sufficient data for calculation of effect sizes existed for each outcome of interest

(unadjusted odds ratios and corresponding 95% confidence intervals). To allow for differences between/within studies, random effects models were utilised. Risk of small study bias across studies was established with funnel plots. [The later three trials were all stopped early \(truncated\) due to beneficial treatment effects. There has been some debate in the literature around the inclusion of truncated and non-truncated trials in a meta-analysis. Historically, the standard approach has been to incorporate truncated RCTs without any special consideration, however fears that early stopping may be an important source of bias has led to further investigation. A comprehensive investigation of the issues has concluded that early stopping of clinical trials is not a substantive source of bias in meta-analyses and recommend that all studies \(truncated and non-truncated\) be included](#)<sup>28</sup>.

### **Trial Sequential Analysis**

A TSA was used to establish the optimal size within our meta-analysis (maintaining Type I error of 0.05 / 5%) after accounting for heterogeneity (diversity) between trials. The TSA was conducted using TSA software version 0.9.5.5 Beta<sup>29</sup>. An estimated optimal information size requirement was calculated using conventional parameters (power = 0.80, Type II error = 0.20; Type I error = 0.05). Based on a previous TSA of thrombectomy trials<sup>30</sup> the following assumptions were made in the current TSA: a threshold of 30% relative risk increase for functional independence (mRS 0 to 2); 30%

relative risk reduction for both all-cause mortality and SICH; and control event rates of pooled control arm rates from the eight trials (30.4%, 17.5% and 4.7%) for functional independence (mRS 0 to 2), mortality and SICH respectively. Trial data were entered into the TSA in order of publication date.

TSA enables the estimation of information size with adjusted threshold for statistical significance – sequential monitoring boundaries<sup>30</sup>. If the cumulative z-statistical curve crosses the sequential monitoring boundaries, then it can be inferred that future trials would not alter the conclusions about the outcome, and a sufficient level of evidence has been accumulated<sup>30</sup>. When the z-curve crosses over into the futility area, it can be inferred that any differences between the comparators would be unlikely to change in future trials of MT<sup>30</sup>.

## **FINDINGS**

Out of 4,993 records identified by the search strategy, eight [randomised clinical](#) trials were assessed to be eligible for inclusion in the meta-analyses ([Figure 1](#)). The eight trials had a combined sample size of [1,841](#) (916 patients treated with MT [and 925 treated without MT](#)). However, the N in the treatment group across the trials for the different outcomes was variable. We also identified discrepancies in numbers of cases

reported in individual published trials compared with the numbers of cases reported in previous meta-analyses (Appendix 4).

The countries of origin of the eight trials were: Australia and New Zealand (EXTEND-IA<sup>31</sup>); Canada, Ireland, South Korea, UK and USA (ESCAPE<sup>32</sup>); Spain (REVASCAT<sup>33</sup>); Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, USA (SWIFT PRIME<sup>34</sup>); The Netherlands (MR CLEAN<sup>8</sup>); Germany and USA (THERAPY<sup>12</sup>); France (THRACE<sup>13</sup>); and UK (PISTE<sup>14</sup>).

The device types, imaging modalities and recanalisation rates for patients treated with MT in the eight trials are shown in Table 1. All eight trials were assessed to have a low risk of bias (Table 2).

## **Synthesis of results**

### ***Functional independence***

Patients treated with MT compared with those receiving IVT and other forms of best medical or supportive care were more significantly more likely to be functional independent (mRS 0 to 2) at 90-days follow-up (OR = 2.39, 95% CI= 1.88 to 3.04) based on data from five trials (Figure 2). The additional impact of the three recent trials

was a slightly decreased pooled effect size, but with increased certainty of the mid-point estimate (OR = 2.07, 95% CI = 1.70 to 2.51).

### ***Mortality***

Patients treated with MT compared with those receiving IVT and other forms of best medical or supportive care did not show any effect on mortality at 90-days follow-up (Figure 3). The addition of the three most recent trials did not impact on mortality, but there was increased certainty of the mid-point estimate with a continuing trend towards reduced mortality.

