Characteristics of studies

Characteristics of included studies

Catanescu

Notes	

Risk of bias table

Item	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Study Participation - Source of target population	Low risk	The source population or population of interest is adequately described: "A retrospective review of 121 patients from three teaching hospitals; Henry Ford- Macomb Hospital, St. John Oakland-Macomb Hospital and William Beaumont Hospital Royal Oak in southeastern Michigan presenting with an rAAA were classified in two groups".
Study Participation - Method used to identify population	High risk	No mention whether the patients are consecutive and the method to retrieve their data.
Study Participation - Recruitment period	Low risk	Period of recruitment is adequately described: "From 2001 to September 2015"
Study Participation - Place of recruitment	Low risk	Place of recruitment is adequately described "Henry Macomb Hospital, St. John Oakland-Macomb Hospital and William Beaumont Hospital Royal Oak"
Study Participation - Inclusion and exclusion criteria	High risk	Exclusion criteria are not described.
Study participation - Adequate study participation	Unclear risk	There is not adequate participation in the study by eligible individuals.
Study Participation - Baseline characteristics	Low risk	The baseline study sample (rAAA without prior EVAR) is adequately described
Study Attrition - Proportion of baseline sample available for analysis	Low risk	The baseline study sample proportion is adequate for the analysis
Study Attrition - Attempts to collect information on participants who dropped out	Unclear risk	There is no information on whether and how many participants (rAAA without prior EVAR) dropped out of the study .
Study Attrition - Reasons and potential impact of subjects lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Attrition - Outcome and prognostic factor information on those lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Definition of the prognostic factor	Low risk	Prognostic factor is adequately described.

Prognostic Factor Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of prognostic factor	Low risk	Evar placement is adequately valid and reliable
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method and setting of prognostic factor Measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of measurement of prognostic is the same for all study participants
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Proportion of data on prognostic factor available for analysis	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method used for missing data	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Outcome Measurement - Definition of the outcome	Low risk	The primary outcome (30 day mortality) is clearly defined
Outcome Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of outcome	Low risk	The method of outcome measurement used is reliable
Outcome Measurement - Method and setting of outcome measurement	Low risk	30 day mortality rates are based on medical records
Study Confounding - Important confounders measured	Low risk	Important confounders (endoleaks, stent grafts) are measured.
Study Confounding - Definition of the confounding factor	Low risk	Definitions of the important confounders measured are provided.
Study Confounding - Valid and reliable measurement of confounders	Unclear risk	Measurement of confounders is adequately valid and reliable
Study Confounding - Method and setting of confounding measurement	High risk	The method and setting of confounding measurement is not refered
Study Confounding - Method used for missing data	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Confounding - Appropriate accounting for confounding	Low risk	Important potential confounders are accounted for in the analysis
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Presentation of analytical strategy	Low risk	There is sufficient presentation of data to assess the adequacy of the analysis.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Model development strategy	Low risk	The selected statistical model is adequate for the design of the study.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Reporting of results	Low risk	There is no selective reporting of results.

Cho

Notes	

Risk of bias table

Item	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Study Participation - Source of target population	Low risk	The source population or population of interest is adequately described: "251 consecutive patients who presented with an rAAA without thoracic extension from January 2001 to December 2008".
Study Participation - Method used to identify population	Unclear risk	Consecutive patients, who were identified by medical records
Study Participation - Recruitment period	Unclear risk	Period of recruitment is adequately described: "From January 1999 to December 2008"
Study Participation - Place of recruitment	Unclear risk	Place of recruitment is adequately described "University of Pittsburgh Medical Center"
Study Participation - Inclusion and exclusion criteria	High risk	Exclusion criteria are not described.
Study participation - Adequate study participation	High risk	There is not adequate participation in the study by eligible individuals.
Study Participation - Baseline characteristics	Low risk	The baseline study sample (rAAA without prior EVAR) is adequately described
Study Attrition - Proportion of baseline sample available for analysis	Low risk	The baseline study sample proportion is adequate for the analysis
Study Attrition - Attempts to collect information on participants who dropped out	Unclear risk	There is no information on whether and how many participants (rAAA without prior EVAR) dropped out of the study .
Study Attrition - Reasons and potential impact of subjects lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Attrition - Outcome and prognostic factor information on those lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Definition of the prognostic factor	Low risk	Prognostic factor is adequately described.
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of prognostic factor	Low risk	Evar placement is adequately valid and reliable
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method and setting of prognostic factor Measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of measurement of prognostic is the same for all study participants
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Proportion of data on prognostic factor available for analysis	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method used for missing data	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Outcome Measurement - Definition of the outcome	Low risk	The primary outcome (operative mortality) is clearly defined

