

Supplemental methods:

Using π_{si} and π_{di} to denote the underlying risks of stroke and DWI+ in the i th treatment group and N_i , S_i and D_i to denote the observed numbers of patients, patients suffering a stroke and patients classified as DWI+ in that group respectively, the model is specified by the following three equations.

$$S_i \sim \text{Binomial}(N_i, \pi_{si}) \quad (1)$$

$$D_i - S_i \sim \text{Binomial}(N_i - S_i, ((\pi_{di} - \pi_{si})/(1 - \pi_{si}))) \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \log(\pi_{di}/(1 - \pi_{di})) \\ \log(\pi_{si}/(1 - \pi_{si})) \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{pmatrix} \mu_d \\ \mu_s \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_d^2 & r\sigma_d\sigma_s \\ r\sigma_d\sigma_s & \sigma_s^2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \quad (3)$$

Equation (1) states that the number of strokes in the i th treatment group follows a binomial distribution. Equation (2) states that the number of DWI+ cases among those not suffering a stroke also follows a binomial distribution whose mean is chosen such that the overall risk of being DWI+ in that treatment group is π_{di} ($\pi_{di} = \pi_{si} + (1 - \pi_{si}) \times (\pi_{di} - \pi_{si})/(1 - \pi_{si})$). Equation (3) states that the underlying log odds of the two types of event follow a bivariate normal distribution. This model was fitted using PROC NLMIXED in SAS software, version 9.2 (copyright, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA), with 95% confidence intervals for r (the correlation coefficient for the association between the two log odds) constructed using the profile likelihood, and the p-value from a likelihood ratio test. Secondary analyses restricted to treatment groups of patients receiving CEA or CAS respectively were also attempted.

To illustrate the effect of imprecision in the two observed risks (DWI+ and stroke) on the association between them we performed a simulation (figure 2). Data from 30 treatment groups with sample sizes typical of those in our data were simulated using the model defined above with

parameters taken to be similar to the parameter estimates from the model using all included studies.

To estimate the change in sample size requirements for a future clinical trial that can be achieved by switching the primary outcome from stroke risk to DWI+ risk it is necessary to convert a postulated effect on stroke risk to one on DWI+ risk. For example, if it is anticipated that a new drug or interventional technique will reduce the risk of procedural stroke from 6% to 3% it is necessary to convert each of these anticipated underlying stroke risks to anticipated underlying DWI+ risks. The sample size of a phase II trial investigating proof of concept of such an intervention could then be calculated to demonstrate the anticipated reduction in DWI+ risk. Estimation of the parameters in the bivariate random effects logistic regression model allows such conversions to be made because equation (3) implies that there is a linear relationship between the underlying log odds of a stroke and the underlying log odds of being DWI+. Specifically, with the underlying log odds of being DWI+ as the dependent variable and the underlying log odds of a stroke the predictor the line passes through the point $\begin{pmatrix} \mu_d \\ \mu_s \end{pmatrix}$ and its slope is $r\sigma_d/\sigma_s$.

Supplementary Table 1:

List of all included studies investigating carotid artery stenting (CAS) for carotid stenosis. CAS treatment groups of comparative studies (CEA vs. CAS) are also included (see supplementary table 2 for CEA treatment groups from the same study). The total number of treatment groups in each study is provided (i.e. n=2 if CAS subgroup is part of a comparative study (CAS vs. CEA or CAS vs. CAS); N/A: information not available. Outcome data are provided per study including all CAS treatment groups.

