

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

## Crizanlizumab for adults with sickle-cell disease: a systematic review and network meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-034147
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Thom, H; University of Bristol , Bristol Medical School Jansen, Jeroen; Precision Xtract Shafrin, Jason; Precision Health Economics Inc, HEOR Zhao, Lauren; Precision Health Economics Inc, HEOR Joseph, George; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp Cheng, Hung-Yuan; University of Bristol , Bristol Medical School Gupta, Subhajit; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp Shah, Nirmish; Duke University
Keywords:	sickle cell disease, crizanlizumab, network meta-analysis, systematic literature review, vasoocclusive crisis, hematology





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Title: Crizanlizumab for adults with sickle-cell disease: a systematic review and network metaanalysis

Running title: Crizanlizumab for adults with sickle-cell disease

Authors: Thom HZ<sup>1\*</sup>, Jansen JP<sup>2</sup>, Shafrin J<sup>3</sup>, Zhao LM<sup>3</sup>, Joseph G<sup>4</sup>, Cheng HY<sup>1</sup>, Gupta, S<sup>4</sup>, Shah N<sup>5</sup>

Affiliations: <sup>1</sup>University of Bristol, Bristol, UK, <sup>2</sup>Precision Xtract, Oakland, CA,<sup>3</sup>Precision Health Economics, Los Angeles, CA, <sup>4</sup>Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, East Hanover, NJ, <sup>5</sup>Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC

### **Corresponding Author\*:**

ioner en en ont Howard Z. Thom University of Bristol Canynge Hall 39 Whatley Road **BS8 2PS** howard.thom@bristol.ac.uk

### ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** Treatment options for preventing vaso occlusive crises (VOC) among patients with sickle cell disease (SCD) are limited, especially if hydroxyurea treatment has failed or is contraindicated. A systematic literature review (SLR) and network meta-analysis (NMA) were conducted to evaluate the efficacy and safety of crizanlizumab for older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients.

**Methods:** The SLR included randomized controlled trials (RCT) and uncontrolled studies. Bayesian NMA of VOC, all-cause hospitalization days, and adverse events were conducted.

**Results:** The SLR identified 51 studies and 9 RCTs on 14 treatments that met the NMA inclusion criteria. The NMA found crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg was associated with a reduction in VOC (hazard ratio 0.55, 95% credible interval (0.43, 0.69); Bayesian probability of superiority >0.99), all-cause hospitalization days (0.58 (0.50, 0.68); >0.99), and no evidence of difference on adverse events (0.91 (0.59, 1.43); 0.66) or serious adverse events (0.93 (0.47, 1.87); 0.59) compared with placebo. The hazard ratio for reduction in VOC for crizanlizumab relative to L-glutamine was 0.67 (0.50, 0.88); >0.99). These results were sensitive to assumptions regarding whether patient age is an effect modifier.

Conclusions: This NMA provides preliminary evidence comparing the efficacy of crizanlizumab with other treatments for VOC prevention.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

### 

### PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

• No patient or public involvement in this study.

### STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This SLR was comprehensive in terms of outcomes and interventions and was focused on the target population of crizanlizumab.
- To include a diverse range of outcome summaries, a shared parameter Bayesian NMA was employed, as recommended by NICE.
- Risk of bias was assessed using the best practice Cochrane collaboration tool.
- It was not possible to adjust for differences in statistical analysis across RCTs.
- The strength of comparisons on outcomes other than crisis were weak, and crisis may not be the key outcome for patients.

terez onz

# Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

### INTRODUCTION

Sickle Cell Disease (SCD) affects approximately 100,000 people in the US.<sup>1</sup> The disease is caused by an autosomal-recessive single gene defect in the beta chain of hemoglobin (HbA), which results in sickle cell hemoglobin (HbS). Sickled cells break down prematurely, and are associated with varying degrees of anemia. Interactions of red blood cells, white blood cells, platelets and endothelial cells are an important contributor to the pathophysiology of sickle cell disease.<sup>2-7</sup> For instance, endothelial cells lining the vasculature are activated and have increased expression of adhesion molecules in SCD patients; this plays a central role in the development of vaso-occlusion.<sup>3 8 9</sup> Ultimately, obstruction of small blood capillaries cause painful crises, damage to major organs, and increased vulnerability to severe infections. Over the past several decades, life expectancy has improved, however, the disease continues to be associated with early mortality and high morbidity.<sup>10</sup> The aim of treatment is to aid disease and chronic pain management, reduce severity and/or prevent complications, and manage acute pain during crises.<sup>11</sup>

There is no widely available cure for SCD and few effective treatments. Hydroxyurea and L-glutamine (Endari), the only two FDA-approved drugs for SCD, are indicated for the prevention of VOCs.<sup>12</sup> In a two-year pediatric study, per patient health care costs for children on hydroxyurea were \$9450, compared with \$13716 for those who did not receive this treatment.<sup>13</sup> Despite the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute's (NHLBI) recommendations, hydroxyurea is not regularly prescribed and adherence to the therapy is poor.<sup>14</sup> Further, there are no current clinical guidelines outlining when to integrate L-glutamine into care. Regular blood transfusions can also be used as a preventive measure, but they may also lead to abnormally high levels of iron in the blood, which can cause long-term organ damage and reactions due to a mismatch between the donors and recipients.<sup>14</sup>

Crizanlizumab is a new drug for the prevention of vaso-occlusive crises. A phase II multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, 12-month study was completed to evaluate crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and 2.5 mg/kg versus placebo.<sup>15</sup> This study found that the median rate of crises per year was 1.63 with crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg versus 2.98 with placebo (indicating a 45.3% lower rate with high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg, *P*=0.01). The median time to the first crisis was also significantly longer with high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg than with placebo (4.07 vs. 1.38 months, *P*=0.001), as was the median time to the second crisis (10.32 vs. 5.09 months, *P*=0.02). In addition, the median rate of uncomplicated crises per year was 1.08 with crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg, *P*=0.02).

The comparative efficacy and safety of crizanlizumab has been evaluated against placebo, however head-to-head randomized controlled trial (RCT) evidence is lacking for comparisons to treatments of interest. Network meta-analysis (NMA) is a statistical method that allows for the simultaneous evaluation of all treatments within a therapeutic area and allows for indirect comparisons between treatments where head-to-head evidence may not be available. Specifically, NMA can be used to combine direct and indirect evidence regarding any interventions that form a network of RCTs where each trial has at least one intervention (active or placebo) in common with another trial and all RCTs

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

are sufficiently similar.<sup>16 17</sup> To minimize risk of bias, RCTs should be identified through a comprehensive systematic literature review (SLR) using pre-defined criteria.<sup>18</sup>

This study conducts a SLR and NMA to assess the comparative efficacy and safety of crizanlizumab against relevant competing interventions for older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) patients with SCD.

### **METHODS**

### Systematic literature reviews

The SLR protocol was finalised on 25 June 2018 and the SLR was conducted according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.<sup>19</sup> A PRISMA NMA checklist can be found in Appendix D. The SLR approach updated and expended an earlier published SLR by Sins et al.<sup>20</sup> by including non-controlled studies and included additional interventions. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for studies are summarised in Table 1 below. Relevant studies were identified by searching the following databases: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE); and Excerpta Medica database (Embase). We also searched a trial registry, *ClinicalTrials.gov*. The search strategies were derived from Sins et al.<sup>20</sup> and can be found in Appendix B along with the complete search protocols in Appendices E and F. As blood transfusion was not included by Sins et al.,<sup>20</sup> we conducted a separate search for blood transfusion from inception of databases to 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018. For non-transfusion studies, the search date was from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017 to 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 to bridge the findings of Sins et al.<sup>20</sup>

Criteria	Description
Population	Studies included adult patients with sickle cell disease
Interventions	<ul> <li>Crizanlizumab</li> <li>L-glutamine</li> <li>Voxelotor (GBT440)</li> <li>Red blood cell transfusions</li> <li>Other types of transfusions</li> <li>Any pharmacological interventions for preventing crisis, pain and/or vaso-occlusive crisis (VOC)</li> </ul>
Comparators	<ul> <li>Placebo or best supportive care</li> <li>Any of the listed interventions of interest</li> <li>Any treatment that facilitates an anchored indirect comparison</li> </ul>
Outcomes	<ul> <li>Primary outcomes: <ul> <li>Pain, crisis and VOC (frequency, intensity and duration in one event)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Secondary outcome: <ul> <li>Hospital admission, including emergency department (ED) and nurse visits</li> <li>SCD complications, including acute chest syndromes (ACS)</li> <li>Analgesic use</li> <li>Adverse events*</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Table 1: Study selection	criteria to identify	trials for the	systematic literatur	e review
Tuble II elady colocion	or nor na co na or na		Systematic interatory	01011011

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
1	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
22	
37	
38	
39	
40	
/1	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
15	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
14	

60

Study design	<ul> <li>Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)</li> <li>Single-arm trials when RCTs are not available for the interventions of interest</li> </ul>
Language	English

\*In addition to efficacy outcomes, adverse events are of interest for the review, but will not be used as study selection criteria.