### ***SICH***

Patients treated with MT compared with those receiving IVT and other forms of best medical or supportive care (Figure 4) did not show any statistically significant increased likelihood of SICH within 7 days based on data from 5 trials. Data from the PISTE trial were not estimable in this meta-analysis, as there were no events recorded of SICH within 7 days for either the treatment or the control group. Inclusion of the remaining two recent trials did not impact on probability of SICH.

### **Findings of the Trial Sequential Analysis (TSA)**

A series of TSA were undertaken using data from eight [randomised clinical](#) trials.

### **Functional independence TSA**

The adjusted 95% CI for the TSA was 1.55 to 2.76 (heterogeneity = 0%). The adjusted information size estimate was  $N = 724$ . **Figure S1 (Appendix 5)** shows that the cumulative z-statistic curve crossed the sequential monitoring boundary for benefit of MT. The TSA demonstrates robust evidence for a 30% relative benefit for MT compared with IVT for mRS 0 to 2.

### **Mortality TSA**

The TSA analysis **(Figure S2, Appendix 5)** shows that the cumulative z-statistic curve failed to cross the traditional boundaries for statistical significance; despite surpassing the diversity adjusted information size requirement ( $N=1,803$ ), suggesting a lack of robust evidence to demonstrate a 30% relative risk reduction for MT over IVT. The TSA results suggest that future trials of MT are unlikely to demonstrate a significant effect on mortality as the adjusted 95% CI was 0.57 to 1.13.

### **SICH TSA**

The TSA-adjusted 95% CI was 0.53 to 2.78 (diversity = 0). The diversity adjusted information size was estimated to be  $N = 6,057$ ; this number was not reached, suggesting that the meta-analysis is underpowered for the SICH outcome. **Figure S3**

(Appendix 5) shows that the cumulative z-statistic curve failed to cross the convention statistical significance boundary, nor does it cross the boundary for futility, which indicates that future trials may show differences for SICH between MT and IVT.

## DISCUSSION

Data from the five MT [randomised clinical](#) trials reporting in 2015 yielded significantly increased likelihood of functional [independence](#) (mRS 0 to 2) at 90-days follow-up (OR = 2.39, 95% CI= 1.88 to 3.04). The impact of the increased evidence base for MT (THERAPY<sup>12</sup>, THRACE<sup>13</sup>, PISTE<sup>14</sup>) was a marginally decreased effect size, but with increased certainty as shown by CIs with a narrower range (mRS 0 to 2; OR = 2.07, 95% CI = 1.70 to 2.51). These findings further confirm the effectiveness of MT, in particular with stent retrievers and ~~modern~~ aspiration devices. Compared with other meta-analyses of MT in the treatment of acute ischaemic stroke, including the recent Hermes meta-analysis<sup>9-11</sup>, our effect size for functional independence is smaller in magnitude.

Our pooled effect size for functional independence derived from the 5 RCTs published in 2015 differed to previous meta-analyses, including meta-analysis conducted by the Hermes collaboration<sup>11</sup>. This can be explained by discrepancies in primary dichotomous study data (Appendix 4) and calculating unadjusted (as opposed to adjusted) odds ratios.

RCTs often adjust their analyses for prognostic factors which are thought to influence outcomes (e.g age, severity). Trials published in 2015 used both unadjusted and adjusted pooled effect sizes, and it is worth noting that the latter are unlikely to have been adjusted using the same variables. There is no consensus about whether, or how to pool adjusted and unadjusted findings, although it is regarded best practice to avoid this approach. The simplest option to avoid heterogeneity due to the differences in adjustment with each RCT is to report unadjusted pooled effects, as we have done here.

