

Complications Post Endovascular Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Repair in Patients with Diabetes Mellitus: A Meta-analysis and Systematic Review

EA Otify¹, M Mekki², J Borucki³, K Dhatariya^{1,4}, P W Stather^{1,5}

1. Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom
2. Department of Internal Medicine, Cairo University Hospitals, Cairo, Egypt
3. Department of General surgery, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust, United Kingdom
4. Department of Endocrinology, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust, United Kingdom
5. Department of Vascular Surgery, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust, United Kingdom

Authors

Miss Eman Ashraf Adly Aly Otify, Associate Fellowship in Higher Education Academy, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia - e.otify@uea.ac.uk

Dr Mohamed Mekki MBChB, Internal Medicine Physician, Cairo University Hospitals - dr.mekki95@gmail.com

Mr Joseph P Borucki MBBS MSc MRCS, Department of General surgery, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust, United Kingdom - j.p.borucki@googlemail.com

Prof. Ketan Dhatariya MBBS MSc MD MS FRCP PhD, Consultant in Diabetes Endocrinology and General Medicine, Honorary Professor of Medicine Elsie Bertram Diabetes Centre. Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia - ketan.dhatariya@nnuh.nhs.uk

Prof. Philip Stather MBChB FRCS MD, Consultant Vascular Surgeon, Department of Vascular Surgery, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust, United Kingdom and Clinical Associate Professor, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia - Philip.Stather@nnuh.nhs.uk

Co-author:

Prof. P Stather - Philip.Stather@nnuh.nhs.uk

Sources of funding for research and/or publication- N/A

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: People with diabetes mellitus (DM) have higher long-term mortality following abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) repair than those without DM. However, whether this adverse outcome is directly related to their aneurysm is unclear.

Aims: To determine the rates of complications in people with and without DM post endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair. Primary outcome data include AAA sac enlargement, reinterventions, endoleaks, post-operative AAA rupture and conversion to open surgical repair.

Methods: PubMed, Embase and Cochrane databases were searched for primary research studies between 2005 and 2023 according to PRISMA guidelines. Those undergoing AAA repair via endovascular aneurysm repair were included.

Results: Thirty-five studies were identified totalling 90,347 people in the control group, and 17,660 in the DM group. Those with DM had a lower rate of reintervention compared to controls (9.94% v 11.58%; OR 0.89, 95% CI [0.82-0.97]; $P=0.005$), however there was no significant difference in the rate of overall, type I or type II endoleaks ($P=0.22$, $P=0.29$, $P=0.15$ respectively).

People with DM were also less likely to have sac enlargement post AAA repair (9.66% v 11.27%; OR 0.79, 95% CI [0.68-0.93]; $P=0.003$). Additionally, people with DM had a significantly reduced rate of conversion to open surgery (2.11 % DM v 3.12% control; OR 0.80, CI [0.66-0.97]; $P=0.02$).

Conclusion: Reinterventions, sac enlargement post AAA repair, and conversion to open surgical repair were significantly lower in people with DM, however the cause for these differences remains unclear.

Keywords:

Endovascular Abdominal Aortic Repair, Diabetes Mellitus, Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm, Reinterventions, Sac enlargement.

Introduction

There is a well-established inverse association between diabetes mellitus (DM) and Abdominal Aortic aneurysm (AAA) growth^[1], especially that of fasting glucose and aortic diameter, suggesting a relationship between glucose metabolism and AAA formation^[2, 3]. However, there is no association between serum glucose levels and aortic expansion^[4]. Glycated haemoglobin (HbA_{1c}) also has an inverse association with AAA growth rate in people with and without DM, suggesting a mechanistic relationship between long-lasting elevated blood glucose concentrations and AAA progression^[4]. These observations are contrary to the strong positive association of DM with other vascular diseases and their complications^[5, 6, 7].

One of the first studies to highlight the diabetes paradox in AAA patients was an observational case-control study^[8] utilising the AAA screening programme. This highlighted a significant reduction in AAA growth rates by 56% in patients using drugs used in the treatment of DM.