Outcome Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of outcome	Low risk	The method of outcome measurement used is reliable
Outcome Measurement - Method and setting of outcome measurement	Low risk	Operative mortality rates are based on medical records
Study Confounding - Important confounders measured	Low risk	Important confounders (endoleaks, stent grafts, haemodynamic instability) are measured.
Study Confounding - Definition of the confounding factor	Low risk	Definitions of the important confounders measured are provided.
Study Confounding - Valid and reliable measurement of confounders	Low risk	Measurement of confounders is adequately valid and reliable
Study Confounding - Method and setting of confounding measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of confounding measurement are the same for all study participants
Study Confounding - Method used for missing data	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Confounding - Appropriate accounting for confounding	Low risk	Important potential confounders are accounted for in the analysis
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Presentation of analytical strategy	Low risk	There is sufficient presentation of data to assess the adequacy of the analysis.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Model development strategy	Low risk	The selected statistical model is adequate for the design of the study.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Reporting of results	Low risk	There is no selective reporting of results.

Coppi

Notes	

Risk of bias table

Item	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Study Participation - Source of target population	Low risk	The source population or population of interest is adequately described: "a total of 169 consecutive patients with rAAA were retrospectively evaluated according to prior primary EVAR for AAA at our center (University of Modena), (14, one patient was subsequently treated for rAAA at another center) or patients without any prior AAA treatment".
Study Participation - Method used to identify population	Unclear risk	Consecutive patients with rAAA were retrospectively evaluated according to prior primary EVAR for AAA. Not enough information about underlying pathology or symptomatic status of patients

Study Participation - Recruitment period	Low risk	Period of recruitment is adequately described: "From January 1999 to December 2007"
Study Participation - Place of recruitment	Low risk	Place of recruitment is adequately described: "University of Modena and Reggio nell ̀emilia"
Study Participation - Inclusion and exclusion criteria	Low risk	Inclusion and exclusion criteria are adequately described.
Study participation - Adequate study participation	High risk	There is not adequate participation in the study by eligible individuals.
Study Participation - Baseline characteristics	Low risk	The baseline study sample (rAAA without prior EVAR) is adequately described
Study Attrition - Proportion of baseline sample available for analysis	Low risk	The baseline study sample proportion is adequate for the analysis
Study Attrition - Attempts to collect information on participants who dropped out	Unclear risk	There is no information on whether and how many participants dropped out of the study.
Study Attrition - Reasons and potential impact of subjects lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Attrition - Outcome and prognostic factor information on those lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Definition of the prognostic factor	Low risk	Prognostic factor is adequately described.
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of prognostic factor	Low risk	Evar placement is adequately valid and reliable
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method and setting of prognostic factor Measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of measurement of prognostic is the same for all study participants
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Proportion of data on prognostic factor available for analysis	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method used for missing data	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Outcome Measurement - Definition of the outcome	Low risk	The primary outcome (30 day mortality) is clearly defined
Outcome Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of outcome	Low risk	The method of outcome measurement used is reliable
Outcome Measurement - Method and setting of outcome measurement	Unclear risk	There is no information on the method and setting of outcome measurement
Study Confounding - Important confounders measured	Low risk	Important confounders (endoleaks, stent grafts) are measured.
Study Confounding - Definition of the confounding factor	Low risk	Definitions of the important confounders measured are provided.
Study Confounding - Valid and reliable measurement of confounders	Low risk	Measurement of confounders is adequately valid and reliable