Consistent with previous meta-analyses of MT in the treatment of stroke<sup>11</sup>, we identified no impact on previous estimates of safety (i.e. no increased risk of mortality and SICH at 90 days and 7-days respectively). Although our meta-analyses showed a trend that MT may lead to a decreased risk of mortality this effect was not statistically significant. In the case of SICH, the divergent definitions and low event rates across the eight trials may have confounded the overall effect for this outcome. A trial sequential analysis confirmed that the meta-analyses fulfilled the information size requirement to satisfy the criterion for ‘sufficient evidence’ on the effectiveness, but not all safety outcomes for MT. The information requirement was met for mortality at 90 [days](#); however uncertainty remains as to whether MT is associated with increased risk of SICH. [The robustness of efficacy data for MT would likely prohibit further randomised clinical trials of MT versus no MT. Further data on mortality and SICH could reliably be](#)

[obtained from on-going or planned trials of MT versus MT plus intravenous thrombolysis.](#)

Questions remain around how best to image/triage emergent LAO stroke and optimal MT device types, including technical questions such as use of stentrievers or aspiration, including issues around use of different modes of anaesthesia<sup>35</sup> which are currently being addressed in on-going trials<sup>36,37</sup>. Efficacy of either MT or IVT for Wake up Stroke (wUS) / stroke of unknown time onset (SUTO) is also unclear.

Our findings make a strong case that no further trials to evaluate the effectiveness of MT versus ~~IVT alone~~ [no MT](#) are warranted. Our meta-analyses included patients from different healthcare systems, patient characteristics and a range of devices which shows the generalisability of effectiveness and safety of MT (with uncertainty around SICH). This assertion is strengthened by our use of full systematic review methodology (including considerations of non-English language literature) and a supplementary trial sequential analysis to establish the robustness of the effect sizes with reference to a specified information size. We also included substantially more patient numbers treated with modern MT compared with previous meta-analyses.

There is uncertainty regarding generalisability of published trials to populations of non-European ancestry (and countries where there may be marked differences in concomitant healthcare systems); however, given the compelling evidence for the efficacy of MT, it is unlikely that further randomised clinical trials of MT versus no MT will be undertaken. Therefore, registry data in other populations will be important to confirm that outcomes and safety in different populations and healthcare systems are consistent with existing trial data.

Subgroups in many categories are still small especially if the query is broken down by any categorisation of trials e.g. advanced imaging selection/all IVT control or timing of MT since onset from symptoms. Furthermore, we did not have access to individual patient data (IPD). However, the IPD meta-analysis undertaken by the Hermes collaboration<sup>11</sup> has already reported on patient-level evidence favouring treatment with MT (patients aged  $\geq 80$  years, patients randomised  $> 300$  min after symptom onset, and patients not eligible for IVT). An updated meta-analysis of individual patient is planned<sup>38</sup>, and this will add further evidence in terms of sub-groups with differential effectiveness and safety of MT.

Given the robustness and generalisability of the evidence base for MT, there is a pressing need to invest in acute stroke care services to support delivery of this complex high technology service to all eligible patients. In the UK, few centres provide 24/7 MT and there is large variability between services in MT pathways and delivery<sup>39</sup>. A recent

study has also shown that 10% of all stroke admissions in the UK could benefit from MT<sup>40</sup>. ~~However, there are limited~~ Economic analyses of MT indicate substantial gains in quality adjusted life years and cost-savings<sup>41,42</sup>, with one analysis reporting larger gains for younger patients<sup>42</sup> ~~data on costs~~. Costs or cost effectiveness of MT to inform service re-design ~~currently~~. ~~This~~ is currently the subject of much research in the UK and elsewhere<sup>43</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

The expanded evidence base for MT yielded a more accurate-precise assessment of effectiveness in terms of functional independence (mRS 0 to 2), with no increased risk of mortality or SICH. Uncertainty remains as to whether MT reduces mortality or is associated with increased risk of SICH.