With the advancement of device technology and technique, more people are having Endovascular Aneurysm Repair (EVAR) compared to open surgical repair (OSR)^[9]. EVAR is associated lower early mortality; however, this approach has an increased long-term all-cause mortality, reintervention, and secondary rupture rates compared to OSR^[10]. Individuals with diabetes have higher rates of complications such as myocardial infarction, pneumonia, superficial surgical site infection, or pancreatitis following OSR^[11, 12]. Following EVAR, the range of complications differs in individuals, including endoleaks and endograft migration, and reintervention rates are typically between 16% to 30%^[13]. A previous meta-analysis has identified that diabetes is not a risk factor for type II endoleak^[14] however there has been very little work done assessing the impact of DM on complications following EVAR. The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to analyse the complications after EVAR in patients with DM.

Methods

A final version of this protocol has been registered on PROSPERO in January 2023 prior to conducting the systematic review and meta-analysis (website: www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/ and ID: CRD42023379545). The review was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines^[15].

Eligibility criteria

Studies must have been written or translated into English, reporting on adults over 18 years old. Studies had to include people with diabetes who underwent EVAR, and have reported on at least one complication including reinterventions, sac enlargement, endoleak, post-operative AAA rupture or conversion to open surgical repair. Case reports, meeting abstracts, thoracic aortic aneurysms, laboratory-based studies, and reviews were excluded.

Literature search

Two independent reviewers (E.O. and M.M.) performed a systematic search of the following 6 databases, PubMed, Medline, Embase, Cochrane Library, The Web of Science, and Google Scholar, for articles published between 2005 and 2023 using the search terms “Reintervention” AND “Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm” AND “Diabetes Mellitus”. “Endoleak” AND “Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm” AND “Diabetes Mellitus”. Researchers

were contacted about published or unpublished trials identified through conferences or social media, to ensure all relevant studies were included. Ongoing trials were identified on www.clinicaltrials.gov. No contact was required to be made with authors. Zero publications required translation to be employed.

Study identification and selection

A systematic search of the databases was undertaken by 2 reviewers (E.O. and M.M.) with duplicates removed, prior to screening the title and abstract of identified studies. Any discrepancies were discussed with the senior author. The remaining full-text articles were retrieved and independently reviewed for eligibility.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Data extraction was undertaken by 2 reviewers using a standardised template. Any discrepancies were discussed. Descriptive, methodological and outcome data was input into a standard form. The reviewers extracted the following from each study: publication year, number of people with DM and controls, mean length of follow up, and outcomes reported from each of the studies to include endoleaks, reintervention, sac expansion, sac shrinkage, and conversion to open repair. The Newcastle-Ottawa scale was used to ensure the quality of non-randomised studies ^[16].

Data synthesis and analysis

Meta-analysis was conducted of the adjusted risk estimates (where available) with use of the inverse variance method in Stata MP 17. Odds ratio was used to measure effect of each outcome. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed, with forest plots with an $I^2 \leq 50\%$ analysed using a Fixed Effects model (except AAA sac expansion where Random Effect model was used as each of the studies included had a different definition for AAA sac growth). For studies that published early and late results these were combined to determine an overall rate of each outcome. Sensitivity analyses were performed for all significant outcomes. Two sensitivity analyses were performed, one including all studies with >500 participants, and one including studies with a Newcastle Ottawa score of Good Quality.

Results

The literature search identified 6165 articles, of which 3235 were excluded using automation tools. 308 articles were potentially suitable for inclusion in the review; 35 of these studies were eligible for inclusion (Figure 1). The characteristics of the included studies are outlined in Table 1.

Reintervention

Meta-analysis of 9 studies including a total of 49,454 in the control group and 7,475 in the DM group identified significantly fewer reinterventions in those with DM (9.94% v 11.58%; OR 0.89, 95% CI [0.82-0.97]; P=0.005), (Figure 2).

Endoleaks

There was no significant difference in all endoleaks (28.33% DM v 31.97% controls; OR 0.91, 95% CI [0.53-1.58]; P=0.22). 6 studies reported on rates of type I endoleak and showed no significant difference (7.68% DM v 8.67% control; OR 0.91, 95% CI [0.77-1.08]; P=0.29) (Figure 3). 14 studies reported on rates of type II endoleak and showed no significant difference (26.41% DM v 26.76% control; OR 0.96, 95% CI [0.90-1.04]; P=0.33) (Figure 4). 3 studies reported on the rate of type III endoleak, identifying a lower rate of type III

endoleak in those with DM (2.94% v 4.69%; OR 0.63, 95% CI [0.43-0.92]; P=0.02) (Figure 5).