Author	Year of first publication	Number of treatment groups included in Study, N	Number of CAS treatment groups included	Number of CEA treatment groups included	CAS Procedures included in study, N	Symptomatic carotid stenoses, N	Number of reported ischaemic strokes, N (%)	Relative Risk of Ischaemic Stroke (%)	Number of reported DWI+, N (%)	Relative Risk of DWI+ (%)	Use of any Protection Device (Yes / No / both)
<i>Loevblad</i> ¹¹⁶	2000	1	1	0	19	N/A	2	10.5	4	21.1	No
<i>Jaeger</i> ¹²⁰	2001	1	1	0	20	13	0	0.0	5	25.0	Yes
<i>Jaeger</i> ¹¹⁷	2002	1	1	0	70	52	1	1.4	22	31.4	No
<i>Kopp</i> ¹⁶⁴	2003	3	3	0	80	13	3	3.8	23	28.8	Both
<i>Schlueter</i> ¹²¹	2003	1	1	0	44	13	1	2.3	10	22.7	Yes
<i>Flach</i> ¹⁶⁶	2004	2	1	1	21	21	1	4.8	9	42.9	Yes
<i>Garcia-Sanchez</i> ¹⁶⁷	2004	2	1	1	10	10	0	0.0	4	40.0	No
<i>Gauvrit</i> ¹⁵⁸	2004	2	2	0	23	12	1	4.3	2	8.7	Both
<i>Cosottini</i> ¹⁵⁹	2005	2	2	0	52	23	1	1.9	16	30.8	Both
<i>Roh</i> ¹⁶⁸	2005	2	1	1	22	18	2	9.1	8	36.4	No
<i>du Mesnil de Rochemont</i> ¹²²	2006	1	1	0	50	50	0	0.0	19	38.0	Yes
<i>Iihara</i> ¹⁶⁹	2006	2	1	1	92	33	7	7.6	32	34.8	Yes
<i>Maleux</i> ¹²³	2006	1	1	0	53	17	0	0.0	22	41.5	Yes
<i>McDonnell</i> ¹²⁴	2006	1	1	0	110	81	8	7.3	23	20.9	Both
<i>Pinero</i> ¹²⁵	2006	1	1	0	162	122	1	0.6	28	17.3	Yes
<i>Poppert</i> ¹⁷⁰	2006	2	1	1	41	18	1	2.4	22	53.7	No
<i>Rosenkranz</i> ¹¹⁸	2006	1	1	0	27	27	0	0.0	8	29.6	No
<i>Grunwald</i> ¹²⁸	2006	1	1	0	10	N/A	0	0.0	4	40.0	Yes
<i>Schillinger</i> ¹²⁹	2006	1	1	0	14	0	0	0.0	1	7.1	Yes
<i>Asakura</i> ¹²⁶	2006	1	1	0	45	21	0	0.0	20	44.4	Both
<i>Asakura</i> ¹²⁷	2006	1	1	0	11	7	0	0.0	2	18.2	Yes
<i>El-Koussy</i> ¹⁶¹	2007	2	2	0	44	25	2	4.5	13	29.5	Yes
<i>Faraglia</i> ¹⁷²	2007	2	1	1	35	11	2	5.7	12	34.3	Yes
<i>Kim</i> ¹⁶²	2007	2	2	0	71	47	3	4.2	28	39.4	Yes
<i>Lacroix</i> ¹⁷¹	2007	2	1	1	61	21	2	3.3	26	42.6	Yes
<i>Peynircioglu</i> ¹¹⁹	2007	1	1	0	13	13	0	0.0	1	7.7	No
<i>Rapp</i> ¹³⁰	2007	1	1	0	54	29	2	3.7	36	66.7	Yes