## REFERENCES

1. Wardlaw JM, Murray V, Berge E, del Zoppo G, Sandercock P, Lindley RL, Cohen G: Recombinant tissue plasminogen activator for acute ischaemic stroke: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2012, 379:2364-2372.
2. Hacke W, Kaste M, Bluhmki E, Brozman M, Dávalos A, Guidetti D, et al: Thrombolysis with alteplase 3 to 4.5 hours after acute ischemic stroke. *New Engl J Med* 2008, 359:1317-1329.
3. Lees KR, Bluhmki E, Kummer R, Brott TG, Toni D, Grotta JC, et al: Time to treatment with intravenous alteplase and outcome in stroke: an updated pooled analysis of ECASS, ATLANTIS, NINDS and EPITHET trials. *Lancet* 2010, 375:1695-1703.
4. Bhatia R, Hill MD, Shobha N, Menon B, Bal S, Kochar P, et al. Low rates of acute recanalization with intravenous recombinant tissue plasminogen activator in ischemic stroke: real-world experience and a call for action. *Stroke*, 2010. 41(10):2254-8.
5. Christou I, Felberg RA, Demchuk AM, Burgin WS, Malkoff M, Grotta JC, Alexandrov AV. Intravenous tissue plasminogen activator and flow improvement in acute ischemic stroke patients with internal carotid artery occlusion. *J Neuroimaging* 2002; 12:119-23.

6. Almekhlafi MA, Menon BK, Freiheit EA, Demchuk AM, Goyal M. A Meta-Analysis of Observational Intra-Arterial Stroke Therapy Studies Using the Merci Device, Penumbra System, and Retrievable Stents. *Am J Neuroradiol* 2013; 34:140-145.
7. Rha JH, Saver JL. The impact of recanalization on ischemic stroke outcome: a meta-analysis. *Stroke* 2007; 38:967–973
8. Berkhemer OA, Fransen PSS, Beumer D, van den Berg LA, Lingsma HF, Yoo AJ. Et al. Randomized Trial of Intraarterial Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:11-20.
9. Balami JS, Sutherland BA, Edmunds LD, Grunwald IQ, Neuhaus AA, Hadley G, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of endovascular thrombectomy compared with best medical treatment for acute ischemic stroke. *Int J Stroke* 2015;10:1168–1178.
10. Badhiwala JH, Nassiri F, Alhazzani W, Selim MH, Farrokhyar F, Spears J, et al. Endovascular Thrombectomy for Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2015;314:1832-1843.
11. Goyal M, Menon BK, van Zwam WH, Dippel DW, Mitchell PJ, Demchuk AM, et al. Endovascular thrombectomy after large-vessel ischaemic stroke: a meta-analysis of individual patient data from five randomised trials. *Lancet* 2016;387(10029):1723-31.

12. Mocco J, Zaidat OO, von Kummer R, Yoo AJ, Gupta R, Lopes D, et al. Aspiration Thrombectomy after Intravenous Alteplase versus Intravenous Alteplase alone. *Stroke* 2016;47(9):2331-8.
13. Bracard S, Ducrocq X, Mas JL, Soudant M, Oppenheim C, Moulin T, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy after intravenous alteplase versus alteplase alone after stroke (THRACE): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2016;15(11):1138-47
14. Muir et al Endovascular Therapy for Acute Ischemic Stroke: the Pragmatic Ischaemic Stroke Thrombectomy Evaluation (PISTE) Randomised, Controlled Trial.
15. Flynn D, Francis R, McMeekin P, Price C, Ford GA, Robalino S, et al. Intra-arterial mechanical thrombectomy in the treatment of acute ischaemic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PROSPERO 2015:CRD42015016649  
Available from  
[http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display\\_record.asp?ID=CRD42015016649](http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42015016649)
16. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009;6:e1000097
17. Bonita R, Beaglehole R. Modification of Rankin Scale: Recovery of motor function after stroke. *Stroke* 1988 19(12):1497-1500

18. Bamford JL, Sandercock PAG, Warlow CP, Slattery J. Interobserver agreement for the assessment of handicap in stroke patients. *Stroke* 1989; 20: 828
19. National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke / National Institutes of Health: National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale.  
<http://www.ninds.nih.gov/disorders/stroke/strokescales.htm>
20. Mahoney F, Barthel D. Functional evaluation: the Barthel Index. *Md Med J* 1965;14:61–65.
21. Higashida RT, Furlan AJ, Roberts H, et al. Trial design and reporting standards for intra-arterial cerebral thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke. *Stroke* 2003;34:e109–137
22. TIMI Study Group. The Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) trial: phase I findings. *N Engl J Med* 1985;312:932–36
23. EuroQol Research Foundation 2016. EQ-5D. Available: <http://www.euroqol.org/>
24. Wahlgren N, Ahmed N, Eriksson N, Aichner F, Bluhmki E, Davalos A, et al. Multivariable analysis of outcome predictors and adjustment of main outcome results to baseline data profile in randomized controlled trials: Safe Implementation of Thrombolysis in Stroke-MONitoring Study (SITS-MOST). *Stroke* 2008; 39: 3316–3322.
25. University of Texas, School for Public Health. Search filters for Medline.  
[http://libguides.sph.uth.tmc.edu/ovid\\_medline\\_filters](http://libguides.sph.uth.tmc.edu/ovid_medline_filters)