Sac change

Meta-analysis of 10 studies including a total of 47,384 in the control group and 6,918 in the DM group were assessed for AAA sac enlargement. Those with DM were less likely to have sac enlargement post AAA repair (9.66% DM v 11.27% controls; OR 0.79, 95% CI [0.68-0.93]; P=0.003) (Figure 6). There was no significant difference seen in the rate of sac shrinkage (19.80% DM v 17.81% controls; OR 0.97, 95% CI [0.89-1.09]; P=0.60) (Figure 7)

Rupture and conversion

There was no significant difference in the rate of AAA rupture post-EVAR (0.70% DM v 0.56% control; OR 1.18, 95% CI [0.87-1.61]; P=0.29) across 6 studies (Figure 8).

Conversion from EVAR to open surgical repair was reported in 4 studies which was significantly less common in those with DM (2.11 % DM v 3.12% control; OR 0.80, CI [0.66-0.97]; P=0.02) (Figure 9).

Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis was undertaken for studies of >500 participants. This was possible for reintervention and AAA sac expansion. These results remained significantly different with lower rates in those with DM (P=0.006 and P=0.009 respectively) (Table 2).

Sensitivity analysis was also undertaken utilising only studies that score as 'good' on the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. The results for reintervention, sac expansion, and open surgical conversion remained significant (P=0.004, P=0.05 and P=0.04 respectively). There are results of type I or type II endoleak, AAA rupture post EVAR, and AAA sac shrinkage remained non-significant (Table 3).

Publication bias

Funnel plots were reviewed for reintervention (Figure 10), sac expansion (Figure 11), and type II endoleak (Figure 12). As there were ≥ 10 studies included in each of those domains. Egger test was undertaken for reintervention, sac expansion and type II endoleak. These showed no evidence of publication bias, p values were 0.18, 0.77 and 0.27 respectively (Table 4).

Discussion

This meta-analysis and systematic review has highlighted significantly lower rates of reintervention, sac enlargement, type III endoleak, and conversion to open surgical repair in people with DM undergoing EVAR. In addition, having diabetes was not associated with significant differences in overall rates of endoleak, type I or type II endoleak, sac shrinkage, or post-EVAR rupture compared to those without the condition.

People with diabetes are more likely to undergo EVAR as opposed to open surgical repair due to microvascular and macrovascular complications that are normally associated with diabetes making them more likely to be unfit for open surgical repair^[17]. Compared to those undergoing open AAA repair, those undergoing EVAR are more susceptible to late aneurysm-related complications due to progress of aortic degeneration and dilatation resulting in late aneurysm sac rupture, device failures, or endoleaks^[18].

Reintervention impedes EVAR. This study identified 9 studies that reported reintervention rates in those with and without DM, of which only the study by Diehm et al showed a significant reduction in reinterventions [19]. Meta-analysis however highlights this significant reduction which remains on both sensitivity analyses. Further analyses showed the rates of endoleaks, sac expansion, rupture and conversion were further subcategorised to try to determine the causal relationship between diabetes and reduced reintervention rates.

One of the main causes for reinterventions is endoleak. 6 studies reported on Type I endoleak none of which showed a significant difference similar to that of the meta-analysis. 14 studies reported on Type II endoleak of which only the study by Leurs et al [18] showed a significant reduction of type II endoleak in those with diabetes. This confirmed the findings by Guo et al [14] who undertook a meta-analysis of studies reporting on factors associated with type II endoleaks and found no association with DM. 3 studies reported type III endoleak, with the study by Fujimura et al [20] suggesting a significant reduction in type III endoleak in those with DM, which was confirmed on meta-analysis.

