Drug Design, Development and Therapy

Open Access Full Text Article

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Incidence and risk of hypertension with bevacizumab in non-small-cell lung cancer patients: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Jian Chen¹ Yingfeng Lu² Yunliang Zheng³

¹Intensive Care Unit, First Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University, ²State Key Laboratory for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Diseases, First Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University, ³Research Center for Clinical Pharmacy, State Key Laboratory for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Diseases, First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China

Correspondence: Yunliang Zheng Research Center for Clinical Pharmacy, State Key Laboratory for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Diseases, First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University, 79 Qing Chun Road, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310003, People's Republic of China Tel/fax +86 571 8723 6537 Email ylzheng1984@zju.edu.cn

submit your manuscript | www.dovepress.com
Dovepress

http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/DDDT.S87258

Aim: A study was conducted to determine the overall risk and incidence of hypertension with bevacizumab in non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients.

Materials and methods: Electronic databases such as the Embase, PubMed, and Cochrane Library were searched for related trials. Statistical analyses were conducted to calculate the overall incidence rates, odds ratios (ORs), and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) by using either random-effect or fixed-effect models depending on the heterogeneity.

Results: A total of 3,155 subjects from nine studies were included. The overall incidences of all-grade and high-grade hypertension in NSCLC patients were 19.55% (95% CI 10.17%–34.3%) and 6.95% (95% CI 5.81%–8.30%). Bevacizumab use was associated with a significantly increased risk in all-grade hypertension (OR 8.07, 95% CI 3.87–16.85; *P*=0.0002) and high-grade hypertension (OR 5.93, 95% CI 3.41–10.32; *P*<0.0001). No evidence of publication bias was determined for the ORs of hypertension in our meta-analysis.

Conclusion: Bevacizumab is associated with a significantly increased risk of hypertension development in NSCLC patients. Early monitoring and effective management of hypertension might be important steps for the safe use of this drug.

Keywords: non-small-cell lung cancer, bevacizumab, hypertension, meta-analysis

Introduction

Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related mortality in the world, and non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is the diagnosis in approximately 85% of lung cancer patients.¹ Platinum-based doublet chemotherapy is the first-line treatment option for NSCLC;² however, only 35% of the patients respond to standard treatment.³ Targeted therapies, such as the vascular endothelial growth factor receptor (VEGFR) inhibitors or other monoclonal antibodies, have been clinically validated to improve the outcome of NSCLC patients.^{4,5} vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) can activate VEGFR and downstream signaling molecules, thereby promoting tumor angiogenesis. Bevacizumab is a novel orally recombinant humanized monoclonal anticancer agent that inhibits the VEGF pathway, which is a crucial growth driver for tumor growth, invasion, and metastasis.⁶ The clinical benefits of bevacizumab administration in NSCLC patients have been observed in several trials.^{5,7,8} In a previous Phase III trial, bevacizumab reduced the risk of disease progression by 50% in NSCLC patients compared with controls.⁹ In a previous meta-analysis, the inclusion of bevacizumab to platinum-based chemotherapy significantly extended progression-free survival and overall survival.¹⁰

Drug Design, Development and Therapy 2015:9 4751-4760

475 I

© 2015 Chen et al. This work is published by Dove Medical Press Limited, and licensed under Creative Commons Attribution — Non Commercial (unported, v3.0) permission from Dove Medical Press Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. Permissions beyond the scope of the License are administered by Dove Medical Press Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. Permissions beyond the scope of the License are administered by Dove Medical Press Limited, Information on how to request permission may be Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. Permissions beyond the scope of the License are administered by Dove Medical Press Limited, Information on how to request permission may be Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. Permissions php

Bevacizumab can effectively treat NSCLC, but using this drug can lead to significant toxic reactions, such as diarrhea, nausea, hemorrhage, fatigue, neuropathy, joint pain, venous thromboembolism, and hematologic toxicity.8,11,12 NSCLC patients treated with bevacizumab may also develop hypertension. A Phase II study of Japanese patients who received first-line carboplatin-paclitaxel (CP) with or without bevacizumab showed that 57 of 119 patients who received bevacizumab had developed all-grade hypertension compared with six of 58 patients in the control group. Grade \geq 3 hypertension was not reported in any patients treated with CP alone, but the condition occurred in 11% of the patients treated with bevacizumab-CP.11 However, because of the limited number of hypertension events in each clinical trial, the overall incidence and risk of hypertension caused by bevacizumab has not been well defined. A study on the occurrence of hypertension in patients receiving bevacizumab treatment may offer additional insights into the underlying mechanisms, risk factors, and potential management strategies. Moreover, hypertension events should be monitored because poor management may lead to serious cardiovascular events, dose reduction, or even life-threatening consequences. Therefore, we conducted this meta-analysis to investigate hypertension incidence and relative risk among bevacizumab-treated NSCLC patients.

Materials and methods Search strategy and study selection

Because this study was based on data extracted from registries, it was exempt from human subjects review, and members of the study population did not have to provide informed consent. We searched electronic databases for literature published up to April 2015; these databases were Embase (from 1974), PubMed (from 1967), and the Cochrane Library. The search terms, used as free text or MeSH (Medical Subject Headings) terms for the queries, were: "non-small-cell lung cancer" and "carcinoma, non-small-cell lung"; "bevacizumab"; and "randomized controlled trials", "clinical trials", "controlled clinical trials", "clinical trial as topic", or "randomized controlled trial as topic". In addition, we searched for relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs) among the meeting abstracts and virtual presentations of the American Society of Clinical Oncology (http://www.asco. org/ASCO) published up to 2015. Additionally, we searched a clinical trial-registration website (ClinicalTrials.gov) to obtain information on registered clinical trials.

Study selection was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement. Clinical trials that met the following criteria included: 1) patients with NSCLC, 2) prospective Phase II or III RCTs that compared bevacizumab with controls, and 3) available data regarding events of hypertension. Data on hypertension were extracted from the safety profile of each RCT. These clinical end points were obtained according to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) of the National Cancer Institute (<u>http:// ctep.cancer.gov/reporting/ctc_archive.html</u>).

Data extraction and quality assessment

Independently, two investigators (Yunliang Zheng and Jian Chen) extracted data from the included trials, and the respective studies were retrieved for further consideration if judged pertinent by one or two reviewers. Any discrepancies were identified and resolved by consensus. For each trial, the following data were extracted: first author's name, year of publication, treatment arm, media progression-free survival, media overall survival, number of patients in the bevacizumab and control groups, and adverse outcomes (all-grade hypertension and high-grade hypertension). The Jadad criteria were used to assess the quality of all included RCTs in this review.¹³ Scores ranged from 0 to 5, with a high score indicating a high-quality study.