Study Confounding - Method and setting of confounding measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of confounding measurement are the same for all study participants
Study Confounding - Method used for missing data	Low risk	No apparent missing data on confounders.
Study Confounding - Appropriate accounting for confounding	Low risk	Important potential confounders are accounted for in the analysis
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Presentation of analytical strategy	Low risk	There is sufficient presentation of data to assess the adequacy of the analysis.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Model development strategy	Low risk	The selected statistical model is adequate for the design of the study.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Reporting of results	Low risk	There is no selective reporting of results.

Rajendran

Notes	

Risk of bias table

Item	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Study Participation - Source of target population	Low risk	The source population or population of interest is adequately described: "This is a retrospective analysis of consecutive patients who presented to Royal Prince Alfred Hospital with ruptured AAA from September 2003 to September 2014.".
Study Participation - Method used to identify population	Unclear risk	Consecutive patients, who were identified by medical records
Study Participation - Recruitment period	Low risk	Period of recruitment is adequately described: "From September 2003 to September 2014"
Study Participation - Place of recruitment	Low risk	Place of recruitment is adequately described "Royal Prince Alfred Hospital"
Study Participation - Inclusion and exclusion criteria	High risk	Exclusion criteria are not described.
Study participation - Adequate study participation	High risk	There is not adequate participation in the study by eligible individuals.
Study Participation - Baseline characteristics	Low risk	The baseline study sample (rAAA without prior EVAR) is adequately described
Study Attrition - Proportion of baseline sample available for analysis	Low risk	The baseline study sample proportion is adequate for the analysis
Study Attrition - Attempts to collect information on participants who dropped out	Unclear risk	There is no information on whether and how many participants (rAAA without prior EVAR) dropped out of the study .

Study Attrition - Reasons and potential impact of subjects lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Attrition - Outcome and prognostic factor information on those lost to follow up	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Definition of the prognostic factor	Low risk	Prognostic factor is adequately described.
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of prognostic factor	Low risk	Evar placement is adequately valid and reliable
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method and setting of prognostic factor Measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of measurement of prognostic is the same for all study participants
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Proportion of data on prognostic factor available for analysis	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Prognostic Factor Measurement - Method used for missing data	Low risk	It is implied that all participants had complete data for the prognostic factor
Outcome Measurement - Definition of the outcome	Low risk	The primary outcome (30 day mortality) is clearly defined
Outcome Measurement - Valid and reliable measurement of outcome	Low risk	The method of outcome measurement used is reliable
Outcome Measurement - Method and setting of outcome measurement	Low risk	Operative mortality rates are based on medical records
Study Confounding - Important confounders measured	Low risk	Important confounders (endoleaks, stent grafts) are measured.
Study Confounding - Definition of the confounding factor	Low risk	Definitions of the important confounders measured are provided.
Study Confounding - Valid and reliable measurement of confounders	Low risk	Measurement of confounders is adequately valid and reliable
Study Confounding - Method and setting of confounding measurement	Low risk	The method and setting of confounding measurement are the same for all study participants
Study Confounding - Method used for missing data	Low risk	This information is not necessary for this metananalysis
Study Confounding - Appropriate accounting for confounding	Low risk	Important potential confounders are accounted for in the analysis
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Presentation of analytical strategy	Low risk	There is sufficient presentation of data to assess the adequacy of the analysis.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Model development strategy	Low risk	The selected statistical model is adequate for the design of the study.
Statistical Analysis and Reporting - Reporting of results	Low risk	There is no selective reporting of results.

Footnotes

Characteristics of excluded studies

Footnotes

Characteristics of studies awaiting classification

Footnotes

Characteristics of ongoing studies

Footnotes

Summary of findings tables

Additional tables