Previous work has highlighted a reduction in untreated AAA growth rates in people with DM [1]. Sac expansion which could be equated to AAA growth was lower in those with DM post-EVAR in 4 out of the 10 studies included, with meta-analysis showing a significant reduction in sac expansion post EVAR in those with DM [17]. These results remained significant on both sensitivity analyses. Leurs et al [18] reported that those with type 2 DM who were insulin-controlled had a significantly lower rate of endoleaks, which resulted in fewer secondary interventions compared to those taking oral hypoglycaemic agents or people without diabetes. One explanation for this could be because people with insulin-treated DM receive more intensive monitoring [21] and that insulin has an anti-inflammatory effect and reduces the pro-coagulant effect of hyperglycaemia [22]. A case-control study suggested that DM causes microvascular disease and involves the vasa vasorum in the adventitia, which might not allow the leakage of pro-inflammatory cells into the arterial wall. Thus, the arterial wall not being able to expand [23]. Unfortunately, it was not possible to do further subgroup analyses across the other studies depending on type of medication.

6 studies reported AAA rupture post EVAR, none of which showed a significant difference similar to that of the meta-analysis. 4 studies reported EVAR conversion to open surgical repair, of which only Diehm et al [19] showed a significant reduction in reinterventions in people with DM, however meta-analysis did identify a significant reduction in favour of those with diabetes.

Reintervention following EVAR can be a challenging clinical decision. Type I and Type III endoleaks have a significant risk of causing rupture, hence treatment is warranted. However, Type II endoleaks are often managed conservatively, with most clinicians not undertaking intervention unless the sac expands by at least 10mm [24, 25, 26]. In addition, conversion to open surgical repair is a very complex procedure with a significant mortality [27]. There may therefore be an underlying selection bias in some of these results as those with diabetes may be less likely to have their EVAR explanted due to their comorbidities. It is also unknown as to whether people with diabetes were more aggressively treated with EVAR, resulting in some grafts potentially being used outside of the manufacturers' instructions for use, which would increase the risk of endoleaks, and post-EVAR rupture [28]. Interestingly, although post-EVAR rupture was more common in those without DM, this was not significant, and the rate of Type 1 endoleaks was lower in those with DM, although this was also not significant. What remains unknown is the proportion of patients diagnosed with a type I or III endoleak

who underwent intervention, and whether this varies between groups, which would affect post-EVAR rupture rates.

This study is limited by the variability in reporting. Whilst it is common to highlight the proportion of participants with diabetes, there was often no comparative analysis reported. In addition, not all outcomes were reported within each study. This is further highlighted by the lack of available data on iliac complications, with no reports on limb occlusion rates identified. Furthermore, most of the studies included did not differentiate between types of DM, or treatment. Given the distinct pathophysiological characteristics between type 1 and type 2 DM and the potential benefits of some glucose lowering agents, it is possible that relationships with AAA differ. The presence or absence of diabetes related co-morbidities were also not often reported, thus increasing the risk of selection bias, and potentially excluding those with more significant disease burden from inclusion into the studies.

The studies included were typically not able to eliminate the possibility of confounding variables in participants' baseline characteristics because there were significant differences between those with or without diabetes in terms of comorbidities. Also, studies differ in the duration of the follow up which no doubt impact the outcomes. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale Quality Assessment sensitivity analysis was used to try to explore this and account for such bias.

Conclusion

This systematic review and meta-analysis of available data has shown that people with diabetes have lower AAA sac expansion, reintervention rates and conversion rates to open surgical repair post-EVAR. People with diabetes also have lower incidence of type III endoleaks compared to those without diabetes. Further work is necessary to establish why these differences occur.

Declarations

Disclosures None.

Conflict of interest The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Ethical approval Not applicable.

Informed consent Not applicable.

References:

1. Golledge J, Cooper ME, Chai Z. Diabetes and Aortic Aneurysm. *Angiology*. 2016;67(6):510-512.
2. Le MT, Jamrozik K, Davis TM, Norman PE. Negative association between infra-renal aortic diameter and glycaemia: the Health in Men Study. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2007;33:599–604.
3. Kubota Y, Folsom AR, Pankow JS, Wagenknecht LE, Tang W. Diabetes-related factors and abdominal aortic aneurysm events: the Atherosclerotic Risk in Communities Study. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2018 Feb;28(2):102-106.e1.
4. Raffort J, Lareyre F, Clément M, Hassen-Khodja R, Chinetti G, Mallat Z. Diabetes and aortic aneurysm: current state of the art. *Cardiovasc Res*. 2018 Nov 1;114(13):1702-1713
5. Rao Kondapally Seshasai S, Kaptoge S, Thompson A, Di Angelantonio E, Gao P, Sarwar N, et al. Diabetes mellitus, fasting glucose, and risk of cause-specific death. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;364(9):829–41.

6. Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration, Sarwar N, Gao P, et al. Diabetes mellitus, fasting blood glucose concentration, and risk of vascular disease: a collaborative meta-analysis of 102 prospective studies [published correction appears in *Lancet*. 2010 Sep 18;376(9745):958. Hillage, H L [corrected to Hillege, H L]]. *Lancet*. 2010;375(9733):2215-2222.
7. Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration, Di Angelantonio E, Gao P, et al. Glycated hemoglobin measurement and prediction of cardiovascular disease. *JAMA*. 2014;311(12):1225-1233.
8. Blanchard JF, Armenian HK, Friesen PP. Risk factors for abdominal aortic aneurysm: results of a case-control study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2000 Mar 15;151(6):575-83.
9. George Dangas, David O'Connor, Belal Firwana, Somjot Brar, Sharif Ellozy, Angeliki Vouyouka, Margaret Arnold, Constantine E. Kosmas, Prakash Krishnan, Jose Wiley, Javed Suleman, Jeffrey Olin, Michael Marin, Peter Faries, Open Versus Endovascular Stent Graft Repair of Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials, *JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions*, Volume 5, Issue 10, 2012, Pages 1071-1080, ISSN 1936-8798.
10. Li B, Khan S, Salata K, Hussain MA, de Mestral C, Greco E, Aljabri BA, Forbes TL, Verma S, Al-Omran M. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the long-term outcomes of endovascular versus open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. *J Vasc Surg*. 2019 Sep;70(3):954-969.e30.
11. Rayan SS, Hamdan AD, Campbell DR, et al. Is diabetes a risk factor for patients undergoing open abdominal aortic aneurysm repair? *Vasc Endovascular Surg* 2002;36:33e40.
12. Hughes K, Jackson JD, Prendergast TI, et al. Diabetes mellitus is not associated with major morbidity following open abdominal aortic aneurysm repair. *J Surg Res* 2013;184: 751e4.
13. Dayer D, Walker TG. Complications of endovascular aneurysm repair of the thoracic and abdominal aorta: evaluation and management. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther*. 2018;8(Suppl 1):S138-S156.
14. Guo Q, Du X, Zhao J, Ma Y, Huang B, Yuan D, Yang Y, Zeng G, Xiong F. Prevalence and risk factors of type II endoleaks after endovascular aneurysm repair: A meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017 Feb 9;12(2):e0170600.
15. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4(1):1.
16. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M et al. The Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. *Third Symposium on Systematic Reviews: Beyond the Basics*, Oxford, 2000.
17. Png C, Tadros R, Kang M, Beckerman W, Tardiff M, Vouyouka A, Marin M, Faries P. The Protective Effects of Diabetes Mellitus on Post-EVAR AAA Growth and Reinterventions.
18. Leurs LJ, Laheij RJ, Buth J; EUROSTAR Collaborators. Influence of diabetes mellitus on the endovascular treatment of abdominal aortic aneurysms. *J Endovasc Ther*. 2005 Jun;12(3):288-96.
19. Diehm N, Hobo R, Baumgartner I, Do DD, Keo HH, Kalka C, Dick F, Buth J, Schmidli J; EUROSTAR Investigators. Influence of pulmonary status and diabetes mellitus on aortic neck dilatation following endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms: a EUROSTAR report. *J Endovasc Ther*. 2007 Apr;14(2):122-9.
20. Fujimura N, Ichihashi S, Matsubara K, Shibutani S, Harada H, Obara H, Kichikawa K, Kitagawa Y. Type IIb Endoleak Is Not Extremely Rare and May Be Underdiagnosed after Endovascular Aneurysm Repair. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2019 Sep;30(9):1393-1399.e1.
21. Jones CE, Graham LA, Morris MS, et al. Association Between Preoperative Hemoglobin A1c Levels, Postoperative Hyperglycemia, and Readmissions Following Gastrointestinal Surgery. *JAMA Surg*. 2017;152(11):1031–1038.
22. Chaudhuri A, Umpierrez GE. Oxidative stress and inflammation in hyperglycemic crises and resolution with insulin: implications for the acute and chronic complications of hyperglycemia. *J Diabetes Complications*. 2012;26(4):257-258.
23. Mukhtyar C, Myers H, Jones C, Dhatariya K, The relationship between glycated haemoglobin levels and the risk of giant cell arteritis – a case–control study, *Rheumatology Advances in Practice*, Volume 4, Issue 2, 2020, rkaa018.
24. Patatas K, Ling L, Dunning J, Shrivastava V. Static sac size with a type II endoleak post-endovascular abdominal aortic aneurysm repair: surveillance or embolization?. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*. 2012;15(3):462-466.
25. Chen JX, Stavropoulos SW. Type 2 Endoleak Management. *Semin Intervent Radiol*. 2020;37(4):365-370.