<i>Tedesco</i> ¹⁷³	2007	2	1	1	34	18	3	8.8	24	70.6	Yes
<i>Kastrup</i> ¹⁶⁰	2008	2	2	0	243	134	14	5.8	144	59.3	Both
<i>Palombo</i> ¹³²	2008	1	1	0	98	30	3	3.1	20	20.4	Yes
<i>Faggioli</i> ¹³⁴	2008	1	1	0	59	0	0	0.0	34	57.6	Yes
<i>Schofer</i> ¹³³	2008	1	1	0	59	8	0	0.0	19	32.2	Yes
<i>Faraglia</i> ¹³⁷	2008	1	1	0	43	N/A	1	2.3	6	14.0	Yes
<i>Ghorab</i> ¹³¹	2008	1	1	0	50	31	2	4.0	6	12.0	Yes
<i>Skjelland</i> ¹⁷⁴	2009	2	1	1	28	N/A	2	7.1	6	21.4	Yes
<i>Tedesco</i> ¹³⁵	2009	1	1	0	20	9	0	0.0	7	35.0	Yes
<i>Zhou</i> ¹⁷⁵	2009	2	1	1	68	N/A	2	2.9	31	45.6	Yes
<i>Taha</i> ¹³⁶	2009	1	1	0	98	51	3	3.1	42	42.9	Yes
<i>Bonati</i> ¹⁷⁶	2010	2	1	1	124	124	9	7.3	62	50.0	Both
<i>Kim</i> ¹⁶⁵	2010	1	1	0	32	32	0	0.0	17	53.1	Both
<i>Palombo</i> ¹³⁸	2010	1	1	0	111	N/A	4	3.6	33	29.7	Yes
<i>Rosenkranz</i> ¹¹⁵	2010	1	1	0	147	147	6	4.1	43	29.3	No
<i>Wasser</i> ¹⁷⁷	2010	2	1	1	21	N/A	2	9.5	15	71.4	Both
<i>Yamada</i> ¹⁷⁸	2011	2	1	1	56	34	2	3.6	23	41.1	Yes
<i>Grunwald</i> ¹¹⁴	2011	1	1	0	194	133	2	1.0	67	34.5	No
<i>Mitsuoka</i> ¹⁸³	2011	2	1	1	20	17	0	0	10	50	Yes
<i>Uchiyama</i> ¹⁴⁰	2011	1	1	0	19	19	1	5.3	15	78.9	Yes
<i>Pinter</i> ¹³⁹	2011	1	1	0	31	N/A	1	3.2	5	16.1	Yes
<i>Tulip</i> ¹⁴¹	2012	1	1	0	34	17	1	2.9	17	50.0	Yes
<i>Felli</i> ¹⁷⁹	2012	2	1	1	150	12	3	2.0	51	34.0	Yes
<i>Leal</i> ¹⁴²	2012	2	2	0	64	44	0	0.0	15	23.4	Yes
<i>Capoccia</i> ¹⁸⁰	2012	2	1	1	28	0	1	3.6	6	21.4	Yes
<i>Palombo</i> ¹⁴³	2012	1	1	0	34	9	0	0.0	8	23.5	Yes
<i>Akutsu</i> ¹⁸²	2012	2	1	1	41	19	1	2.4	14	34.1	Yes
<i>Bijuklic</i> ¹⁶³	2012	2	2	0	62	25	1	1.6	41	66.1	Yes
<i>Zhou</i> ¹⁸¹	2012	2	1	1	16	8	0	0.0	8	50.0	Yes
<i>Takayama</i> ¹⁴⁴	2013	2	2	0	61	28	2	3.3	25	41.0	Yes
<i>Tanemura</i> ¹⁵¹	2013	1	1	0	47	23	1	2.1	26	55.3	Yes
<i>Castro-Afonso</i> ¹⁵⁰	2013	2	2	0	40	33	0	0	13	32.5	Yes
<i>Cano</i> ¹⁴⁵	2013	2	2	0	60	15	1	1.7	39	65.0	Yes
<i>Pini</i> ¹⁴⁶	2013	1	1	0	20	13	0	0.0	18	90.0	Yes
<i>Park</i> ¹⁴⁷	2013	2	2	0	91	76	1	1.1	36	39.6	Both
<i>Patti</i> ¹⁴⁸	2013	4 (2x2 design)	2	0	156	22	5	6.4	40	33.3	Yes
<i>Bijuklic</i> ¹⁴⁹	2013	1	1	0	728	N/A	8	1.1	241	33.1	Yes
<i>Gunduz</i> ¹⁵²	2014	1	1	0	52	39	2	3.8	33	63.5	Yes

<i>Huang</i> ¹⁵³	2014	1	1	0	126	47	4	3.2	33	26.2	Yes
<i>Kuliha</i> ¹⁸⁴	2015	2	1	1	77	39	1	1.3	38	49.4	Yes
<i>Matsukawa</i> ¹⁵⁴	2015	1	1	0	36	24	0	0	11	30.6	Yes
<i>Adhikari</i> ¹⁵⁵	2016	1	1	0	35	N/A	2	5.7	10	28.6	Yes
<i>Kuliha</i> ¹⁵⁶	2016	1	1	0	81	32	0	0	46	56.8	Yes
<i>Ruffino</i> ¹⁵⁷	2016	1	1	0	23	14	0	0	7	30.4	Yes

Supplementary Table 2:

List of all included studies investigating CEA for carotid stenosis. CEA subgroups of comparative studies (CEA vs. CAS) are included (see supplementary table 1 for corresponding CAS subgroups). Number of treatment groups displays the total number of subgroups in each study, i.e. n=2 if CEA subgroup is part of a comparative study (CAS vs. CEA or CEA vs. CEA); N/A: information not given

