

Middle meningeal artery embolization for subdural hematoma: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Alick P Wang^{*1} MD MSc, Husain Shakil² MD MSc, Brian J Drake¹ MBBCh MPH FRCSC

1. Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, University of Ottawa

2. Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, University of Toronto

* Corresponding author:

Alick P Wang, MD MSc

The Ottawa Hospital, Civic Campus

1053 Carling Ave, Ottawa Ontario, Canada, K1Y4E9

alickwang@gmail.com

Abstract

(178 words)

Background: Middle meningeal artery embolization is an emerging neuroendovascular therapy for chronic subdural hematoma. Recently, a number of randomized control trials have been conducted to assess the efficacy of middle meningeal artery embolization to reduce the recurrence or progression of chronic subdural hematoma.

Methods: A systematic review will be conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines. The authors will systematically search MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane, and ClinicalTrials.gov (National Library of Medicine) for randomized control trials evaluating middle meningeal artery embolization for chronic subdural hematoma. A meta-analysis will be undertaken to compare patients undergoing middle meningeal artery embolization and standard care compared to standard care alone; primary effectiveness endpoints will be symptomatic recurrence, radiographic re-accumulation, or reoperation; secondary safety endpoints will be new disabling stroke, myocardial infarction, or death within 30 days.

Discussion: This proposed systematic review and meta-analysis will synthesize and appraise available data regarding middle meningeal artery embolization, a novel neurointerventional therapy. Findings will help clinicians, patients, administrators, policy makers to determine the role of this new treatment and its potential benefits.

Systematic review registration: PROSPERO #CRD42024512049

Keywords

Meta-analysis; Middle meningeal artery embolization; Randomized control trial; Subdural hematoma.

Background

Chronic subdural hematoma (CSDH) is a common condition, with an incidence of up to 20.6 per 100,000 person-years¹. It disproportionately affects elderly populations and is often caused by minor trauma. It can cause symptoms ranging from headaches to confusion, decreased level of consciousness, weakness, aphasia, or seizures.

Depending on the volume, local mass effect, and symptoms, chronic SDH has been treated either surgically (burr hole evacuation, craniotomy, or subdural drainage ports) or conservatively (medical therapy or observation/serial imaging). Conservatively managed SDH can progress in up to 34% of cases². After surgical evacuation, recurrence rates have been estimated between 10-20%³.

Recently, endovascular embolization of the middle meningeal artery (EMMA) has become an emerging therapy for CSDH⁴. While EMMA was initially used in patients who were at high risk of recurrence, the indications have recently widened to all patients with CSDH. Although EMMA does not immediately remove the SDH or its mass effect, it is hypothesized to devascularize the subdural membrane and prevent recurrence or progression.

EMMA has been used in cases of small, asymptomatic SDH not requiring surgery⁵ as well as in cases of SDH requiring surgical evacuation⁶. A recent systematic review found that EMMA reduced the risk of recurrence from 23.5% to 3.5% (RR 0.17)⁷. However, at the time of publication, there had not been any prospectively conducted randomized control trials (RCTs).

Recently, a number of multi-centre RCTs have been conducted to evaluate the efficacy of EMMA for reducing recurrence or progression in CSDH. A meta-analysis of these trials has yet to be performed.

57 **Methods/Design**

58 This protocol outlines the design and conduct of our intended systematic review and meta-
59 analysis in compliance with the guideline Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
60 Meta-analyses (PRISMA). The protocol has been submitted to the PROSPERO database and
61 assigned the unique identifier #CRD42024512049. This study was exempt from institutional
62 research ethics board review under article 1B of the University of Toronto policy on Human
63 Research Exempt from REB Review ([https://research.utoronto.ca/ethics-human-](https://research.utoronto.ca/ethics-human-research/activities-exempt-human-ethics-review)
64 [research/activities-exempt-human-ethics-review](https://research.utoronto.ca/ethics-human-research/activities-exempt-human-ethics-review))

65 ***Study Aim***

66 We aim to conduct a meta-analysis of available data from RCTs comparing the efficacy of
67 EMMA in addition to standard of care to standard of care alone. The primary efficacy endpoints
68 will be the likelihood of SDH recurrence, re-accumulation, or re-operation at 90 days, and 180
69 days.

70 ***Data Sources and Study Eligibility***

71 Two authors (APW, HS) will independently search citations from MEDLINE, EMBASE,
72 Cochrane, and ClinicalTrials.gov (National Library of Medicine) without language restriction
73 (see Appendix 1 for search strategy). We will include randomized control trials studying adult
74 patients (≥ 18 years of age) with radiographic diagnosis of chronic or subacute SDH, with at
75 least 10 patients, and at least 90 days of follow-up.

76 ***Treatment Groups***

77 The intervention group of interest will be the use of EMMA in addition to standard of care. The
78 control group will be treatment with standard of care alone. Standard of care will include
79 observation, medical therapy, burr hole, mini-craniotomy, craniotomy, and subdural evacuation
80 port system.

81 ***Outcomes***

82 The primary effectiveness endpoints for this study will be symptomatic recurrence, radiographic
83 re-accumulation, or reoperation at 90, and 180 days. We will also aim to assess a secondary
84 safety endpoint of new major disabling stroke, myocardial infarction, or death from any
85 neurological cause within 30 days.

86 ***Data Extraction***

87 Spreadsheet software will be used by two authors (APW, HS) to extract study design,
88 inclusion/exclusion criteria, randomization characteristics, patient population, primary and
89 secondary outcome measures, and sources of bias, and covariates. Covariates will include age,
90 standard treatment approach used, presence of symptoms, type of embolization material, and use
91 of general anesthetic for EMMA procedure.