26. Mulay S, Geraedts ACM, Koelemay MJW, Balm R; ODYSSEUS study group. Type 2 Endoleak With or Without Intervention and Survival After Endovascular Aneurysm Repair. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2021 May;61(5):779-786.
27. Ibrahim M, Silver M, Jacob T, Meghpara M, Almadani M, Shiferson A, Rhee R, Pu Q. Open conversion after failed endovascular aneurysm repair is increasing and its 30-day mortality is higher than that after primary open repair. *J Vasc Surg*. 2022 Dec;76(6):1502-1510.
28. Stather PW, Wild JB, Sayers RD, Bown MJ, Choke E. Endovascular Aortic Aneurysm Repair in Patients with Hostile Neck Anatomy. *Journal of Endovascular Therapy*. 2013;20(5):623-637.

Figures

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases, registers, and other sources.




Figure 2 - Forest Plot of reintervention rates post EVAR in those with DM and controls.




Figure 3 – Forest Plot of Type I Endoleak post EVAR in those with DM and controls.




Figure 4 - Forest Plot of Type II Endoleak post EVAR in those with DM and controls.




Figure 5 - Forest Plot of Type III post EVAR in those with DM and controls

Type III endoleak




Figure 6 – Forest plot of AAA Sac expansion in those with DM and controls




Figure 7 – Forest Plot AAA Sac Shrinkage in those with DM and controls

Sac shrinkage




Figure 8 - Forest plot AAA Rupture Post EVAR in those with DM and controls




Figure 9 - Forest plot Conversion to open surgical repair in those with DM and controls.




Figure 10 - Funnel plot of AAA reintervention




Figure 11 - Funnel plot of AAA sac expansion





Figure 12 – Funnel plot of type II endoleak



Tables

Table 1. studies included in the meta-analysis

Study	Study design, Country	No. of DM	No. of Control	Inclusion Criteria
Png, 2017	Retrospective Cohort, USA	183	810	Sac enlargement, Rupture, Reintervention and Type I, II, III and total Endoleak, conversion to open surgical repair
Taimour S., 2019	Prospective Cohort, Sweden	748	2630	Reintervention
Leurs L.J., 2005	Retrospective Cohort, Netherlands	731	5286	Reintervention, Type I, II, III Endoleak, conversion to open surgical repair
Hall M.R., 2017	Retrospective Cohort, USA	29	50	Endoleak
Diehm, 2007	Prospective Cohort, The Netherlands	810	5573	AAA sac enlargement, Reintervention, type I endoleak, conversion to open surgical repair
Takahara M., 2022	Prospective Cohort, Japan	226	703	Aortic sac enlargement, Reintervention, total Endoleak
Praca, 2018	Retrospective Cohort, Belgium	57	191	Aortic sac enlargement, Type II & total Endoleak
Seike Y., 2022	Prospective Cohort, Japan	2526	14573	Type II Endoleak
Morisaki K., Matsubara Y., 2022	Retrospective Cohort, Japan	60	208	Sac Shrinkage
Tseng HW,2022	Retrospective Cohort, Taiwan	36	155	AAA sac enlargement and shrinkage after EVAR
Candell L, 2014	Retrospective Cohort, USA	441	1290	Post-operative (EVAR) AAA Rupture
Hoshina K., 2019	retrospective Survey, Japan	4611	33397	Sac enlargement and Reintervention
Lee JS, 2022	Retrospective Cohort, South Korea	60	294	Aneurysm sac enlargement
Koole D., 2011	Prospective Cohort, The Netherlands	767	5570	AAA sac enlargement and shrinkage after EVAR
Buijs RV, 2016	Retrospective Case-control, The Netherlands	10	50	Type I Endoleak
Andersen R.M., 2018	Retrospective Cohort, Denmark	57	364	endoleak after EVAR