Results of searches were managed using Endnote and a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Two reviewers screened and selected records independently against inclusion and exclusion criteria using titles and abstracts. Full-texts of potential eligible records were retrieved and screened to assess the eligibility for data extraction. Disagreements were resolved by discussion and consensus. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third investigator was included to reach consensus for any remaining discrepancies. The Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool was used to assess risk of bias in included RCTs.<sup>21</sup> The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to assess the quality of noncontrolled studies.<sup>22</sup>

The primary outcome of this review was sickle cell pain crisis (SCPC), also known as a vaso-occlusive crisis (VOC) leading to a healthcare visit. A variety of definitions for VOC was observed in the included studies. We consulted several medical experts and chose the definition of crisis used in the pivotal Phase II RCT of crizanlizumab.<sup>15</sup> In this trial, a VOC was defined as an acute episode of pain, with no medically determined cause other than a vaso-occlusive event that resulted in a medical facility visit and treatment with oral or parenteral narcotic agents or with a parenteral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug. In addition to outcomes specifically named as pain crisis, the outcomes of vaso-occlusive crisis (VOC) and Sickle Cell Disease Crisis (SCDC) were extracted and included with the VOC set if found to use a comparable definition.

Other outcomes identified as of interest and/or extracted included pain-related outcomes, acute chest syndrome (ACS), all-cause hospitalizations, transfusions, analgesic use, death, adverse events, and serious adverse events. In addition to study and intervention characteristics, the patient characteristics were extracted to qualitatively assess comparability of different study populations.

### **Network meta-analysis**

Quantitative synthesis through NMA was planned for reported or derived time-to-event outcomes of VOC, all-cause hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events, in line with those reported by the Phase II RCT on crizanlizumab.<sup>15</sup> International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR), Society for Medical Decision (MDM), and UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines were followed in design of the NMA model.<sup>23-26</sup> As the pivotal study on crizanlizumab was conducted within an older adolescent and adult ( $\geq$ 16 years old) population, the NMA was conducted only on studies that included patients  $\geq$ 16 years old with SCD. Whilst the pivotal study for L-glutamine (Niihara 2018) included patients aged <16 years old, a decision was made to include the study to enable a comparison with crizanlizumab. The primary comparison examines the outcomes in the whole population. A sensitivity analysis, was subsequently run using the results with Endari in a subgroup of patients aged >18 years old (reported in Niihara 2018).. Evidence networks were generated with nodes corresponding to treatments and edges connecting nodes if at least one RCT comparing corresponding treatments was identified.<sup>27</sup> An extended network including RCTs with a mixture of child, adolescent and adult populations was investigated for additional direct or indirect evidence on any comparison with crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg.

6

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Following NICE guidelines, we employed a shared parameter model for hazard ratios to synthesise studies summarising outcomes in different formats and accounting for differences in trial duration.<sup>26</sup> Summaries that could be included were total number of events, percentage of patients with events, mean numbers of events, mean or median rates, numbers of patients with at least one event, and risk or hazard ratio of event. Likelihood and link function for each summary followed MDM and NICE guidelines.<sup>25 26</sup>. Total number of events are modelled with a Poisson likelihood and log link, numbers of patients with at least one event are modelled using a Binomial likelihood and complementary log log link, while risk and hazard ratios are modelled on a log scale with a Normal likelihood and identify link. A Bayesian perspective with vague priors was adopted. Sensitivity to priors was explored. Fixed and random effect were considered with choice being made on basis of model fit; meta-regressions were also explored to assess heterogeneity due to trial duration, proportion female, mean age, proportion homozygous hemoglobin S (HbSS) genotype, proportion hydroxyurea use, and proportion black or African-American.<sup>28</sup> Different doses of the same drug were analysed independently. If a connected evidence network could be formed using only RCTs, single-arm study evidence was discarded. The reference treatment in all analyses was placebo. If feasible, inconsistency between direct and indirect evidence was planned to be tested by node-splitting and an independent means inconsistency model.<sup>16</sup> All analyses were conducted using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) software of OpenBUGS version 3.2.3.<sup>29</sup> Two MCMC chains with 400,000 iterations for burn-in and 30,000 iterations for posterior sampling were used. Convergence was assessed by visual inspection and the Gelman-Rubin statistic.<sup>29</sup> Further details of the modelling methods are provided in Appendix C.

We generated hazard ratios with 95% credible intervals (CrI) of high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg relative to each comparator. We estimated the Bayesian probability that crizanlizumab was superior (lower hazard of event) or inferior (higher hazard of event). These probabilities are the Bayesian equivalent of one-sided p-values. In line with the recommendations of the American Statistical Association, we did not adopt a strict threshold for interpreting these Bayesian probabilities,<sup>30</sup> but instead reported the probability itself. Probabilities are interpreted to suggest evidence in favour of a hypothesis if it lay lower than 5% or above 95%, and weak evidence if the probability was between 5-10% or 90-95%.<sup>31</sup>

### RESULTS

### Systematic literature review results

We retrieved 3388 records from electronic databases, *ClinicalTrials.gov* and Sins 2017. After removing duplicates and irrelevant records, we screened 250 full-text articles. Fifty one studies (67 references) were included to perform evidence evaluation for the NMA (Figure 1). Full details and references for the 51 studies are included in Appendix B. We also identified fourteen additional ongoing clinical RCTs or completed RCTs without publication, which investigated effects of non-hydroxyurea treatments on SCD patients.<sup>32-45</sup>

Of 51 studies, duration of follow-up was reported in 41 studies and, among RCTs in the  $\geq$ 16 years old population, duration ranged from 30 days in Wun 2013<sup>46</sup> to 52 weeks in Ataga 2017.<sup>15</sup> This range represents substantial variation in follow-up, but the methods used for NMA model trial follow-up compare annualized hazards in order to adjust for this difference.

The proportion of female patients varied across RCTs, ranging from 0.44 in Glassberg 2017<sup>47</sup> to 0.60 in Sins 2017,<sup>48</sup> so qualitatively similar proportions. Across all 51 studies, the proportion of females varied from 0.23 in Gupta 1995<sup>49</sup> to 1.00 in de Abood 1997,<sup>50</sup> representing a more substantial

difference. In the  $\geq 16$  years old population RCTs, age ranged from 20.5 years in Pace 2003<sup>51</sup> to 35.5 years in Ataga 2008.<sup>52</sup> Across all 51 studies, the mean age ranged from 4.8 years in Adegoke 2013<sup>53</sup> to 48.8 years in Bridges 2017.<sup>54</sup> The proportion with HbSS genotype ranged from 0.60 in Wun 2013<sup>46</sup> to 1.00 in several studies that restricted enrolment to patients with HbSS disease alone, including Ataga 2008<sup>52</sup> in the  $\geq 16$  years old population. Although HbSS is indicative of absolute outcomes (prognostic factor), there is no known evidence that it is an effect modifier, so the NMA remains feasible.<sup>28</sup> Proportion of patients reported as black or African American ranged from 0.53 in NCT02482298<sup>55</sup> to 1.00 in Styles 2010.<sup>56</sup> Several studies excluded patients with history of hydroxyurea usage, including Bao 2008<sup>57</sup> in the  $\geq 16$  years old population. In the  $\geq 16$  years old population, this otherwise varied from 0.42 in Sins 2017<sup>48</sup> to 0.67 in Niihara 2018,<sup>12</sup> making it somewhat comparable.