Data analysis

The principal summary measures were the incidence, odds ratio (OR), and corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI). For the calculation of incidence, the number of patients with all grades and high grades (grades 3 and 4) of hypertension, as well as the number of patients receiving bevacizumab, were obtained. The proportion of patients with hypertension and the 95% CI was derived for each study. The OR of hypertension was only calculated for studies that assigned a control group in the same trial. P-values less than 0.05 were considered significant. The Peto method was used to calculate the OR and the 95% CI, because this method provided the best CI coverage; this method was more powerful and relatively less biased in addressing low event rates.¹⁴ Heterogeneity was assessed by the Q-statistic and I^2 tests among clinical trials.15,16 Heterogeneity was considered statistically significant when P < 0.1 or $I^2 > 40\%$. If heterogeneity was present, the data were analyzed by a random-effect model; otherwise, a fixed-effect model was used. The presence of publication bias was evaluated by funnel plots, Begg's test, and Egger's test.^{17,18} All data analyses were performed with R software, version 3.0.3 (*R* Foundation for Statistical Computing [http:// www.r-project.org]).

Results

Search results and trial characteristics

A total of 1,776 studies were retrieved from an initial search. After reviewing each study, 1,767 studies were excluded. Figure 1 outlines the details of the selection process. The remaining nine studies^{8,9,11,12,19-23} had a total of 3,155 subjects that met our inclusion criteria, and were included in our analyses. The age of all subjects was over 18 years. The number of female subjects was 769 in the bevacizumabtreatment group, and the number of female subject was 527 in the control group. The characteristics of each trial are summarized in Table 1. The quality of the nine clinical trials was high: two studies had Jadad scores of 5,9,12 which provided the number of patients who withdrew and dropped from the trials, as well as described the methods of randomization and blinding. Two studies had Jadad scores of 4,8,11 which were attributed to the fact that the investigators did not appropriately describe the methods of blinding or randomization. Five studies had Jadad scores of 3.19-23 Meta-analysis was performed by following the guidelines of the PRISMA statement (Table S1).

Incidence of all-grade and high-grade hypertension

A total of 402 patients from six studies^{8,11,20–23} were treated with bevacizumab, and the incidence of all-grade hypertension was analyzed. The incidence of all-grade hypertension ranged from 5.36% to 47.9%. The highest incidence occurred



Figure 1 Flowchart demonstrating the study-selection process. Abbreviation: RCTs, randomized controlled trials.

in a Phase II trial of Japanese patients with advanced nonsquamous NSCLC.¹¹ The lowest incidence was recorded in a Phase III trial.²³ Based on data from included trials, the calculated overall incidence of all-grade hypertension was 19.55% (95% CI 10.17%–34.3%; Figure 2) according to the random-effects model (P=88.3%, P<0.001).

High-grade (grade 3 or 4) hypertension had serious adverse reactions that might have been associated with distinct morbidity and could result in the discontinuation of bevacizumab treatment. A total of 1,680 patients from

Table I	Baseline of	characteristics	of trials	included	in the	meta-anal	ysis ((n=3,155))
---------	-------------	-----------------	-----------	----------	--------	-----------	--------	-----------	---

Study	Year	Trial	Treatment	Median PFS	Median OS	HEs, n		Enrolled	Jadad
		phase	arms	(months)	(months)	All grade	High grade	patients, n	score
Johnson et al ⁸	2004	2	Beva + PC	7	17.7	11	2	67	4
			PC	5.9	14.9	I	I	32	
Sandler et al ¹⁹	2006	3	Beva + PC	6.2	12.3	NR	30	427	3
			PC	4.5	10.3	NR	3	440	
Herbst et al ²⁰	2007	2	Beva + DP	4.8	12.6	6	2	39	3
			DP	3	8.6	0	0	42	
Reck et al ¹²	2009	3	Beva + CG	6.5	13.4	NR	49	659	5
			Placebo + CG	6.1	13.1	NR	5	327	
Herbst et al ⁹	2011	3	Beva + Erl	3.4	9.3	NR	15	313	5
			Placcbo + Erl	1.7	9.2	NR	4	313	
Soria et al ²¹	2011	2	PC + Dulanermin	5.5	9.8	NR	NR	39	3
			Beva + Dulanermin	8.6	13.9	22	NR	81	
Niho et al ¹¹	2012	2	PC	6.9	22.8	6	0	58	4
			Beva + PC	5.9	23.4	57	13	119	
Spigel et al ²²	2012	2	Beva + IC	6.7	13.2	6	NR	40	3
			IC	5.3	9.3	I	NR	42	
Boutsikou et al ²³	2013	3	Beva + DC	NR	19.1	3	2	56	3
			DC	NR	15.3	0	0	61	

Abbreviations: PFS, progression-free survival; OS, overall survival; HEs, hypertension events; Beva, bevacizumab; PC, paclitaxel + carboplatin; DP, docetaxel or pemetrexed; CG, cisplatin + gemcitabine; Erl, erlotinib; IC, ixabepilone + carboplatin; DC, docetaxel + carboplatin; NR, not reported.

Study	Events	Total	Proportion	95% CI	W (random)
Johnson et al ⁸	11	67	0.1642	(0.0586-0.3053)	17.4%
Herbst et al ²⁰	6	39	0.1538	(0.0849-0.2748)	15.8%
Soria et al ²¹	22	81	0.2716	(0.1787-0.3819)	18.4%
Niho et al ¹¹	57	119	- 0.4790	(0.3866-0.5725)	19.0%
Spigel et al ²²	6	40	0.1500	(0.0571–0.2984)	15.8%
Boutsikou et al ²³	3	56	0.0536	(0.0112–0.1487)	13.6%
Random-effect m	odel	402	0.1955	(0.1017–0.3430)	100%
Heterogeneity: I ² =	88.3%, $\tau^2=0$	1.7659, <i>P</i> <0.0001			
		0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5			

Figure 2 Forest plot for the meta-analysis of the incidence of all-grade hypertension with bevacizumab-treated patients. Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval.

seven trials were available for the incidence of highgrade hypertension analysis.^{8,9,11,12,19,20,23} The incidence of high-grade hypertension ranged from 2.99% to 10.92%. The highest incidence occurred in the Phase II trial of Japanese patients with advanced nonsquamous NSCLC.¹¹ The lowest incidence occurred in patients with advanced or metastatic NSCLC.⁸ The overall incidence of highgrade hypertension was 6.95% (95% CI 5.81%–8.30%; Figure 3) according to the fixed-effect model (I^2 =24.9%, P=0.2392).