26. Hoffmann T, Glasziou P, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, Altman D, et al S. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ* 2014;348:g1687
27. Higgins JPT, Green S (Eds.). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions* version 5.0.2, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2009. Available from [www.cochrane-handbook.org](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org). Accessed 3 March 2011.
28. Schou IM, Marschner IC. Meta-analysis of clinical trials with early stopping: an investigation of potential bias. *Statist Med* 2013; 32:4859–4874.
29. Thorlund K, Engstrøm J, Wetterslev J, Brok J, Imberger G, Gluud C. User manual for trial sequential analysis (TSA). Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Copenhagen, Denmark. 2011. p. 1-115.
30. Phan K, Zhao DF, Phan S, Huo YR, Mobbs RJ, Rao PJ, Mortimer AM. Endovascular therapy including thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis. *J Clin Neurosci* 2016; 29:38-45.
31. Campbell BCV, Mitchell PJ, Kleinig TJ, Dewey HM, Churilov L, Yassi N, et al. Endovascular Therapy for Ischemic Stroke with Perfusion-Imaging Selection. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:1009-1018.

32. Goyal M, Demchuk AM, Menon BK, Eesa M, Rempel JL, Thornton J, et al.  
Randomized assessment of rapid endovascular treatment of ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:1019-1030.
33. Jovin TG, Chamorro A, Cobo E, de Miquel MA, Molina CA, Rovira A, et al.  
Thrombectomy within 8 Hours after Symptom Onset in Ischemic Stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:2296-2306.
34. Saver JL, Goyal M, Bonafe A, Diener H, Levy EL, Pereira VM, et al. Stent-Retriever Thrombectomy after Intravenous t-PA vs. t-PA Alone in Stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:2285-2295.
35. Brinjikji W, Murad MH, Rabinstein AA, Cloft HJ, Lanzino G, KD. Conscious Sedation versus General Anesthesia during Endovascular Acute Ischemic Stroke Treatment : A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J Neuroradiol.* 2015;(36):525–9.
36. University of Aarhus. "GOLIATH" - General Or Local Anaesthesia in Intra Arterial Therapy. In: ClinicalTrials.gov. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine (US). 2016. Available from:  
<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02317237?term=stroke+conscious+sedation+general+anesthesia&rank=1> NLM Identifier: NCT02317237.
37. Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Sweden. Sedation Versus General Anesthesia for Endovascular Therapy in Acute Stroke - Impact on Neurological Outcome

(ANSTROKE). In: ClinicalTrials.gov. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine (US). 2016. Available from:  
<https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01872884?term=NCT01872884&rank=1> NLM Identifier: NCT01872884.

38. MacIsaac RL, Khatri P, Bendszus M, Bracard S, Broderick J, Campbell B, et al. A collaborative sequential meta-analysis of individual patient data from randomized trials of endovascular therapy and tPA vs. tPA alone for acute ischemic stroke: Thrombectomy And tPA (TREAT) analysis: statistical analysis plan for a sequential meta-analysis performed within the VISTA-Endovascular collaboration. *Int J Stroke*. 2015;10:136-144.
39. Flynn D, Ford GA, McMeekin PJ, White PM. Characteristics of intra-arterial thrombectomy service provision in England. *Int J Stroke* 2016, 11(8), NP83-NP85.
40. McMeekin P, White P, James M, Price CI, Flynn D, Ford GA. Estimating the numbers of stroke patients in the UK that are eligible for treatment with Mechanical Thrombectomy. Paper submitted to [\*European Stroke Journal\*](#)
41. [Shireman TI, Wang K, Saver JL, Goyal M, Bonafé A, Diener H-C, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Solitaire Stent Retriever Thrombectomy for Acute Ischemic Stroke. \*Stroke\*. 2017;48:379-87.](#)
42. [Steen Carlsson K, Andsberg G, Petersson J, Norrving B. Long-term cost-effectiveness of thrombectomy for acute ischaemic stroke in real life: An analysis](#)