### Construction of evidence networks

Of the 51 studies identified, there were 17 non-controlled studies that were excluded from the NMA due to lack of common comparators and potential bias. Of the 34 remaining RCTs , only 8 were conducted solely in older adolescent and adult ( $\geq$ 16 years old) patients.<sup>15 46-48 51 52 55 56</sup>. As the only RCT identified on L-glutamine, Niihara 2018<sup>12</sup> was included in the network. This gave 9 RCTs in the  $\geq$ 16 years old population evidence networks. Five of these studies used a VOC definition comparable to that in Ataga 2017<sup>12 15 51 52 56</sup> (details in Appendix C). The only study that examined transfusions was a conference abstract by Vichinsky. As the authors did not specify the definition of VOC or a placebo control, this study was excluded from the NMA<sup>58</sup> Appendix A shows the characteristics of included studies in the NMA. Analysed evidence networks are provided in Figure 2.

In addition to crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and 2.5 mg/kg, multiple doses of other drugs were included in the networks. Ticagrelor was studied as both twice daily 45mg (high-dose) and 10mg (low-dose);<sup>55</sup> N-acetylcysteine (NAC) as 600mg (low-dose), 1200mg (mid-dose), and 2400mg (high-dose);<sup>51</sup> Senicapoc with a loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance,<sup>56</sup> and as a low-dose and high-dose formulation corresponding to single loading doses of 100mg and 150mg, respectively, and maintenance 6mg and 10mg daily, respectively.<sup>52</sup>

Cochrane risk of bias assessment for the 9 RCTs included in NMA is reported in full in Appendix C. Risk of bias was low in all categories for three of these studies (two studying senicapoc and one mometasome), and was low in all except incomplete outcome data in Ataga 2017.<sup>15</sup> Three studies were at unclear risk of bias due to random sequence generation and allocation concealment (studying ticagrelor, L-glutamine, and NAC doses).<sup>12 51 55</sup> Sins 2017 (studying NAC) was at low risk of bias for all categories except incomplete outcome data, on which it was at high risk of bias.<sup>48</sup>. Wun 2013 (studying prasugrel) was at unclear risk of bias on random sequence generation, allocation concealment, and blinding but low risk of bias on remaining categories.<sup>46</sup>

### Network meta-analysis results

A fixed effects NMA approach was used for the primary analyses. The NMA models converged well and fit, assessed by comparing residual deviance to total number of data points, was good for all fixed effects analyses. Random effects analyses did not converge as only one RCT was available on each treatment contrast. Meta-regression to explore covariate effects did not reveal evidence of effect medication but convergence was poor for these models. Fit statistics and model assessment details are provided in Appendix C. Inconsistency could not be tested as there were no treatment contrasts on which both direct and indirect evidence were available.<sup>16</sup>

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

We discuss in turn the results of the NMA on VOC, all-cause hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events. Forest plots of hazard ratios with 95% CI of crizanlizumab vs all comparators are provided in Figure 3. Bayesian probabilities that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg is superior or inferior are also provided in this figure. Pairwise results for all treatment comparisons are provided in Appendix C.

We found evidence that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard of crisis than L-glutamine (hazard ratio 0.67, 95% CrI (0.51, 0.88); Bayesian probability crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg superior 0.9982), placebo (0.55 (0.43, 0.69); >0.9999), and senicapoc (0.46 (0.32, 0.67); >0.9999). We found only weak evidence that hazard of crisis was lower on crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg than crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.81 (0.63, 1.05); 0.9452) or low-dose NAC (0.48 (0.18, 1.21); 0.9396). We found no evidence of a difference between crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and low-dose senicapoc (0.53 (0.14, 1.95); 0.8334), high-dose NAC (1.91 (0.57, 7.58); 0.1507), mid-dose NAC (0.81 (0.29, 2.18); 0.6619), or high-dose senicapoc (0.57 (0.15, 2.17); 0.8010). Results are summarized in Table 2 below.

		All-cause	Adverse	Serious adverse
	Crisis	hospitalization	events	events
Placebo	>0.9999	>0.9999	0.6558	0.5857
L-glutamine	0.9982	0.0731	0.2480	0.2854
Crizanlizumab				
2.5mg/kg	0.9452	>0.9999	0.5743	0.8134
Mometasome	-	0.7496	0.9399	-
Low-Dose NAC	0.9396	0.0166	0.6996	0.9744
Mid-Dose NAC	0.6619		-	-
High-Dose NAC	0.1507		-	-
Prasugrel	-		-	0.5242
Senicapoc	>0.9999	-	0.7176	-
High-Dose				
Senicapoc	0.8010	-	-	-
Low-Dose				
Senicapoc	0.8334	-	-	-
High-dose				
Ticagrelor	-	-	-	0.4247
Low-dose				
Ticagrelor	-	-		0.6181

### Table 2. Bayesian probabilities that crizanlizumab is superior on each outcome analyzed\*

\*Proportion of MCMC samples for which crizanlizumab vs comparator hazard ratio is above (inferior) or below (superior) 1. Entry '-' indicates comparator not included in outcome specific evidence network.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading daily.

In a sensitivity analysis using a reported rate ratio of 0.64 with 95% confidence interval (0.45, 0.89) in a subgroup of patients aged >18 years old from Niihara 2018, we found no evidence that crizanlizumab had a lower hazard of crisis than L-glutamine (0.86 (0.57, 1.29); 0.7707). Full results of this analysis are provided in Appendix C.

We found evidence that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard of all-cause hospitalization days than placebo (0.58 (0.50, 0.68); >0.9999), and crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.58 (0.50, 0.68); >0.9999), but found evidence that hazard was higher than on low-dose NAC (2.08 (1.06, 4.66); 0.0166). We found weak evidence that hazard of all-cause hospitalization days was higher on crizanlizumab 5.0

mg/kg than on L-glutamine (1.73 (0.82, 3.76); 0.0731) and no evidence of a difference with mometasome (0.89 (0.63, 1.26); 0.7496). Note that all-cause hospitalization includes admission for crisis but also for adverse events and non-SCD related causes.

The hazard of adverse events—both serious and overall—for crizanlizumab was generally similar or weakly better than other treatments. The exception is that there was weak evidence that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard than mometasome (0.51 (0.21, 1.19); 0.9399). We found no evidence of a difference in hazard of adverse events between crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and placebo (0.91 (0.59, 1.43); 0.6658), L-glutamine (1.31 (0.62, 3.08); 0.2680), crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.96 (0.61, 1.48); 0.5743), low-dose NAC (0.84 (0.45, 1.60); 0.6996), or senicapoc (0.86 (0.52, 1.44); 0.7176). Similarly, the hazard of serious adverse events on crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg were lower than on low-dose NAC (0.20 (0.02, 1.00); 0.9744). There was no evidence of a difference on adverse event rates between crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and placebo (0.93 (0.47, 1.87); 0.5857), L-glutamine (1.24 (0.58, 2.70); 0.2854), crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.75 (0.39, 1.43); 0.8134), high-dose ticagrelor (1.14 (0.27, 4.81); 0.4247), or low-dose ticagrelor (0.81 (0.21, 3.17); 0.6181).

### DISCUSSION

Previous SLRs and meta-analyses of treatments for SCD have demonstrated hydroxyurea to be effective in reducing VOC rates.<sup>59 60</sup> However, patients receiving hydroxyurea therapy can continue to have crises, end-organ damage, and a decreased life expectancy.<sup>61</sup> Crizanlizumab and L-glutamine are promising treatment options for SCD patients not well managed on hydroxyurea, but no direct comparison across these treatments has been conducted.<sup>14 15 62</sup> Our SLR and NMA is the first looking at the comparative efficacy of new treatments for older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients not well managed on hydroxyurea and is therefore of vital importance to this patient population.

Our baseline analysis found that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg reduced crisis compared to L-glutamine, placebo, and senicapoc, and weak evidence of reduction compared to crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg and low-dose NAC. These results, however, were sensitive to whether the L-glutamine efficacy was measured for all patients or only those aged >18 years.