Relative risk of all-grade hypertension

The specific contribution of bevacizumab to the development of hypertension in patients was determined by excluding the influence of confounding factors, such as history of other therapeutic interventions. We calculated the OR of all-grade hypertension between the bevacizumab and control groups. The pooled OR for all-grade hypertension cases indicated that bevacizumab treatment significantly increased the risk of developing all-grade hypertension in NSCLC patients, with an OR of 8.07 (95% CI 3.87–16.85, P=0.0002; Figure 4) according to the fixed-effect model (P=0, P=0.9891).^{8,11,20,22,23}

Relative risk of high-grade hypertension

High-grade (grade 3 or 4) hypertension is an important index of bevacizumab safety. Our meta-analysis of the OR for high-grade hypertension attributable to bevacizumab in comparison with the controls was performed on seven RCTs with a total of 2,953 patients. The pooled OR for high-grade hypertension demonstrated that treatment with bevacizumab significantly increased the risk of developing high-grade hypertension in NSCLC patients, with an OR of 5.93 (95% CI 3.41–10.32, P<0.0001; Figure 5) according to the fixedeffect model (I^2 =0%, P=0.6465).^{8,9,11,12,19,20,23}

Publication bias

No evidence of publication bias was found for the OR of hypertension in our meta-analysis by funnel plot (Figure 6), Egger's test (95% CI –2.05 to 1.78, P=0.862), or Begg's test (Z=0.3, Z<1.96; P=0.76).

Discussion

Bevacizumab has been clinically validated as a targeted agent against in NSCLC by inhibiting the signaling pathways of VEGF.^{9,12} Unlike traditional chemotherapy agents,^{24–26} bevacizumab has advanced efficacy and

Study	Events	Total				Proportion	95% CI	W (fixed)
Johnson et al ⁸	2	67				0.0299	(0.0036-0.1037)	1.9%
Sandler et al19	30	427				0.0703	(0.0479-0.0988)	26.6%
Herbst et al ²⁰	2	39				0.0513	(0.0063-0.1732)	1.8%
Reck et al ¹²	49	659		•		0.0744	(0.0555-0.0971)	43.2%
Herbst et al ⁹	15	313		_		0.0479	(0.0271-0.0778)	13.6%
Niho et al ¹¹	13	119	_			- 0.1092	(0.0595-0.1796)	11.0%
Boutsikou et al ²³	2	56			_	0.0357	(0.0044–0.1231)	1.8%
Fixed-effect mode	el	1,680	\sim	>		0.0695	(0.0581–0.0830)	100%
Heterogeneity: /2=2	24.9%, τ ² =	0.0267, <i>F</i>	P=0.2389					
			0.05	0 1	0 15			



Study	Treatme	ent	Control			0	dds ratio		OR	95% CI	W (fixed)
	Events	Total	Events	Tota	I						. ,
Johnson et al [®]	11	67	1	32			<u> </u>	_	6.0893	(0.7505–49.4093)	16.1%
Herbst et al ²⁰	6	39	0	42			+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		16.4925	(0.8968-303.3159)	5.8%
Niho et al ¹¹	57	119	6	58					7.9677	(3.1804–19.9615)	59.9%
Spigel et al ²²	6	40	1	42					7.2353	(0.8300–63.0695)	11.8%
Boutsikou et al ²³	3	56	0	61		-	-		8.0467	(0.4064–159.3371)	6.4%
Fixed-effect mod	lel	321		235					8.0737	(3.8690–16.8479)	100%
Heterogeneity: I2=	=0%, τ²=0	, <i>P</i> =0.9	9891				-				
					0.01	0.1	1 10	100			

Figure 4 Relative risk of bevacizumab-associated all-grade hypertension. Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; Cl, confidence interval.

lower toxicity. However, adverse effects in patients with bevacizumab treatment include hypertension, nausea, hemorrhage, fatigue, and neuropathy.^{27,28} Hypertension is commonly associated with bevacizumab in clinical trials. This condition may lead to serious cardiovascular events or even life-threatening consequences. The incidence and management for hypertension is important in NSCLC patients with bevacizumab treatment. However, the overall incidence and risk of bevacizumab-induced hypertension remains unknown. The present meta-analysis was performed to calculate its overall incidence and to compare differences in incidence rates between bevacizumab treatment and controls.

Meta-analysis is a formidable statistical tool that can be used to assess the incidence and risk factors of drug-related adverse reactions. Meta-analysis results can increase the number of clinical samples and improve productivity based on statistical evidence. In addition, meta-analysis reaches more valid conclusions for the selection of suitable therapeutic schemes in clinical practice. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to estimate the incidence and risk of hypertension associated with bevacizumab treatment in patients with NSCLC. Our meta-analysis included a total of 3,155 subjects from nine studies, and we demonstrated that the overall incidence rate of all-grade hypertension was 19.55%, whereas the incidence rate of high-grade hypertension was 6.79%. There are also several factors that should be considered in the rate reported in our study, such as the size of each selected study and patient features (sex, age, etc). Additionally, the use of bevacizumab is associated with significantly increased incidence of all-grade and high-grade hypertension compared with controls. The OR of all-grade hypertension was 8.07, and that of high-grade hypertension was 5.93. According to a report by Hong et al,²⁹ the relative risk of all-grade hypertension in advanced NSCLC patients treated with angiogenesis inhibitors was 3.23 (95% CI 1.93-5.41, P<0.001), and the relative risk of high-grade hypertension in advanced NSCLC patients treated with angiogenesis inhibitors was 5.42 (95% CI 4.06–7.22, P < 0.001). Our results were similar to Hong et al. Based on our results, we concluded that bevacizumab treatment was associated with an unexpectedly high risk of developing hypertension. Continuous monitoring and effective hypertension management are important during bevacizumab treatment.

Study	Treatm Events	ent Total	Cont Ever	trol Its Total	Odds ratio	OR	95% CI	W (fixed)
Johnson et al ⁸	2	67	1	32		0 9538	(0.0833-10.9247)	8.4%
Sandler et al ¹⁹	30	427	3	440		11.0076	(3.3335–36.3485)	17.7%
Herbst et al ²⁰	2	39	0	42		5.6667	(0.2636-121.8210)	2.9%
Reck et al ¹²	49	659	5	327		5.1731	(2.0411–13.1114)	39.8%
Herbst et al ⁹	15	313	4	313		3.8884	(1.2759–11.8504)	24.5%
Niho et al ¹¹	13	119	0	58		14.8310	(0.8660-254.0049)	3.8%
Boutsikou et al ²³	2	56	0	61		5.6422	(0.2650–120.1153)	2.9%
Fixed-effect mode	el	1,680		1,273		5.9302	(3.4074–10.3210)	100%
Heterogeneity: /2=	0%, <i>τ</i> ²=0,	P=0.64	65	Г 0 0				

Figure 5 Relative risk of bevacizumab-associated high-grade hypertension. Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.



