

- [Paper](#)
- Primary Outcomes
- Secondary Outcomes
- Reported Result
 - “When compared with AC alone, CDT had lower mortality but high major bleeding and numerically higher ICH”
 - “The risk of mortality and ICH was high with ST when compared with CDT.
 - Findings were similar when analysis was restricted to intermediate risk PE.

Problems

The Definition of Risk Groups is not Stated

- Uses “intermediate risk,” “high risk”, and “intermediate-high risk,” thus mixing terminologies
 - **2019 ESC:** low, intermediate-low, intermediate-high, high
 - **2011 AHA:** massive, sub-massive, low risk
 - **2016 CHEST:** low high, PE without hypotension, PE with hypotension

Very few RCT patients got CDT

Total Papers (n=45)		
patient_type	number	percent
AC	19976	24.4%
CDT	9610	11.8%
ST	52119	63.8%
total	81705	NA

Intermediate-Risk Papers (n=20)		
$\text{patienttype}^{\text{number}}^{\text{percent}} \mid \text{AC} \mid 8873 \mid 75.9\% \mid \text{CDT} \mid 1929 \mid 16.5\% \mid \text{ST} \mid 883 \mid 7.5\% \mid \text{total} \mid 11685 \mid 14.3\% \text{ (of } n_{\text{total}} \text{)}$		

RCT Trials Only (n=17)		
$\text{patienttype}^{\text{number}}^{\text{percent}} \mid \text{AC} \mid 1101 \mid 49.8\% \mid \text{CDT} \mid 78 \mid 3.5\% \mid \text{ST} \mid 1031 \mid 46.7\% \mid \text{total} \mid 2210 \mid 2.7\% \text{ (of } n_{\text{total}} \text{)}$		

This means that the number of CDT patients from RCTs is only $\frac{n_{\text{CDT}}}{n_{\text{total}}} = \frac{78}{81611} = 0.096\%$ of the study total!!

ULTIMA trial (2013) was only CDT RCT looked at, and $N = 59$ ($n = [30, 29]$)

TATED (2021 in India), CDT vs ST ($N = 50$).

CANARY (2022 in Iran), CDT vs AC ($N = 94$)

The Primary Outcome is not reported correctly, given likely intransitivity

The paper utilized a network meta-analysis ([1,2,3](#)).

They list that “[t]he primary analysis compared CDT and systemic fibrinolysis with AC alone.” However, they combine RCTs, prospective, and retrospective studies, raising

serious questions of intransitivity.

Statistical Issues

No attempts to control family-wise error rate

They had to change their statistical analysis strategy

Interestingly, they do NOT report p values for their efficacy outcome – just 95% CI.

Publication inconsistency for their efficacy outcome was significant ($p = 0.036$), but there was no inconsistency at the loop level using a loop inconsistency plot.

Thus, they had to perform a direct meta-analysis. For this analysis, they reported p values (?!). Why would they only report p-values for a “backup” analysis method.

From:

<https://ewrobbins.com/> - ewrobbins.com

Permanent link:

<https://ewrobbins.com/doku.php?id=jc&rev=1713979633>

Last update: **2024/04/24 17:27**