Author	Year of fist publication	Number of treatment groups included in study, N	Number of CEA treatment groups included, N	Number of CAS treatment groups included, N	CEA Procedures included in study, N	Symptomatic carotid stenoses, N	Number of reported ischaemic strokes, N (%)	Relative Risk of Ischaemic Stroke (%)	Number of reported DWI +, N (%)	Relative Risk of DWI + (%)	Type of Anaesthesia (Local or General or Both)
<i>Feiwell</i> ¹⁰⁰	2001	1	1	0	25	N/A	0	0	1	4	Local
<i>Tomczak</i> ¹⁰¹	2001	1	1	0	51	33	2	3.9	6	11.8	N/A
<i>Mueller</i> ¹⁰²	2003	1	1	0	33	22	1	3.0	9	27.3	General
<i>Flach</i> ¹⁶⁶	2004	2	1	1	23	23	1	4.3	2	8.7	General
<i>Garcia-Sanchez</i> ¹⁶⁷	2004	2	1	1	10	10	1	10.0	1	10.0	General
<i>Roh</i> ¹⁶⁸	2005	2	1	1	26	19	0	0.0	1	3.8	General
<i>Iihara</i> ¹⁶⁹	2006	2	1	1	139	92	3	2.2	13	9.4	General
<i>Inoue</i> ¹⁰³	2006	1	1	0	72	32	1	1.4	3	4.2	General
<i>Poppert</i> ¹⁷⁰	2006	2	1	1	93	44	2	2.2	16	17.2	General
<i>Faraglia</i> ¹⁷²	2007	2	1	1	40	8	0	0.0	3	7.5	Both
<i>Lacroix</i> ¹⁷¹	2007	2	1	1	60	41	2	3.3	7	11.7	General
<i>Tedesco</i> ¹⁷³	2007	2	1	1	30	22	0	0.0	1	3.3	General
<i>Ogasawara</i> ¹⁰⁴	2008	1	1	0	163	118	2	1.2	28	17.2	General
<i>Soinne</i> ¹⁰⁵	2008	1	1	0	44	21	0	0.0	2	4.5	General
<i>Skjelland</i> ¹⁷⁴	2009	2	1	1	30	N/A	1	3.3	2	6.7	General
<i>Zhou</i> ¹⁷⁵	2009	2	1	1	100	N/A	2	2.0	12	12.0	General
<i>Bonati</i> ¹⁷⁶	2010	2	1	1	107	107	3	2.8	18	16.8	Both
<i>Hebb</i> ¹⁰⁶	2010	1	1	0	50	18	0	0.0	0	0.0	General
<i>Wasser</i> ¹⁷⁷	2010	2	1	1	28	N/A	0	0.0	1	3.6	General
<i>Mitsuoka</i> ¹⁸³	2011	2	1	1	25	22	0	0	0	0	N/A

<i>Yamada</i> ¹⁷⁸	2011	2	1	1	25	16	0	0.0	2	8.0	General
<i>Felli</i> ¹⁷⁹	2012	2	1	1	150	138	2	1.3	6	4.0	Local
<i>Capoccia</i> ¹⁸⁰	2012	2	1	1	32	0	0	0.0	1	3.1	Local
<i>Akutsu</i> ¹⁸²	2012	2	1	1	63	34	0	0.0	11	17.5	General
<i>Zhou</i> ¹⁸¹	2012	2	1	1	35	19	0	0.0	3	8.6	General
<i>Oikawa</i> ¹⁰⁷	2013	1	1	0	101	101	2	2.0	9	8.9	General
<i>Yoshida</i> ¹⁰⁸	2013	2	1	0	67	36	0	0.0	7	10.4	General
<i>Cho</i> ¹⁰⁹	2013	1	1	0	45	31	0	0.0	4	8.9	Local
<i>Sfyroeras</i> ¹¹⁰	2013	1	1	0	66	17	0	0.0	5	7.6	General
<i>Akpinar</i> ¹¹¹	2015	1	1	0	51	28	0	0	8	15.7	General
<i>Kuliha</i> ¹⁸⁴	2015	2	1	1	73	48	1	1.4	18	24.7	General
<i>Bourke</i> ¹¹²	2016	1	1	0	206	149	4	1.9	27	13.1	Local
<i>Zhang</i> ¹¹³	2016	1	1	0	36	25	0	0.0	0	0	General