We found that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg reduced all-cause hospitalization days compared to placebo and crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg. Conversely, we found evidence that low-dose NAC reduced hospitalization compared to crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg, and weak evidence that L-glutamine reduced hospitalization compared to crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg.

Our analysis found high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard of adverse events compared to mometasome and of serious adverse events compared to low-dose NAC. There was no evidence of a difference between 5 mg/kg crizanlizumab on safety with other treatments.

### Strengths

This SLR was comprehensive in terms of outcomes and interventions and was focused on the target population of crizanlizumab, that of older adolescent and adult ( $\geq$ 16 years old) SCD patients not well managed, or having failed previous treatment, with hydroxyurea. Our review followed the PRISMA guidelines and checklist.<sup>19</sup> Risk of bias was assessed using the best practice Cochrane collaboration tool.<sup>21</sup> To be comprehensive, we searched for both RCT and single-arm evidence but used only RCT evidence in the NMA. Our analysis followed published and international guidelines on indirect comparisons and network meta-analysis.<sup>23-26</sup> On the outcome of VOC, we ensured only studies with a definition compatible with that of the principal crizanlizumab study were analysed. <sup>15</sup> To include a

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

diverse range of outcome summaries, such as total number of events and numbers of patients with at least one event, a shared parameter Bayesian NMA was employed, as recommended by NICE.<sup>26</sup>

### Limitations

There were several limitations to this SLR and NMA. There was at most only one RCT on each of the treatment contrasts. A similar definition of VOC was used across RCTs but the shared parameter NMA combined RCTs without adjusting for differences in statistical analyses, such as methods for managing drop-outs, used. Differences in RCT follow-up (e.g. 30 days in Wun 2013<sup>46</sup> and 52 weeks in Ataga 2017)<sup>15</sup> limit comparability of annualized hazard rates across treatments. The strength of evidence for comparisons on hospitalization, adverse events, and serious adverse events was weak. Furthermore, we could not include transfusions in the NMA as the only available RCT in an adult population —Vichinsky 2010<sup>58</sup>— used an unspecified standard of care rather than a placebo control, did not describe the definition of VOC that was used, and was published only as an abstract.

Due to a lack of evidence, the NMA was not able to estimate the relative impact of crizanlizumab treatment on the rate of complicated crisis or organ damage, both of which are important health outcomes for patients and physicians. Inconsistency in the network could not be assessed as there were no loops in the evidence networks; it was necessary to assume consistency to enable comparisons with crizanlizumab.

A previous SLR in non-hydroxyurea SCD treatments did not conduct quantitative synthesis due to concerns regarding heterogeneity.<sup>20</sup> Although we considered meta-regression on trial duration, proportion female, mean age, proportion HbSS genotype, proportion hydroxyurea use, and proportion black or African-American there was insufficient evidence as there was only one RCT on each treatment contrast. We were also lacking information on the amount of VOCs in the year preceding randomization/treatment start for several of the treatments included in the analysis, a factor known to be prognostic. We therefore had to assume differences in characteristics would not modify treatment effects, even in parameters expected to influence the frequency of VOCs. Although we conducted a sensitivity analysis using results among >18 year olds from Niihara 2018, that study itself concluded that there was "no significant interaction between trial group assignment and age".<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, if age is an effect modifier, the baseline results should be interpreted cautiously. Future real-world evidence studies may be useful to explore effect modifiers and identify patient types that benefit most from crizanlizumab and other treatments.

Further, caution should be taken when interpreting these results in relation to switching patients from hydroxyurea to crizanlizumab or L-glutamine. Our analysis does not purport to compare crizanlizumab, or indeed L-glutamine or blood transfusions, with hydroxyurea but is instead focused solely on patients who are not well managed on hydroxyurea. Before more evidence is available, physicians should consider treatment with hydroxyurea before consideration of second line treatments.<sup>64</sup>

### Conclusion

Our baseline analysis showed from an SLR and NMA that crizanlizumab reduced crises and hospital days compared with placebo and other treatments with an acceptable adverse event profile in older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients when compared to other non-hydroxyurea treatments. The VOC results, however, were sensitive to assumptions regarding whether patient age is an effect modifier.

### 

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Systematic literature review was assisted by Luke McGuinness of University of Bristol, Rohan Shirali of Precision Xtract, and Emily Glowienka of Precision Xtract. Clifton Chow provided early review of the systematic literature review protocols. We would like to thank Miranda Bailey, Andrew Cavey, Pascal Edrich, Thu Thuy Nguyen, and Patrick Urban for their comments and feedback on this manuscript.

### DATA SHARING STATEMENT

All necessary data, coda, and initial values for our OpenBUGS models are provided in the network meta-analysis.

### AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS

HT drafted the manuscript and conducted and designed and conducted the network meta-analysis. NS ensured medical relevance for the review and analysis and provided context for the results. JJ advised on statistical aspects of the analysis. GJ and JS provided oversight to the whole project. LZ provided project management and administrative support. MB provided subject-matter expertise on the review and analysis. HYC led the systematic review. SG validated the network meta-analysis. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

### DISCLOSURES OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

This work was funded by Novartis Pharma AG, manufacturer of crizanlizumab. JS and JP disclose employment by and equity in by Precision Health Economics, a consulting firm to the life sciences and broader health care industry. HT discloses personal consulting fees from Novartis Pharma AG, Hoffman La-Roche, Pfizer Inc., and Eli Lilly. LZ discloses employment by Precision Health Economics, a consulting firm to the life sciences and broader health care industry. Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

### FUNDING

This work was funded by Novartis Pharma AG, manufacturer of crizanlizumab.

### REFERENCES

- 1. Hassell KL. Population Estimates of Sickle Cell Disease in the U.S. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 2010;38(4, Supplement):S512-S21. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.12.022
- 2. Manwani D, Frenette PS. Vaso-occlusion in sickle cell disease: pathophysiology and novel targeted therapies. *Blood* 2013;122(24):3892-98.
- 3. Zhang D, Xu C, Manwani D, et al. Neutrophils, platelets, and inflammatory pathways at the nexus of sickle cell disease pathophysiology. *Blood* 2016;127(7):801-09.
- 4. Polanowska-Grabowska R, Wallace K, Field JJ, et al. P-selectin–mediated platelet-neutrophil aggregate formation activates neutrophils in mouse and human sickle cell disease. *Arteriosclerosis, thrombosis, and vascular biology* 2010;30(12):2392-99.
- 5. Frelinger III AL, Jakubowski JA, Brooks JK, et al. Platelet activation and inhibition in sickle cell disease (pains) study. *Platelets* 2014;25(1):27-35.

- 6. Sreeramkumar V, Adrover JM, Ballesteros I, et al. Neutrophils scan for activated platelets to initiate inflammation. *Science* 2014;346(6214):1234-38.
- 7. Matsui NM, Varki A, Embury SH. Heparin inhibits the flow adhesion of sickle red blood cells to Pselectin. *Blood* 2002;100(10):3790-96.
- 8. Matsui NM, Borsig L, Rosen SD, et al. P-selectin mediates the adhesion of sickle erythrocytes to the endothelium. *Blood* 2001;98(6):1955-62.
- 9. Wagner DD, Frenette PS. The vessel wall and its interactions. *Blood* 2008;111(11):5271-81.
- 10. Novelli EM, Gladwin MT. Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. *Chest* 2016;149(4):1082-93. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2015.12.016</u>
- 11. Lanzkron S. Sickle cell anemia BMJ Best Practice, 2018.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57 58