Figure 6 Funnel-plot standard error based on the odds ratio for relative risk of high-grade hypertension.

Bevacizumab is used to treat a more heterogeneous patient population than those found in clinical trials. More effort is required to limit the risk of hypertension. Bevacizumab-administered patients need to be carefully monitored for hypertension symptoms, especially if these patients have cardiovascular disease or other risk factors.30 Furthermore, the use of bevacizumab can cause high-grade hypertension, as described by the CTCAE of the National Cancer Institute. Therefore, patients treated with this drug should be monitored for symptoms, such as fever, dyspnea, and hypoxemia, during bevacizumab administration. Clinicians should be aware of the possibility that any patient treated with bevacizumab may develop hypertension, especially those at high risk. In addition to its anti-NSCLC properties, bevacizumab is used against other tumor types, particularly colon cancer.^{31,32} The incidence of hypertension in other cancer patients should be considered.

The mechanism of bevacizumab-associated hypertension has not been clarified, and may be associated with the suppression of nitric oxide production in endothelial cells.³³ Whether via pharmacological or genetic methods, the inhibition of the VEGF pathway in endothelial cells can induce thrombotic microangiopathy, endotheliosis, and narrow capillaries in patients treated with VEGF-targeting agents.³⁴ The relationship between hypertension and the patient's response to bevacizumab may be related to gene polymorphism. Previous studies have determined that genetic variants of the VEGFR and vascular endothelial growth factor A (VEGFA) are associated with the patient's reaction to bevacizumab treatment.^{35,36} These genetic variants could increase the response of endothelial cells to anti-VEGF-targeted agents, which may be directed at the increased risk of cardiac toxicity. Therefore, patients developing hypertension during bevacizumab therapy may be influenced by these variants. Hypertension associated with polymorphisms of VEGF has been reported in patients treated with sunitinib and bevacizumab.³⁷

Although bevacizumab-associated hypertension is an important side effect reported in clinical trials, the management of this side effect is controversial. Guidelines of the American Heart Association³⁸ and the European Society of Hypertension³⁹ do not mention measures against induced hypertension. Furthermore, no evidence-based suggestions are available. Therefore, clinicians are free to choose the best therapeutic strategy for their patients. A large number of clinical trials have shown that the main effects of antihypertensive treatment are largely independent of the drugs used. In addition, β -adrenoceptor antagonists, angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors, angiotensin-receptor antagonists, and calcium antagonists can adequately lower blood pressure and markedly decrease the frequency of cardiovascular events.^{40,41} Therefore, all the aforementioned agents can be used as antihypertensive treatment either in alone or in combination. Of course, it should be noted that because VEGF inhibitors interact with cytochrome enzymes, the metabolism of some antihypertensive drugs, such as calcium-channel blockers, is affected, and hence, these antihypertensive drugs may not be effective in patients treated with VEGF inhibitors. According to the British Columbia Cancer Agency recommendations for the management of adverse effects of bevacizumab, a thiazine diuretic should be the first-line treatment and angiotensin-receptor blockers or ACE inhibitors can be the second-line treatment. However, diuretic treatment of patients under concurrent chemotherapy should be performed with caution to prevent volume depletion.42

Our meta-analysis has several limitations. First, we may have underestimated the incidence of bevacizumab-associated hypertension because of the definition of the CTCAE. Under the CTCAE, patients are considered hypertensive only if the blood pressure is greater than 150/100 mmHg or the diastolic pressure is increased by more than 20 mmHg. In our study, this strict criteria would have reduced the number of hypertensive patients compared with the real-world criteria for the diagnosis of hypertension (140/90 mmHg). Second, RCTs have strict inclusion and exclusion criteria. Only patients with adequate major organ function are included in these trials; therefore, the results of our meta-analysis may not represent actual patients.^{43,44} Our results may not be applicable to the general population in daily practice. Third, hypertension events are collected for each individual trial, but potentially differences among the trials may exist, as follows: various international institutions, administration schedules of bevacizumab, and periods of study. All of these differences would increase the clinical heterogeneity among the included trials,⁴⁵ which contributed to the difficulty of interpreting the results of our analysis. Finally, the treatment designs varied, and the analysis did not focus on individual patient data. Meta-analyses that are based on published data tend to overestimate the treatment effects compared with individual patient data analyses.⁴⁶

Conclusion

Our study suggested that bevacizumab treatment in NSCLC patients is associated with a significantly increased risk of developing hypertension. Early monitoring and effective management of hypertension could be an important step for the safer use of this drug. Further studies should be conducted to identify the mechanism of bevacizumab-associated hypertension.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

References

- 1. Siegel R, Ma J, Zou Z, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2014. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2014;64(1):9–29.
- NSCLC Meta-Analyses Collaborative Group. Chemotherapy in addition to supportive care improves survival in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual patient data from 16 randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Oncol.* 2008;26(28):4617–4625.
- Stinchcombe TE, Socinski MA. Current treatments for advanced stage non-small cell lung cancer. Proc Am Thorac Soc. 2009;6(2):233–241.
- Francis H, Solomon B. The current status of targeted therapy for nonsmall cell lung cancer. *Intern Med J.* 2010;40(9):611–618.
- 5. Parums DV. Current status of targeted therapy in non-small cell lung cancer. *Drugs Today (Barc)*. 2014;50(7):503–525.
- Zetter BR. Angiogenesis and tumor metastasis. Annu Rev Med. 1998; 49:407–424.
- Chiappori AA, Kolevska T, Spigel DR, et al. A randomized phase II study of the telomerase inhibitor imetelstat as maintenance therapy for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Ann Oncol.* 2015;26(2):354–362.
- Johnson DH, Fehrenbacher L, Novotny WF, et al. Randomized phase II trial comparing bevacizumab plus carboplatin and paclitaxel with carboplatin and paclitaxel alone in previously untreated locally advanced or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2004; 22(11):2184–2191.
- Herbst RS, Ansari R, Bustin F, et al. Efficacy of bevacizumab plus erlotinib versus erlotinib alone in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer after failure of standard first-line chemotherapy (BeTa): a doubleblind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet.* 2011;377(9780): 1846–1854.
- Su Y, Yang WB, Li S, Ye ZJ, Shi HZ, Zhou Q. Effect of angiogenesis inhibitor bevacizumab on survival in patients with cancer: a metaanalysis of the published literature. *PloS One*. 2012;7(4):e35629.