92 ***Risk of Bias/Quality Assessment***

Two reviewers (APW, HS) will independently perform quality assessment of included studies. The Cochrane ROB 2 tool⁸ will be applied to assess the risk of bias related to the randomization process, deviations from intended interventions, missing data, measurement of the outcome, and selection of the reported results. We judged trials with more than 2 high-risk components as having a moderate overall risk of bias, and trials with more than 4 high-risk components as having a high overall risk of bias. The GRADE approach⁹ will be used for appraisal of the quality of evidence.

Statistical Analysis

All analyses will be conducted in R version 4.3.1 with a priori specified significance level of $p < 0.05$ for two-tailed tests. We will follow an intention-to-treat approach in assigning treatment groups.

The odds ratio (OR) of SDH recurrence and associated 95% confidence intervals (CI) for EMMA with standard therapy compared to standard therapy alone will be estimated for each study using logistic regression.

Heterogeneity in the treatment effect across trials will be investigated by the Cochran Q test and measured by the I^2 statistic, with I^2 values exceeding 25%, 50%, and 75% representing low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively¹⁰. Treatment effect estimates will be pooled using a fixed effect Mantel-Haenszel method if heterogeneity is found to be low heterogeneity. A DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model¹¹ will be used if moderate-high heterogeneity is found.

Publication bias will be assessed using Funnel plots and Egger's test¹². We will further investigate the effect of covariates including age, standard treatment approach, presence of symptoms, history of prior subdural hematoma, use of general anesthetic, and type of embolization material used. We will assess missingness of covariates and outcomes. Based on data availability, we will conduct subgroup analyses based on presence of symptoms, type of standard management (e.g. conservative, medical, burr-hole, and craniotomy), older patients, or patients with prior subdural hematoma. We will not impute data on outcomes or treatment assignment, and will only analyze available data for these variables. For study covariates, we will impute data found to be missing completely at random, or missing at random there is less than 20% missingness.

Discussion

This proposed systematic review and meta-analysis will address an important knowledge gap regarding EMMA, a novel neurointerventional therapy.

While several studies have evaluated the safety and benefit of EMMA³, up until recently there had not been any prospective RCTs conducted to evaluate its efficacy. Recently, a number of multi-centre RCTs have been completed and early results have been presented at the International Stroke Conference 2024.

A meta-analysis of RCTs will help clinicians, patients, administrators, policy makers to determine the role of this new treatment and its potential benefits.

132 **List of abbreviations**

133 CSDH - chronic subdural hematoma

134 EMMA - embolization of the middle meningeal artery

135 MMA - middle meningeal artery

136 PRISMA - Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

137 RCT - randomized control trial

138 SDH - subdural hematoma

139 **Declarations**

140 *Ethics approval*

141 No ethics approval required for systematic review.

142 *Availability of data and materials*

143 All data will be extracted from publicly available publications. Extracted data will be made
144 available upon reasonable request.

145 *Competing interests*

146 No competing interests to declare.

147 *Funding*

148 No funding to declare.

149 *Authors' contributions*

150 APW, HS, and BJD study conception. APW and HS protocol design and drafting.

References

1. Feghali, J., Yang, W. & Huang, J. Updates in Chronic Subdural Hematoma: Epidemiology, Etiology, Pathogenesis, Treatment, and Outcome. *World Neurosurg* 141, 339–345 (2020).
2. Foppen, M., Bandral, H. V., Slot, K.-A. M., Vandertop, W. P. & Verbaan, D. Success of conservative therapy for chronic subdural hematoma patients: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Neurology* 14, (2023).
3. Almenawer, S. A. et al. Chronic subdural hematoma management: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 34,829 patients. *Ann Surg* 259, 449–457 (2014).
4. Rudy, R. F., Catapano, J. S., Jadhav, A. P., Albuquerque, F. C. & Ducruet, A. F. Middle Meningeal Artery Embolization to Treat Chronic Subdural Hematoma. *Stroke: Vascular and Interventional Neurology* 3, e000490 (2023).
5. Rojas-Villabona, A. et al. A systematic review of middle meningeal artery embolization for minimally symptomatic chronic subdural haematomas that do not require immediate evacuation. *Brain and Spine* 3, 102672 (2023).
6. Lam, A. et al. The efficacy of postoperative middle meningeal artery embolization on chronic subdural hematoma - A multicentered randomized controlled trial. *Surg Neurol Int* 14, 168 (2023).
7. Dian, J., Linton, J. & Shankar, J. J. Risk of recurrence of subdural hematoma after EMMA vs surgical drainage – Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Interv Neuroradiol* 27, 577–583 (2021).
8. Sterne, J. A. C. et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 366, 14898 (2019).
9. Guyatt, G. H. et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 336, 924–926 (2008).
10. Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J. & Altman, D. G. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 327, 557–560 (2003).
11. DerSimonian, R. & Laird, N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 7, 177–188 (1986).
12. Egger, M., Davey Smith, G., Schneider, M. & Minder, C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 315, 629–634 (1997).

181 **Appendix 1:**

182 *Search Strategy*

183 The following search strategy will be employed for the MEDLINE database using the OVID
184 interface.

- 185 1. exp Hematoma, Subdural/
- 186 2. exp Embolization Therapeutic/
- 187 3. exp Meningeal Arteries/
- 188 4. exp Endovascular Procedures/
- 189 5. Exp Clinical Trial/
- 190 6. 2 or 3 or 4
- 191 7. 1 and 5 and 6