59

- 12. Niihara Y, Miller ST, Kanter J, et al. A Phase 3 Trial of I-Glutamine in Sickle Cell Disease. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379(3):226-35. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1715971 [published Online First: 2018/07/19]
- Wang WC, Oyeku SO, Luo Z, et al. Hydroxyurea Is Associated With Lower Costs of Care of Young Children With Sickle Cell Anemia. *Pediatrics* 2013;132(4):677-83. doi: 10.1542/peds.2013-0333
- 14. Hematology ASo. State of Sickle Cell Disease: 2016 Report, 2016.
- 15. Ataga KI, Kutlar A, Kanter J, et al. Crizanlizumab for the Prevention of Pain Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2017;376(5):429-39. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1611770
- 16. Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, et al. Evidence synthesis for decision making 4: inconsistency in networks of evidence based on randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 2013;33(5):641-56. doi: 10.1177/0272989X12455847
- Jansen JP, Naci H. Is network meta-analysis as valid as standard pairwise meta-analysis? It all depends on the distribution of effect modifiers. *BMC Med* 2013;11:159. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-11-159 [published Online First: 2013/07/06]
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. J Clin Epidemiol 2009;62(10):1006-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005
- 19. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2700. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700
- 20. Sins JWR, Mager DJ, Davis S, et al. Pharmacotherapeutical strategies in the prevention of acute, vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell disease: a systematic review. *Blood Adv* 2017;1(19):1598-616. doi: 10.1182/bloodadvances.2017007211
- 21. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 22. Wells GS, O'Connell D, Peterson J, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses 2013 [Available from: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp accessed October 1 2016.
- 23. Jansen JP, Fleurence R, Devine B, et al. Interpreting indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis for health-care decision making: report of the ISPOR Task Force on Indirect Treatment Comparisons Good Research Practices: part 1. *Value Health* 2011;14(4):417-28. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2011.04.002
- 24. Hoaglin DC, Hawkins N, Jansen JP, et al. Conducting indirect-treatment-comparison and networkmeta-analysis studies: report of the ISPOR Task Force on Indirect Treatment Comparisons Good Research Practices: part 2. Value Health 2011;14(4):429-37. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2011.01.011
- 25. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, et al. Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 2013;33(5):607-17. doi: 10.1177/0272989X12458724

Page 15 of 151

2	
3	26. Dias
4	2012100
5	
6	27 Sala
7	27. 3didi
8	
9	28. Dias
10	
11	
12	29. Lunr
13	
14	30 Ame
15	50.74110
16	
17	
18	31. Steri
19	
20	32. NCT
21	33. NCT
22	
23	34. NCT
24	35 NCT
25	26 NCT
26	50. NCT
27	
28	37. NCT
29	
30	38. NCT
31	39. NCT
32	
33	40. NCT
34	41 NCT
35	41.1001
36	42 NCT
37	42. NCT
38	
39	43. NCT
40	
41	44. NCT
42	45. NCT
43	46. Wur
44	
45	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	47. Glas
51 52	
5∠ 52	
55 57	
54 55	48 Sins
55 56	10. 5115
50	
57	
50 50	
59 60	
nu	

- 40. doi: 10.1177/0272989X13485157 29. Lunn D, Jackson C, Best N, et al. The BUGS book : a practical introduction to Bayesian analysis. Boca Raton ; London: CRC Press 2013.
- 30. American Statistical Association. AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION RELEASES STATEMENT ON STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND P-VALUES. Provides Principles to Improve the Conduct and Interpretation of Quantitative Science March 7, 2016 2016
- 31. Sterne JA, Davey Smith G. Sifting the evidence-what's wrong with significance tests? *BMJ* 2001;322(7280):226-31.
- 32. NCT02179177. Apixaban in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2017
- 33. NCT02615847. Clinical Trial to Study the Safety and Tolerability of Memantin Mepha<sup>®</sup> in Sickle Cell Disease Patients. 2017
- 34. NCT02594462. Contraception in Women With Sickle Cell Disease. 2018
- 35. NCT02380079. Dose-Escalation Study of SCD-101 in Sickle Cell Disease. 2018
- 36. NCT01702246. Effect of Simvastatin Treatment on Vaso-occlusive Pain in Sickle Cell Disease. 2015
- 37. NCT01737814. Evaluation of Purified Poloxamer 188 in Vaso-Occlusive Crisis of Sickle Cell Disease (EPIC). 2016
- 38. NCT02449616. Evaluation of Repeat Administration of Purified Poloxamer 188. 2016
- 39. NCT02061202. Inhaled Mometasone to Reduce Painful Episodes in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2017
- 40. NCT02633397. A Multi-Center Study of Riociguat in Patients With Sickle Cell Diseases. 2018
- 41. NCT03247218. A Phase IIa IIb, Trial to Study the Safety, Tolerability and Efficacy of Memantine as a Long-term Treatment of SCD. 2019
- 42. NCT02525107. Prevention of Vaso-occlusive Painful Crisis by Using Omega-3 Fatty Acid Supplements. 2019
- 43. NCT01704794. Quality of Life Study for Sickle Cell Patients Treated With Jobelyn (Sorghum Bicolor Extract). 2014
- 44. NCT01202812. A Randomized Trial of LOVAZA in Pediatric Sickle Cell Disease (SCD). 2012
- 45. NCT02604368. Sickle Cell Omega-3 Treatment Trial (SCOT Trial). 2020
  - 46. Wun TS, Denis; Frelinger, Andrew L.; Krishnamurti, Lakshmanan; Novelli, Enrico M.; Kutlar, Abdullah; Ataga, Kenneth I.; Knupp, Charles L.; McMahon, Lillian E.; Strouse, John J.; Zhou, Chunmei; Heath, Lori E.; Nwachuku, Chuke E.; Jakubowski, Joseph A.; Riesmeyer, Jeffrey S.; Winters, Kenneth J. A double-blind, randomized, multicenter phase 2 study of prasugrel versus placebo in adult patients with sickle cell disease. *Journal of Hematology & Oncology* 2013;6 doi: 10.1186/1756-8722-6-17
- 47. Glassberg JM, Caterina; Cromwell, Caroline; Cytryn, Lawrence; Kraus, Thomas; Skloot, Gwen S.; Connor, Jason T.; Rahman, Adeeb H.; Meurer, William J. Inhaled steroids reduce pain and sVCAM levels in individuals with sickle cell disease: A triple-blind, randomized trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2017;92(7):622-31. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ajh.24742</u>
- 48. Sins JF, X; Fijnvandraat, K; Dominguez, M; Rijneveld, Aw; Kerkhoffs, J-L; Meurs, A; Groot, Mr; Heijboer, H; Nur, E; Luken, Bm; Zeerleder, Ss; Dresse, M-F; Le, P-Q; Hermans, P; Vanderfaeillie, A; Neste, E; Benghiat, Fs; Kesse-Adu, R; Delannoy, A; Efira, A; Azerad, M-A; Borgie, Ca; Chen, J; Lopez, Ja; Biemond, Bj. Effects of oral N-acetylcysteine on oxidative stress in patients with sickle cell disease. *Blood Conference: 59th annual meeting of the*