- 11. Niho S, Kunitoh H, Nokihara H, et al. Randomized phase II study of first-line carboplatin-paclitaxel with or without bevacizumab in Japanese patients with advanced non-squamous non-small-cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2012;76(3):362–367.
- Reck M, von Pawel J, Zatloukal P, et al. Phase III trial of cisplatin plus gemcitabine with either placebo or bevacizumab as first-line therapy for nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer: AVAil. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009;27(8):1227–1234.
- Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, et al. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials*. 1996;17(1):1–12.
- 14. Sweeting MJ, Sutton AJ, Lambert PC. What to add to nothing? Use and avoidance of continuity corrections in meta-analysis of sparse data. *Stat Med.* 2004;23(9):1351–1375.
- Zintzaras E, Ioannidis JP. Heterogeneity testing in meta-analysis of genome searches. *Genet Epidemiol*. 2005;28(2):123–137.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327(7414):557–560.
- 17. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics*. 1994;50(4):1088–1101.
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629–634.
- Sandler A, Gray R, Perry MC, et al. Paclitaxel-carboplatin alone or with bevacizumab for non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;355(24):2542–2550.
- Herbst RS, O'Neill VJ, Fehrenbacher L, et al. Phase II study of efficacy and safety of bevacizumab in combination with chemotherapy or erlotinib compared with chemotherapy alone for treatment of recurrent or refractory non small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2007;25(30):4743–4750.
- Soria JC, Márk Z, Zatloukal P, et al. Randomized phase II study of dulanermin in combination with paclitaxel, carboplatin, and bevacizumab in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2011;29(33): 4442–4451.
- Spigel DR, Greco FA, Waterhouse DM, et al. Phase II trial of ixabepilone and carboplatin with or without bevacizumab in patients with previously untreated advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2012;78(1):70–75.
- 23. Boutsikou E, Kontakiotis T, Zarogoulidis P, et al. Docetaxel-carboplatin in combination with erlotinib and/or bevacizumab in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *Onco Targets Ther.* 2013;6:125–134.
- Artal Cortés A, Calera Urquizu L, Hernando Cubero J. Adjuvant chemotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: state-of-the-art. *Transl Lung Cancer Res.* 2015;4(2):191–197.
- 25. Petrioli R, Francini E, Fiaschi AI, et al. Switch maintenance treatment with oral vinorelbine and bevacizumab after induction chemotherapy with cisplatin, gemcitabine and bevacizumab in patients with advanced non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer: a phase II study. *Med Oncol.* 2015;32(4):134.
- 26. Tamiya A, Tamiya M, Shiroyama T, et al. Phase II trial of carboplatin, S-1, and gefitinib as first-line triplet chemotherapy for advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer patients with activating epidermal growth factor receptor mutations. *Med Oncol.* 2015;32(3):40.
- Montero JA, Yanez-Castro G, Sanchis-Merino ME, Ruiz-Moreno JM. Bevacizumab in vitreous haemorrhage secondary to radiation retinopathy. *BMJ Case Rep.* 2014;2014.
- Fu DB, Alexandru D, Curticiu DM, Fu Y, Bota DA. Two patients with brain tumors who received bevacizumab and radiotherapy: optic neuropathy and quality-of-life issues. *J Adv Pract Oncol.* 2013;4(4): 252–256.
- Hong S, Tan M, Wang S, Luo S, Chen Y, Zhang L. Efficacy and safety of angiogenesis inhibitors in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2015;141(5): 909–921.
- Pereg D, Lishner M. Bevacizumab treatment for cancer patients with cardiovascular disease: a double edged sword? *Eur Heart J.* 2008;29(19): 2325–2326.

- Kaidar-Person O, Badarna H, Bar-Sela G. Bevacizumab for metastatic colon cancer: does patient BMI influence survival? *Anticancer Drugs*. 2015;26(3):363–366.
- 32. Hamdollah Zadeh MA, Amin EM, Hoareau-Aveilla C, et al. Alternative splicing of TIA-1 in human colon cancer regulates VEGF isoform expression, angiogenesis, tumour growth and bevacizumab resistance. *Mol Oncol.* 2015;9(1):167–178.
- Robinson ES, Khankin EV, Choueiri TK, et al. Suppression of the nitric oxide pathway in metastatic renal cell carcinoma patients receiving vascular endothelial growth factor-signaling inhibitors. *Hypertension*. 2010;56(6):1131–1136.
- Eremina V, Sood M, Haigh J, et al. Glomerular-specific alterations of VEGF-A expression lead to distinct congenital and acquired renal diseases. J Clin Invest. 2003;111(5):707–716.
- 35. Lambrechts D, Claes B, Delmar P, et al. VEGF pathway genetic variants as biomarkers of treatment outcome with bevacizumab: an analysis of data from the AVITA and AVOREN randomised trials. *Lancet Oncol.* 2012;13(7):724–733.
- Yu J, Cao XF, Zheng Y, et al. Anti-VEGF therapy with bevacizumab limited cardiovascular toxicity. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2014;15(24): 10769–10772.
- 37. Garcia-Donas J, Esteban E, Leandro-García LJ, et al. Single nucleotide polymorphism associations with response and toxic effects in patients with advanced renal-cell carcinoma treated with first-line sunitinib: a multicentre, observational, prospective study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2011;12(12):1143–1150.
- Aronow WS, Fleg JL, Pepine CJ, et al. ACCF/AHA 2011 expert consensus document on hypertension in the elderly: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Task Force on Clinical Expert Consensus Documents. *Circulation*. 2011;123(21):2434–2506.