[based on data from the Swedish Stroke Register \(Riksstroke\). International Journal of Stroke. First published date: April-04-2017 10.1177/1747493017701154](#)

~~41.43.~~ Ford G, Price C, White P, McMeekin P, Vale L, Exley C, et al. Promoting Effective And Rapid Stroke Care (PEARS). NIHR Programme Grant for Applied Research (RP-PG-1211-20012).

Table 1. Summary of device type, imaging modality and recanalisation in the eight trials

<b>Primary author; Study Name</b>	<b>Device Type</b>	<b>Advanced Imaging*</b>	<b>Recanalisation %</b>
Berkhemer 2015; <i>MR CLEAN</i> <sup>8</sup>	Trevo retrievable stents and others	No	MT treatment group = 115/196 (59)
Campbell 2015; <i>EXTEND:IA</i> <sup>31</sup>	Solitaire FR retrievable stent	CT perfusion imaging	IV rt-PA plus MT = 25/35 (86)
Goyal 2015; <i>ESCAPE</i> <sup>32</sup>	Retrievable stents or aspiration	Yes	IV rt-PA plus MT = 113/156 (72)
Jovin 2015; <i>REVASCAT</i> <sup>33</sup>	Solitaire FR	Y (in defined subgroups)	IV rt-PA within 4.5h plus MT = 67/103 (65)
Saver 2015; <i>SWIFT PRIME</i> <sup>34</sup>	Solitaire FR or Solitaire 2	Y (in a majority)	IV-tPA plus MT = 73/83 (88)
Mocco 2016; <i>THERAPY</i> <sup>12</sup>	Penumbra, Solitaire or Trevo	No	IV rt-PA plus MT = 30/43 (70)
Bracard 2016; <i>THRACE</i> <sup>13</sup>	Merci, Penumbra, Catch, Solitaire	Y (MRI in a majority)	IV rt-PA plus MT = 95/138 (69)
Muir 2016; <i>PISTE</i> <sup>14</sup>	Any CE-marked device approved for MT (stentrievors or aspiration)	No	IV rt-PA plus MT = 26/30 (87)

\*Advanced imaging is taken as use of MRI techniques, Perfusion CT or a systematic combination of CTA collateral scoring and ASPECTS on CT brain (ESCAPE trial)

Table 2. Methodological Quality and Risk of Bias Assessment

Primary Author; Study Name	Power calculation	Sample size achieved (reason for stopping early)	Attrition (n/%)	Adequate sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants / personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective outcome reporting	Free of other problems	Overall Risk of Bias
Berkhemer 2015; <i>MR CLEAN</i> <sup>8</sup>	Yes	Yes	2/0.4%	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low
Campbell 2015; <i>EXTEND:IA</i> <sup>31</sup>	Yes	No (Efficacy)	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low
Goyal 2015; <i>ESCAPE</i> <sup>32</sup>	Yes	No (Efficacy)	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low
Jovin 2015; <i>REVASCAT</i> <sup>33</sup>	Yes	No (Efficacy)	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low
Saver 2015;	Yes	No	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low

<i>SWIFT PRIME</i> <sup>34</sup>		(Efficacy)									
Mocco 2016;	Yes	No	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low
<i>THERAPY</i> <sup>12</sup>		(Loss of equipoise)									
Bracard 2016;	Yes	No	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low
<i>THRACE</i> <sup>13</sup>		(Efficacy)									
Muir 2016;	Yes	No	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	High risk**	Low risk	N/A	Low risk	Low risk	Low
<i>PISTE</i> <sup>14</sup>		(Loss of equipoise)									

---

\*\* Not feasible to blind interventionists and was unlikely to have biased outcome in these trials