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57 58

59 60

american society of hematology, ASH 2017 United states 2017;130(Supplement 1) (no pagination) 49. Gupta VLC, B. S. Efficacy of zinc therapy in prevention of crisis in sickle cell anemia: a double blind, randomized controlled clinical trial. The Journal of the Association of Physicians of India 1995;43(7):467-9. 50. de Abood MdC, Z.; Guerrero, F.; Espino, M.; Austin, K. L. Effect of Depo-Provera (R) or Microgynon (R) on the painful crises of sickle cell anemia patients. *Contraception* 1997;56(5):313-16. doi: 10.1016/S0010-7824(97)00156-X 51. Pace BSS, A.; Pack-Mabien, A.; Mulekar, M.; Ardia, A.; Goodman, S. R. Effects of N-acetylcysteine on dense cell formation in sickle cell disease. American Journal of Hematology 2003;73(1):26-32. doi: 10.1002/ajh.10321 52. Ataga KIS, Wally R.; De Castro, Laura M.; Swerdlow, Paul; Saunthararajah, Yogen; Castro, Oswaldo; Vichinsky, Elliot; Kutlar, Abdullah; Orringer, Eugene P.; Rigdon, Greg C.; Stocker, Jonathan W. Efficacy and safety of the Gardos channel blocker, senicapoc (ICA-17043), in patients with sickle cell anemia. Blood 2008;111(8):3991-97. doi: 10.1182/blood-2007-08-110098 53. Adegoke SAS, Umar Abdullahi; Mohammed, Lasisi Oluwafemi; Sanusi, Yunusa; Oyelami, Oyeku Akibu. Influence of Lime Juice on the Severity of Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine 2013;19(6):588-92. doi: 10.1089/acm.2012.0567 54. Bridges KRG, B.; Bronte, L. A single center experience of GBT440 treatment of severe anemia in sickle cell disease (SCD). Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017;130(Supplement 1) 55. NCT02482298. A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrelor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2016 56. Ataga KIR, Marvin; Ballas, Samir K.; Yasin, Zahida; Bigelow, Carolyn; St James, Luther; Smith, Wally R.; Galacteros, Frederic; Kutlar, Abdullah; Hull, James H.; Stocker, Jonathan W. Improvements in haemolysis and indicators of erythrocyte survival do not correlate with acute vaso-occlusive crises in patients with sickle cell disease: a phase III randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study of the gardos channel blocker senicapoc (ICA-17043). British Journal of Haematology 2011;153(1):92-104. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2141.2010.08520.x 57. Bao BP, Ananda S.; Beck, Frances W. J.; Snell, Diane; Suneja, Anupam; Sarkar, Fazlul H.; Doshi, Nimisha; Fitzgerald, James T.; Swerdlow, Paul. Zinc supplementation decreases oxidative stress, incidence of infection, and generation of inflammatory cytokines in sickle cell disease patients. Translational Research 2008;152(2):67-80. doi: 10.1016/j.trsl.2008.06.001 58. Vichinsky EP, Neumayr LD, Gold J, et al. A Randomized Trial of the Safety and Benefit of Transfusion Vs. Standard Care In the Prevention of Sickle Cell-Related Complications In Adults: a Preliminary Report From the Phase II NHLBI Comprehensive Sickle Cell Centers (CSCC) Study of Neuropsychological Dysfunction and Neuroimaging Abnormalities In Neurologically Intact Adult Patients with Sickle Cell Disease. Blood (abstract only) 2010;116:3221. 59. Lanzkron S, Strouse JJ, Wilson R, et al. Systematic review: Hydroxyurea for the treatment of adults with sickle cell disease. Ann Intern Med 2008;148(12):939-55. 60. Nevitt SJJ, Ashley P.; Howard, Jo. Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2017;4:CD002202. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD002202.pub2 61. Steinberg MH, Barton F, Castro O, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on mortality and morbidity in adult sickle cell anemia: risks and benefits up to 9 years of treatment. JAMA 2003;289(13):1645-51. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.13.1645

62. Niihara YM, S.; Razon, R.; Claggett, B.; Onyekwere, O. C.; Ikeda, A.; Singleton, T.; Wood, A. K.; Singh, R.; Tran, L.; Stark, C. W. Phase 3 study of l-glutamine in sickle cell disease: Analyses of

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	time to first and second crisis and average cumulative recurrent events. <i>Blood Conference:</i> 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017;130(Supplement 1) 63. Niihara Y, Miller ST, Kanter J, et al. A Phase 3 Trial of I-Glutamine in Sickle Cell Disease. <i>New</i> England Journal of Medicine 2018;379(3):226-35. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1715971 64. Quinn CT. I-Glutamine for sickle cell anemia: more questions than answers. <i>Blood</i> 2018;132(7):689-93. doi: 10.1182/blood-2018-03-834440
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	
33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	
54 55 56 57 58 59 60	

**BMJ** Open



60



Figure 1. SCD Prisma Flow Chart 209x297mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 2. Evidence networks

\* Each node represent a treatment and nodes are connected by an edge if at least trial has compared the relevant treatments. Any two treatments can be compared if their corresponding nodes can be connected by a path of one or more edges.

High-dose Crizanlizumab=5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. Low-Dose Crizanlizumab=2.5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose

Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily. 5 RCTs on crisis = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo), Ataga 2011 (senicapoc vs. placebo), Ataga 2008 (senicapoc low-dose, senicapoc high-dose vs. placebo), and Pace 2003 (NAC low, mid, and high dose vs. placebo). 4 RCTs on all-cause hospitalization days = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo), Glassberg 2017 (mometasome vs. placebo), and Sins 2017 (NAC vs. placebo). 5 RCTs on adverse events = Glassberg 2017 (mometasome vs placebo), Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Ataga 2011 (senicapoc vs placebo), Sins 2017 (NAC vs placebo), and Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo). 5 RCTs on serious adverse events = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Sins 2017 (NAC vs placebo), Wun 2013 (prasugrel vs placebo), NCT02482298 (TICAGRELOR vs placebo), and Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo).

291x185mm (192 x 192 DPI)

**BMJ** Open



57 58 59

60





Figure 3. Forest plot

\*Hazard ratio less than 1 suggests lower hazard of event on the crizanlizumab. Bayesian probabilities of superiority are proportion of MCMC samples for which crizanlizumab vs comparator hazard ratio is above (inferior) or below (superior) 1.

High-dose Crizanlizumab=5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. Low-Dose Crizanlizumab=2.5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose

Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

Page 21 of 151			BMJ Ope	n	/bmjopen-2019 .cted by copyri	
2 3 Appendi	x A: Characteristics	s and outcomes of studies in	cluded in the ne	etwork meta-analysis*	9-0341 ight, ir	
Author/Year/Country Ref/Enrolment/NCT registry	Design Total N of PT (N of female); N of arm Follow-ups	Interventions	Crisis	All-cause Hospitalization days	Adverse events (AE) din 17 g fo	Serious adverse events (SAE)
8 Glassberg 2017 <sup>47</sup> 9 USA 10 11	RCT, triple-blind Adults and adolescents	<ol> <li>Mometasone furoate 220mcg OD inhale (n=35)</li> <li>In addition to standard SCD care</li> </ol>		Rate hospitalization days: 2.67	Total number of AE032 Total number of SE mber seigner ate	
13 NCT02061202 14 15	Single centre 54 (23); 2 16 weeks	2. Placebo (n=17) In addition to standard SCD care		Rate of hospitalization days: 4.09	d deg Total number of text Superior text an	
Ataga 2017 <sup>15</sup> Brazil, Jamaica, USA 19 20 Aug 2013 to Jan 2015 21 NCT01895361	RCT, double-blind Adults and adolescents Multicentre	<ol> <li>Crizanlizumab 5 mg/kg IV (n=67)</li> <li>Two doses 2 weeks apart (loading dose) and then every 4 weeks. A total of 14 doses for 50 weeks</li> </ol>	Median annual rate of crisis 1.63	Annual rate of days hospitalized 4.00	Number of patha BES) . ≥1 AE: 57 mining.	Number of patients with ≥1 SAE: 17
22 23 24 25 26	198 (109); 3 52 weeks	<ul> <li>2. Crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg IV (n=66)</li> <li>Two doses 2 weeks apart (loading dose) and then every 4 weeks. A total of 14 doses for 50 weeks</li> </ul>	Median annual rate of crisis 2.01	Annual rate of days hospitalized 6.87	Number of pat <mark>rainis</mark> ≥1 AE: 56 aning, and	Number of patients with ≥1 SAE: 21
27 28 29		3. Placebo (n=65)	Median annual rate of crisis 2.98	Annual rate of days hospitalized 6.87	Number of patents with ≥1 AE: 55	Number of patients with ≥1 SAE: 17
30 Sins 2017 <sup>48</sup> 31 Netherlands, Belgium, 32 UK	RCT, double-blind Adults	1. NAC 600mg BID oral (n=27)		Total hospital admission days: 9	Total number of AE Tag 9 Total number of AE Tag 9 Total number of AE Tag 9	Total number of SAE: 8
33 34 35 Apr 2013 to Nov 2015 36 NCT01849016 37	Multicentre 96 (40); 2 6 months	2. Placebo (n=40)		Total hospital admission days: 53	Total number 😴 AE <table-cell> 6 S. at Age</table-cell>	Total number of SAE: 2
38 Niihara 2018 <sup>12</sup> 39 US 40	RCT, double-blind (phase 3)	1. L-glutamine 0.3 g/kg BID oral (n=152) Maximum dose: 30mg	Mean number pain crises: 3.2	Total hospitalization days: 12.1	Percentage with ≥1 0.98 Bi	Percentage with ≥1 SAE: 0.782
42 43 44 45 46 47		For peer review only - ht	tp://bmjopen.bmj	j.com/site/about/guidelir	nes.xhtml de	