- Mancia G, Laurent S, Agabiti-Rosei E et al. Reappraisal of European guidelines on hypertension management: a European Society of Hypertension Task Force document. *Journal of hypertension*. 2009;27(11):2121–2158.
- Izzedine H, Ederhy S, Goldwasser F, et al. Management of hypertension in angiogenesis inhibitor-treated patients. *Ann Oncol.* 2009; 20(5):807–815.
- Sato Y, Sonoda H. The vasohibin family: a negative regulatory system of angiogenesis genetically programmed in endothelial cells. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol.* 2007;27(1):37–41.
- Runge Sørensen C, Madsen JK, Schmidt F, Sloth E. [No evidence for renal protective effect of loop diuretics for patients having oliguria.] Ugeskr Laeger. 2012;174(43):2617–2620. Danish.
- Jaeschke R, Gajewski P, Brozek J. Cardiovascular thrombotic events in controlled, clinical trials of rofecoxib. *Circulation*. 2002;106(5):e18.
- 44. Dhurandhar EJ, Kaiser KA, Dawson JA, Alcorn AS, Keating KD, Allison DB. Predicting adult weight change in the real world: a systematic review and meta-analysis accounting for compensatory changes in energy intake or expenditure. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. Epub 2014 Oct 17.
- 45. Sedgwick P. Meta-analyses: what is heterogeneity? *BMJ*. 2015;350: h1435.
- Zhang Z, Xu X, Ni H. Small studies may overestimate the effect sizes in critical care meta-analyses: a meta-epidemiological study. *Crit Care*. 2013;17(1):R2.