Eden CL, 2020	Retrospective Cohort, USA	54	335	Reintervention, Type II Endoleak
Morisaki K., Yamaoka T, 2017	Retrospective Cohort, Japan	29	182	Sac enlargement and Type II Endoleak
Tan TW, 2016	Retrospective Cohort, USA	466	1936	Type I Endoleak
Vaaramaki S, 2021	Prospective Cohort, Finland	30	189	Sac Shrinkage, endoleak
Walker J., 2014	Prospective Cohort, USA	442	1294	Type II Endoleak
Suarez G. LA, 2023	Retrospective Cohort, Spain	33	107	Endoleak after EVAR
Wang Y., 2022	Retrospective Cohort, China	51	236	Type II Endoleak
Major M., 2022	Retrospective Cohort, USA	54	335	Type I Endoleak
Fujimura N, 2016	Retrospective Cohort, Japan	125	707	Type II Endoleak
Shingaki M., 2018	Retrospective Cohort, Japan	25	148	Sac Shrinkage
Kray J., 2015	Retrospective Cohort, USA	46	145	Type II Endoleak
Suckow B.D., 2022	Retrospective Cohort, USA	4492	11445	conversion to open surgical repair
Boniakowski A.E, 2016	Retrospective Cohort, USA	11	45	Type II Endoleak
Sakaki M., 2020	Retrospective Cohort, Japan	96	454	Type II Endoleak
Gibello L, 2020	Prospective Cohort, Italy	139	509	Sac enlargement
Conrad M.F., 2009	Retrospective Cohort, USA	112	720	Reintervention
Le T.B., 2018	Retrospective Cohort, South Korea	27	54	Endoleak Post EVAR
Ichihashi S., 2019	Retrospective Cohort, Japan	71	362	Type III Endoleak
Menges A.-L., 2022	Retrospective Cohort, Switzerland	5	30	Reintervention

Table 2. Sensitivity analysis of reinterventions and AAA sac expansion of sample size >500 participants

Outcome	No. Studies	DM (Event)	Total DM	Control (Event)	Total control	Total participants	OR, 95% CI	I²	P value
Reinterventions	7	739	7,421	5,684	49,119	56,540	0.89 [0.82-0.97]	19%	0.006
AAA Sac Expansion	6	640	6,736	5,160	46,562	53,298	0.80 [0.68-0.95]	41%	0.009

Table 3. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale Quality Assessment Sensitivity analysis

Outcome	No. Studies	DM (Event)	Total DM	Control (Event)	Total control	Total participants	OR, 95% CI	I ²	P value
Reinterventions	7	193	2,815	1,478	15,752	18,567	0.79 [0.67-0.93]	0%	0.004
AAA Sac Expansion	6	200	2,182	1,422	13,356	15,538	0.80 [0.64-1.00]	35%	0.05
Type I Endoleak	5	172	2,244	1,202	13,940	14,164	0.92 [0.78-1.09]	0%	0.33
Type II Endoleak	10	1129	4,229	6,296	23,651	27,880	0.98 [0.91-1.06]	6%	0.68
Post-EVAR AAA rupture	5	35	2,391	165	13,662	16,053	1.26 [0.87-1.83]	34%	0.22
Conversion	3	53	1,724	491	11,669	13,393	0.74 [0.55-0.99]	19%	0.04
Sac Shrinkage	4	186	1,005	1,108	6,717	7,722	1.01[0.84-1.22]	0%	0.89

Table 4. Diabetes and AAA: Results from Eggers test

Meta-analysis	Result	p
Reintervention	no small-study effects	0.1772
Sac expansion	no small-study effects	0.7694
Type II endoleak	no small-study effects	0.2698