			BMJ Ope	en	/bmjopen-2	Page 22 of 151
1 2 3 Jun 2010 to Dec 2013 4 NCT01179217	Adults and children 2. pla Multicentre	icebo (n=78)	Mean number pain crises: 3.9	Total hospitalization days: 18.1	Vright Percentage witti≥1445: 1.00	Percentage with ≥1 SAE: 0.87
6	230 (124); 2				on 17 Iding	
/ ο Δtaga 2011 <sup>56</sup>	BCT_double-blind (phase 3	1 Senicanoc 20mg/d BID	(loading) and then	Total number of	for Se	
o United	terminated early)	10mg/dOD oral (n=145)	(louding) and then	crises: 89		Total number of AE:
10 11 States, Jamaica, Brazil, France Trinidad and	Adults and adolescents				amber 2 Inseigne ses relat	127
12 the United	Multicentre	2. Placebo (n=144)		Total number of	ed 02	Total number of AE:
13 Kingdom. 14	297 (160); 2			crises: 106	). Dov ent Si to te	119
15	52 weeks				ct pe	
16 Feb 2005 to Apr 2007 17 NCT00102791		$\rho_{\rm o}$			oade Prieur Ind da	
18 Ataga 2008 <sup>52</sup> 19 US	RCT, double-blind (phase 2)	1. Senicapoc (high-dose): mg/d (maintenance) oral (	150 mg (loading dose OD (n=31)	e); 10 Total number of crises: 5	d from (ABE: ata mii	
20	Adults					
21 22 Feb 2002 and Jan 2004	Multicentre	2. Senicapoc (low-dose): 1 mg/d(maintenance) oral C	.00 mg (loading dose DD (n=29)	); 6 Total number of crises: 5	; g, Al t	
23 NCT00040877 24	90 (45); 3	3. Placebo (n=30)		Total number of crises: 5	mjope	
25 Pace 2003 <sup>51</sup> 26 USA	RCT, double-blind	1. NAC (high-dose) 2400m	ng/day (n=6)	Total number of crises: 5	n.bmj jg, an	
27	Adults and Adolescents	All doses were divided by	3 to be taken		d . S	
28 29	Single centre	2. NAC (mid-dose) 1200m	g/day (n=5)	Total number of crises: 5	imilar	
30 31	21 (10); 4	All doses were divided by	3 to be taken		tech	
32 33	7 months	3. NAC (low-dose) 600 mg	/day (n=5)	Total number of crises: 4	∍ 14, <i>;</i> nolog	
34		All doses were divided by	3 to be taken		ies 202	
35		4. Placebo (n=5)		Total number of crises: 3	5 at	
37 NCT02482298 <sup>55</sup> 37 USA, Egypt, France,	RCT, double-blind	1. Ticagrelor 45mg BID ora	al (n=30)		\genc	Total number of SAE: 5
39 UK, Turkey 40	Adults	2. Ticagrelor 10MG BID or	al (n=27)		e Biblio	Total number of SAE: 6
41 42 43 44 45 46 47		For peer review only - h	ttp://bmjopen.bm	ıj.com/site/about/guidelir	graphique les.xhtml de	

Pa	ge 23 of 151		BMJ Open d by pe	
1 2			copyrigh	
3 4 5	Jul 2015 to Nov 2016	Multicentre 87 (47); 3	1. Placebo (n =30)	Total number of SAE: 6
6		12 weeks		
7	Wun 2013 <sup>46</sup>	RCT, double-blind (phase 2)	1. Prasugrel 5 mg/day oral (n=41)	Total number of
8	United States and		or c p	SAE: 8
9	Canada	Adults	v <u>n</u> e	
10		Multicoptro	2. placebo (n=19)	Total number of
11	26 Aug 2010 to 13 lun	62 (30): 2		SAE: 4
12	2011	02 (30), 2	emp emp	
13	NCT01167023		to ent p	
14			tê x c x	
15				
16	*ACS: Acute of	chest syndrome; ALT: Alanine transa	minase; CA: Conference abstract; Cr: creatinine; CSRPM: Center for Scientific Research into Plant Medicine C a window in the registry; DDCF: Doris Duke	
1/	Charitable Fo	undation; ED: emergency departme	nt; HbSS: Homozygous sickle haemoglobin (HbS); HbSC: sickle haemoglobin S and haemoglobin C; HbSb: sice beat thalassemia, type '0' or '+'; HU:	
18	National Heat	rt Lung and Blood Institute: NSAID: N	Jonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: NR: Not reported: OOPD: EDA's Office of Orphan Products Development 20 research resources, NHEDI.	
19	TCD: transcra	anial Doppler; ZonMw: The Netherlar	ands Organisation for Health Research and Development	
20				
21	** Entry is bla	ank if no data provided for crisis, all-	cause hospitalization days, adverse events, or serious adverse events. See appendix for relevant link function to connect different outcome	
22	summaries to	o network meta-analysis.		
23			a i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
24				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31			Š H	
32				
33				
34				
35			د. م	
36				
37			ge	
38			псе	
39				
40				
41			ogr	
42			ai D	
43				
44				
45			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
46			-	
47				

### Appendix B: Additional details of Systematic literature review

### A.1 Literature search strategies for non-transfusions SLR

Table 1: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of MEDLINE

#	Searches	Concept
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
3	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp length of stay/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	_
7	or/1-6	
8	anemia, sickle cell/	Population
9	hemoglobin, sickle/	_
10	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	exp antisickling agents/	Interventions
13	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or L-glutamine or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	meta analysis.pt.	Systematic review
18	((meta adj analys*) or metaanalys or meta-analys*).ti,ab,sh.	and meta-analysis
19	(systematic adj5 (review or overview*)).ti,ab,sh.	studies
20	or/17-19	
21	16 and 20	
22	clinical trial/	RCTs
23	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	

r
Z
3
4
-
5
6
7
,
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
15
14
15
16
10
17
18
10
19
20
21
22
22
23
24
21
25
26
27
20
28
29
30
50
31
32
22
55
34
35
26
30
37
38
20
22
40
41
12
42
43
44
15
45
46
47
40
48
49
50
E 1
эι
52
53
55
54
55
56
50
5/
58
50

#	Searches	Concept
24	single blind method/	
25	double blind method/	
26	random allocation/	
27	placebos/	
28	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	
29	randomized controlled trial/	
30	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	
31	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	
32	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	
33	or/22-32	
34	16 and 33	
	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or	Single arm trial
35	follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	
20	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case	
36	control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	
27	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or	
57	prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
28	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or	
50	data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	
39	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	
40	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	_
41	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	
42	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	
12	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no	
43	control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	
<u>م</u> ۸	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or	
44	studies)).ti,ab,kf.	
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	-
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	
47	(all adj3 received).ab.	
48	or/35-47	
49	16 and 48	

3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
50 51
21
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
ΔΔ
44
45
40
4/
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
52

1 2

#	Searches	Concept
50	limit 21 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on rSLR and meta-analysis
		studies
51	limit 34 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on RCTs
52	limit 49 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on single arm trials

### Table 2: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of EMBASE

#	Searches	
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein	
3	occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp "length of stay"/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
7	or/1-6	
8	sickle cell anemia/	Population
9	hemoglobin S/	
	(sickle cell or sickle h\$emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
10	h\$emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an\$emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	antisickling agent/	Intervention
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling	
13	agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or	
	velaresol or crizanlizumab or L-glutamine or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	randomized controlled trial/	RCTs
18	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	

#	Searches	
	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide*	
19	or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or	
	treat*)).ab,kw.	_
20	trial.ti.	_
21	crossover procedure/	
22	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
23	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	
24	or/17-23	
25	16 and 24	
26	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/	Single-arm trials
27	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	
28	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	-
29	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	
30	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
31	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	
32	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	
33	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	_
34	(all adj3 received).ab.	
35	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	
36	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw.	1
37	or/26-36	
38	16 and 37	
39	limit 25 to em=201705-201825	Date limit on RCTs
40	limit 38 to em-201705-201825	Date limit on singl