Supplementary material

Dovepress

Sected notable Checklist chem Checkli			
Tute I dentify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. The I dentify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. Sectorared summary 2 Provide as required nummary, including as tplicable budge routed, calleding multications. Conditions will any systematic review meta-analysis, or both. Sectorared summary 2 Provide as registration number. Sectorared summary including as tplicable budge addressely toom. 3 Besche and registration number. Provide an registration number. 5 Besche any structured anney of colorw-up) and report classes. 4 Basility criteria Sectorared summary including as explicable provide review meta-analysis. 1 Besche and review meta-analysis. 5 Besche analysis and sectoral ad report classes. Provide an registration number. 2 Baser the provide an registration number. 5 Besche analysis and sectoral ad registration number. 5 Besche analysis and sectoral ad registration number. Besche an registration number. 2 Besche analysis and segistration number. 5 Besche analysis and sectoral ad registration number. Besche an registredit provine reactor stratege for an last rest or difference anad	Section/topic	Checklist item	Reported on page
The Inder I dentify the report at a systematic review, meta-analytic, or both. All the review in the review registration number. The concreted summary and second second second concreted summary is a presented summary. Target and strends and antibility and the second second concreted summary is a presented summary. Target and strends and antibility and the second second concreted summary is a presented summary. Target and antibility and the second second concretes in the second sec	Title		
 Provide a structured summary including a applicable background, objectives, dua sources, study-eligbility criteria, and increventions. such approximation and synthesis memodar, results, immatoris: conclusions and implications of floy findings: systematic review registration number. Terrotatican Terrotatican	Title	I Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	_
Incodecion Incodecion Stational Objectives Protocia and registration Protocia and registration Protocia and registration Protocia and registration Protocia and registration information including registration moments. Biglinly criteria Protocia and registration registration protocia exists, if and where it can be accessed (eg, web address), and if anilable, provide registration information, including registration number. Biglinly criteria Protocia and registration registration strutup signation number. Biglinly criteria Protocia and registration registration strutup and an oritant registration number. Biglinly criteria Sateria Biglinly criteria Sateria Sateria Biglinly criteria Sateria S	Abstract Structured summary	2 Provide a structured summary, including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study-eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2
Bactorelie Bostrolet <	Introduction		
Methods Freedor Statudy characteristics (ag PICOS, length of followup) and report characteristics (ag, years considered, language, publication raturo) used as criteria Free Eligibility criteria 6 Specify starty characteristics (ag PICOS, length of followup) and report characteristics (ag, years considered, language, publication staruly used as criteria 5 Information sources 7 Secribe an information source (agd atchases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and dates 5 Server full elecronic search reports 7 Secribe and information sources 9 Secribe and information sources (agd atchases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date 5 Search 8 Reserver full elecronic search reports 9 Secribe and information sources (agd atchases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and any search studies in hubble. 5 Search 9 Secribe and information is concerage for a data synthesite of studies. 6 6 Describe method of data scratscion form studies (ag which studies) and any start processes for obtaining data from for unsettions: 5 5 State the principal summary measures (ag tick raits, difference) in maters) 11 Lest and combined in a remotion of that avers studies (ag studies	Rationale Objectives	 Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) 	ω4
 Protocol and regaration 3 tenders in revents, in an where it can be accessed up, were acc	Methods	- 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19	
Elighting criteria 5 specify such characteristics (eg, PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (eg, vent considered, language, publication status) used as criteria information sources 7 specify such characteristics (eg, PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (eg, vent could be repeated. information sources 7 secretional information sources (eg, databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. Start the process in secretion 9 start the process for setering studies (a, stream), indeploted forms, indeploted), induded in the meta-analysis. Data collection process 10 becritom encloded of data excration from reports (eg, ploted forms, independently, in diplicars) and any processes for obtaining data from 6 state excration from reports (eg, ploted forms, independently, in diplicars) and any processes for obtaining data from 6 state excration from reports (eg, end and any processes) for obtaining data from 6 state excration from reports (eg, end and any constrains) Start ender 11 Last and define all archion analyses (eg, end (indiding specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), study and for states and synthess. Start ender 5 Secretion 5 secretion analyses, including measures of constrany (eg, f) for each meta-analysis. Start ender 5 Secretion analyses (for which with reasons for exulay or outcome level), and dedited in any estudy or study on eac	Protocol and registration	5 indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (eg, web address), and if available, provide registration information, including registration number	I
 Information sources Describe all informations sources (eg, databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date is starched. Sarch Sareth Breached in descriptions sources (eg, databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the meta-analysis. Data relations Describe method of data excraction from reports (eg piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining data from 6 metsignos. Data relations State the principal summary measures State the principal summary measures (eg, risk of bias of relation of models of that and combining relations of relations made. State the principal summary measures State the principal summary measures (eg, risk of bias of relations) relations made. State the principal summary measures State the principal summary measures (eg, risk of bias of relations) relations of relations made. State the principal summary measures (eg, risk of bias of relations) relations made. Risk of bias across studies State the principal summary measures (eg, risk of relations) relations) bias, selective reporting within a meta-analysis. State the principal summary measeres (eg, risk of relations)	Eligibility criteria	6 Specify study characteristics (eg. PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (eg. years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria	ß
Search Breast rule Breast rule Breast rule alerconic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. State the process for selecting studies (it, streeming, eligblity, included in systematic review, and if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). State the process for selecting studies (it, streeming, eligblity, included in systematic review, and if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). State collection process Describe method of data extraction from reports (eg, ploted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from westignors. State and effice all variables for which data were sought (eg, PICOS funding specification of whicher this was done at the study or outcome level), extending and how this information is to be used in any data synthes of treats State the principal summary measures (eg, risk ratio, difference in means). State the principal summary measures (eg, risk ratio, difference in means). State collection process State the principal summary measures (eg, risk ratio, difference in means). State collection process for obtaining data data were south of the review, with ratuels of the meta-analysis. State the principal summary measures (eg, risk ratio, difference in means). State collection process studies (ratuels are access). State collection process for robaining and conditional analyses. State collection process for robaining and colleging and the review, with ratuels of the rest are state and the write studies (including specification bias, selective reporting with ratuels). State and bio write state accestrest of robain indicate access analos is the constant are state	Information sources	for eligibility, giving rationale. 7 Describe all information sources (eg, databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date	ъ
Search 8 Stream full electronic search strategy for a transmort of approxem, and if approxemes included in the meta-analysis. 5 Data-collection process 9 State the process for selecting studies (ie, streening eligblily, included in ystematic review, and if approxemes for colorining and confirming data from 6 5 Data-collection process 10 Describe method of data extraction from reports (eg. PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made. 5 Data items 11 List and define all variables for which data were sought (eg. PICOS, funding specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), studies 6 Synthesis 13 State the principal summary measures (eg. risk ratio, difference inmary), in duplication of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), synthesis of results 6 Synthesis 13 State the principal summary measures (eg. risk ratio, difference inmary), in duplication of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), so that set of the ortholing tracted states of results 6 Sundy characteristics 13 State the principal summary measures (eg. risk ratio, difference inmary), results 7 6 Sundy characteristics 13 State the principal summary measures for studies (rescence), and in princes at study in a row of results 7 7 Sundy characteristics 18 For each study, whether tha strate study oro traceouprelevel state study oro toutcome level), and fornidia a		last searched.	
Data-collection process 10 Describe method of data extraction from reports (eg, plloted forms, independenty, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from 6 investigances. 5. Data items 11 Lists and define all variables for which data were sought (eg, PICOS, funding sources) and any passumptions and simplifications made. 5. Risk of bias in individual 12 Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), surdies 5 Surdies of results 13 Eate the principal summary measures (eg, risk and data varies) (figs, PICOS, funding, sources) and any sestime reprint, with an measures (eg risk risk of bias across studies). 6 Surdis sections the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, including measures of constitency (eg, <i>fi</i>) for each meta-analysis. 6 Study selection 16 Secribe the methods of radional analyses (eg, sensitivy or subgroup analyses, mecargression), fi done, indicaning which were prespecified 6 Results 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligbility, and included in the review, with reasons for exciting with a flow dagam. 7 Study selection 16 For each strudy, with a flow at were study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates studies of results 7 Study characteristics 18 For each strudy with a flowast present for each strudy: 1) simple summary data f	Search Study selection	 Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. State the process for selecting studies (ie, screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). 	6 5
Data items investigators. Data items It start and define all variables for which data were sought (eg. PICOS, funding specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), studies 5. Risk of bias in individual 12 Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), studies 5. Synthesis of results 13 Stare the principal summary measures of thermetical in means). 13 Care the principal summary measures (studies, if done, including measures of consistency (eg. <i>Iⁿ</i>) for each meta-analysis. Results 6 Risk of bias across studies 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (eg. publication bias, selective reporting within studies). 6 Results 16 Describe methods of handing data and combining treature solution of analyses. metaregression), if done, indicating with a flow diagram. 7 Study befarced and on risk of bias of each study, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each study end on studies. 7 Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies of each study. and if available, any concomeleveles (eg. study state). 7 Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies of each study. and if available, and concomelevele (eg. study state). 6 Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies of each study. 16 7 St	Data-collection process	10 Describe method of data extraction from reports (eg, piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from	6
studiesand how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.Summary measuresis state the principal summary measures (es; reito, difference in means).Summary measuresis state the principal summary measures (es; reito, difference in means).Summary measuresis state the principal summary measures (es; reito, difference in means).Summary measuresis state the principal summary measures (es; reito, difference in means).Risk of blas across studiesis Specify any saessment of risk of blas that may affect the cumulative evidence (eg, publication bias, selective reporting within studies).Resultsis Specify any saessment of risk of blas that way affect the cumulative evidence (eg, study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.Resultsif Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.Resultsif Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage.Rusk of blas within studiesif For each study.Risk of blas within studiesif For each study.Risk of blas within studiesif available, any outcome-level assessement (see item 12).Risk of blas across studiesif confidence intervals.Risk of blas across studiesif Second measures of studies, if done, including confidence intervals and many state for each intervention group, and 3 effect estimatesRisk of blas across studiesif Second measures of studies, if done (eg, risk of blas, and outcome) is a dot on state of results of r	Data items Risk of bias in individual	investigators. 11 List and define all variables for which data were sought (eg. PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made. 12 Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level),	5, 6 6
Summary measures 13 State the principal summary measures (eg. risk ratio, difference in means). 6 Synthesis of results 14 Describe methods of handling stata and coming results of studies; if done, including measures of consistency (eg. f) for each meta-analysis. 6 Risk of bias across studies 15 Specify any sasessment of risk of bias and coming results of studies; if done, indicating which were prespecified. 6 Additional analyses 16 Describe methods of radding rest and coming results of the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. 7 Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a forward provide the citations. 7 Study followal 17 Give numbers of studies corrent characteristics for which data were extracted (stations the stage stage) and provide the citations. 7 Study followal 17 Give numbers of studies corrent characteristics for which data were extracted (stations the stage) and provide the citations. 7 Study followal 17 Give numbers of studies corrent characteristics for which data were extracted (stations the stage) and provide the citations. 7 Study followal 17 Give numbers of studies corrents of the state for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates and confidence intervals, idealy with a forware provides the citations. 7 Results 21 Pre	studies	and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	
Synthesis of results 14 Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (eg. <i>Pl</i>) for ach meta-analysis. 6 Additional analyses 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (eg. publication bias, selective reporting within studies). 6 Additional analyses 16 Describe methods of additional analyses (eg. sensitivity or subgroup analyses, metaregression), if done, indicating which were prespecified. 6 Results 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and inudued in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. 7 Study tharacteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (eg. study size, PICOS folow-up period) and provide the citations. 7 Results 19 Present results of this of bias of each study. and if available, any outconnel evel seasens studies (see item 12). 7 Risk of bias within studies) 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present fost entervals, ideally with a fore study size, pICOS folow-up period) and 2) effect estimates 7 Risk of bias within studies) 21 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15). 7 Discussion 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg. sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16). 7 Discussion 24 diditional	Summary measures	13 State the principal summary measures (eg. risk ratio, difference in means).	6
 Additional analyses 15 opecity any assessment or rask on bas via mary aract the cumutative evidence (eg. publication bias, selection 17 Give numbers of studies streened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each study, present characteristic for which data were extracted (eg. study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. 7 Study reharacteristics 18 For each study, present chara on risk of bias of each study, and if available, any outcome level, with reasons for exclusions at each study, present chara on risk of bias of each study, and fi available, any outcome level, with reasons for exclusions at each study, and fi available, any outcome level, with reasons for exclusions are each study and provide the citations. 7 Risk of bias within studies 10 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study; and fi available, any outcome level (see item 12). 8 Results of individual 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study; and measures of consistency. 8 Risk of bias across studies 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including (see item 15). 8 Adional analysis 22 Present results of additional analysis, including the strength of evidence for each main unctome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers, 8 usits) or studies are across studies 23 Present results of additional analysis, including the strength of evidence for each matu characteristic or substrom analysis. 15 Discussion 24 Summary of evidence 25 Present results of additional analysis, including the strength of evidence, and indications for future research, reporting bias. 24 Summary of evidence 25 Present results of additional analysis, including the strength of evidence, and implications for future research, reporting bias. 26 Provi	Synthesis of results	14 Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (eg. β) for each meta-analysis.	, 9
Realts Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligbility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. 7 Study selection 17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligbility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. 7 Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (eg, study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. 7 Results of individual 20 For and nutcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates 7, studies 21 Present results of any matural studies confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 21 Present results of aad meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). Discussion 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). Discussion 24 Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers, 8 users, and policy makers). Conclusions 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 24 Summarize the main finding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 11 Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,	Kisk of bias across studies Addirional analyses	is Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (eg, publication bias, selective reporting within studies). 16 Describe methods of additional analyses (مع sensitivity or suberoun analyses metaregression) if done indicating which were prespectified	o رو
Study selection17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.7Study characteristics18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (eg, study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.7Risk of bias within studies19 Present data on risk of bias of each study, and if available, any outcome-level assessment (see item 12).7Results of individual20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates7,Synthesis of results21 Present results of each study or a forward in analysis21 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15).7,Discussion23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]).7,Discussion24 Summary of evidence24 Summarize the main finding, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers, locuclusions at study and policy makers).10Discussion25 Discuss limitations25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).10Discussion26 Provide a general interpretation of the results of other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.10Discussion27 Discuss limitations27 Discus limitations for the systemation	Results		•
 Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (eg, study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. 7 7 Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study: any outcome-level assessment (see item 12). 7 Results of individual 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates 7, studies 8 and confidence intervals, idealy with a forest plot. 5) Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 8 Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). 7) Discussion 24 Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers, 8 users, and policy makers). 10 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 24 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research, reporting bias). 10 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 24 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. 10 Conclusions 21 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic revie	Study selection	17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram	7
Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study, and if available, any outcome-level assessment (see item 12). 7 Results of individual 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7 Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 8 Additional 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 7 Risk of bias across studies 21 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15). 7 Additional analysis 23 Give results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15). 7 Discussion 24 Summary of evidence 24 Summary of evidence 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, in	Study characteristics	18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (eg. study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	7
Results of individual 20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates 7, studies studies and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. 7, studies Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7	Risk of bias within studies	19 Present data on risk of bias of each study, and if available, any outcome-level assessment (see item 12).	7
 studies and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results I Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Risk of bias across studies Present results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). Additional analysis Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). Summary of evidence Summary of evidence<td>Results of individual</td><td>20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates</td><td>7, 8</td>	Results of individual	20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates	7, 8
Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15). 4 dditional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). 7, 7, 7, 0 iscussion 24 Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers, 8 users, and policy makers). 10 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 24 Frovide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. Teporting bias). 10 Conclusions 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 21 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data)). 11 Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data)). 10 Substant for the systematic review and other substant context of other evidence, and implications for future research. 11 Substant for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data)). 10 Substant for the systematic review and context of other substant (eg, supply of data). 10 Substant for the systematic review. 11 Substant for the systematic review and context of context of other substant for the systematic review. 11 Substant for the systematic review and context of context on any hour for the systematic review. 11 Substant for the systematic review and context of context on any hour for the systematic review. 11 Substant for the systematic review an	studies	and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	
Risk of bias across studies 22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15). 7, Additional analysis 23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). 7, 7, Discussion 24 Summary of evidence 24 Summary of evidence 8 10 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. 11 Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 11	Synthesis of results	21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	7, 8
Additional analysis 2.5 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg. sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]). /, Discussion 24 Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg. health care providers, 8 users, and policy makers). 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 2.6 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. ¹ If Funding Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg. supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. ¹ If ¹	Risk of bias across studies	22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15).	, 00 1
Discussion Summary of evidence 24 Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers, 8 users, and policy makers). 8 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 25 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. 11 Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 11	Additional analysis	2.5 Give results of additional analyses, if done (eg, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, met-regression [see item 16]).	7, 8
Umitations Users, and policy makers). Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 25 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. 11 Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 11	Uiscussion Summary of evidence	24 Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (eg, health care providers,	œ
Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg, risk of bias), and at review level (eg, incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). 10 Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. 11 Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg. supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 11 Non-evidence, and inding for the systematic review and other support (eg. supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. 11		users, and policy makers).	
Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg. supply of data): role of funders for the systematic review. 11 Matter Based Matter D. Harves A. Almon DC Based accord according for support for support for the potent for the systematic review.	Limitations	25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (eg. risk of bias), and at review level (eg. incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	0 :
Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg, supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	Conclusions	26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	=
Matter Deschard form Matter D. Harmer A. Zhana D.C. Desformed constrict for construction and non-construction of DBICMA recommends [2] A.C. Mod. 2006;47(7):1000001	runaing Funding	27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (eg. supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	=
	Note: Bornodicod from Mohor	Librari A Tradaff Alman DC Defended constraint instruction and sources du BDIGMA constraint BJ & Mad. 2006;27715(1000007)	

4759

Reference

 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6(7):e1000097.

Drug Design, Development and Therapy

Publish your work in this journal

Drug Design, Development and Therapy is an international, peerreviewed open-access journal that spans the spectrum of drug design and development through to clinical applications. Clinical outcomes, patient safety, and programs for the development and effective, safe, and sustained use of medicines are a feature of the journal, which

has also been accepted for indexing on PubMed Central. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php to read real quotes from published authors.

 $\textbf{Submit your manuscript here:} \ \texttt{http://www.dovepress.com/drug-design-development-and-therapy-journal}$

Dovepress