#	Searches	
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	Outcomes
#2	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein	
#3	occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	
#4	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	
#5	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#6	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#7	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6	
#8	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	Population
#9	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	
	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
#10	h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	
#11	#8 or #9 or #10	
#12	MeSH descriptor: [Antisickling Agents] explode all trees	Interventio
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling	
#13	agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or	
	velaresol or crizanlizumab or L-glutamine or voxelotor or GBT440):ti,ab,kw	
#14	(#8 or #9 or #10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*	
#15	#11 or #12 or #13	
	#7 and #11 and #14	

### ials

### Table 6: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of ClinicalTrials.gov\*

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Drug OR Placebo OR Crizanlizumab OR Hydroxyurea OR L-glutamine OR Voxelotor OR GBT440 OR hydroxycarbamide	Intervention/treatment
#4	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	Outcome Measures
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

### A.2 Literature search strategies for transfusions SLR

### Table 4: Search strategy for transfusions search on CENTRAL database

#	Searches	Results
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	583
#2	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	19
#3	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	4790
#4	#1 or #2 or #3	4790
#5	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Transfusion] this term only	1766
#6	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocyte Transfusion] explode all trees	564
#7	((blood or erythrocyte* or "red cell*" or "red blood cell*" or RBC*) near/5 (transfus* or infus* or unit*))	14775
#8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) near/5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program* or therapy)):ab	30189
#9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)):ti	3612
#10	("allogeneic blood" or (unit* near/2 blood) or "allogenic blood" or (blood near/2 exposure) or "donor blood" or "blood product*" or "blood component*" or "blood support")	3365
#11	hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*	107
#12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*) and transfus*:ti	2434
#13	#5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12	41927
#14	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Component Transfusion] this term only	115
#15	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocytes] this term only	1478
#16	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*)	12756
#17	#14 and (#15 or #16)	39
#18	#13 or #17	41927
#10		1
#19	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	42323

#	Coarshoo	Beaulta
#	Searches	Results
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion"	
#21	or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-	4404
	occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	
#22	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	6488
#23	hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	20854
#24	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	1779
#25	#19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24	153780
#26	#4 and #18 and #25	332

### Table 5: Search strategy for transfusions search on MEDLINE database

#	Searches	Results
1	anemia, sickle cell/	19329
2	hemoglobin, sickle/	3011
3	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	27120
4	1 or 2 or 3	27602
5	Blood Transfusion/	48056
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	8033
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	90906
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	47785
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	35184
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	26829
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1217
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	24060
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	183648
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	3477
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	16726

3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
10
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
27
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
37
32 33
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
- <del>1</del> 0 //1
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
50
20
59

#	Searches	Result
16	14 not 15	3229
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	128578
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	216650
19	17 or 18	258199
20	16 and 19	834
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	13177
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	3326
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	18802
24	exp pain/	362648
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	547392
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso- occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	66169
27	exp length of stay/	77857
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	104873
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	6507
30	or/24-29	901074
31	4 and 23 and 30	848
32	clinical trial/	51214
33	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	1010
34	single blind method/	25632
35	double blind method/	14736
36	random allocation/	95709
37	placebos/	34063
38	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	126392
39	randomized controlled trial/	467730
40	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	786522
41	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	14521
42	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	6481
40	or/32_42	156516

#	Searches	Results
44	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	2187051
45	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	1071161
46	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	615678
47	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	340559
48	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	18409
49	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	29604
50	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	14110
51	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	139501
52	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	53439
53	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	114108
54	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	34084
55	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	2644
56	(all adj3 received).ab.	41192
57	or/44-56	3114626
58	31 and 43	120
59	31 and 57	278



Table 6: Search strategy for transfusions search on EMBASE databa	ise
---	-----

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	exp Anemia, Sickle Cell/ (h?emoglobin s or h?emoglobin sc or h?emoglobin se or h?emoglobin ss or h?emoglobin c or h?emoglobin d or Hb s or Hb sc or Hb se or Hb ss or Hb c or Hb d or sc disease*).tw. (sickle cell or sicklemia or sickled or sickling or meniscocyt* or drepanocyt*).tw. 1 or 2 or 3 Blood Transfusion/ Erythrocyte Transfusion/ ((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) adj or utiliz* or utilis*	32009 5794 29569 38361 108332 23021 135137 77239
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(h?emoglobin s or h?emoglobin sc or h?emoglobin se or h?emoglobin ss or h?emoglobin c or h?emoglobin d or Hb s or Hb sc or Hb se or Hb ss or Hb c or Hb d or sc disease*).tw. (sickle cell or sicklemia or sickled or sickling or meniscocyt* or drepanocyt*).tw. 1 or 2 or 3 Blood Transfusion/ Erythrocyte Transfusion/ ((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) adj0 or utiliz* or utiliz*	5794 29569 38361 108332 23021 135137 77239
3 4 5 6 7 8	(sickle cell or sicklemia or sickled or sickling or meniscocyt* or drepanocyt*).tw. 1 or 2 or 3 Blood Transfusion/ Erythrocyte Transfusion/ ((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	29569 38361 108332 23021 135137 77239
4 5 6 7 8	1 or 2 or 3 Blood Transfusion/ Erythrocyte Transfusion/ ((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	38361 108332 23021 135137 77239
5 6 7 8	Blood Transfusion/ Erythrocyte Transfusion/ ((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	108332 23021 135137 77239
6 7 8	Erythrocyte Transfusion/ ((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	23021 135137 77239
7 8	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or utiliz* or utiliz* or utilis*	135137 77239
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab. ((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	77239
	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	+
9	or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	38387
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	43111
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1555
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	28985
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	273982
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	2629
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	19765
16	14 not 15	2279
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	112741
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	256379
19	17 or 18	278120
20	16 and 19	523
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	22304
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	4095
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	279695

5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
27	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
50 77	
3/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
رب ۱	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
57	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

1

#	Searches	Results
24	exp pain/	1146280
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	789805
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	82887
27	exp length of stay/	150699
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	169748
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	12514
30	or/24-29	1690290
31	4 and 23 and 30	2325
32	randomized controlled trial/	508600
33	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	1062285
34	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide* or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw.	560662
35	trial.ti.	248694
36	crossover procedure/	56042
37	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	276112
38	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	99658
39	or/32-38	1386841
40	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/	1771952
41	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	1282224
42	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	790240
43	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	500633
44	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	183687
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	42777
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	3333
47	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	80316
48	(all adj3 received).ab.	75969
#	Searches	Results
----	--	---------
49	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	126474
50	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw.	205403
51	or/40-50	3180246
52	31 and 39	245
53	31 and 51	599

### Table 7: Search strategy for transfusions search on clinicaltrials.gov database

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Transfusion OR blood OR RBC OR hematocrit OR erythrocyte	Intervention/treatment
	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis	Outcome Measures
#4	OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR	
	interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

## A.3 Additional results from systematic literature review

Table 8: Cochrane risk of bias assessment of randomized controlled trials included in the feasibility assessment

Trial ID	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (personnal)	Blinding (outcome assessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Arruda 2013	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	None
Ataga 2008	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
Ataga 2011	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of

~
2
3
4
4
5
6
-
7
8
~
9
10
11
11
12
13
15
14
15
10
10
17
18
10
19
20
21
21
22
22
~ .
24
25
26
26
27
28
20
29
30
20
31
32
22
22
34
35
22
36
37
20
20
39
40
40
41
42
42
43
44
45
-13
46
47
10
4ŏ
49
50
51
52
52
22
54
55
56
57
E0
20
59
60
00

Trial ID	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (personnal)	Blinding (outcome assessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
							interest of authors
Ataga 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
Bao 2008	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
Cabannes 1984	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Baseline imbalances or not assessed
Deceulaer 1982	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed; Industry funded
Diop 2011	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
Glassberg 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
NCT02482298	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded
Niihara 2018	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	High	Low	Industry funded
Pace 2003	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	High	Low	Industry funded
Schlaeger 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
Sins 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	None
Tomer 2001	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Baseline imbalances
Wun 2013	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded
Adegoke 2013	Low	Unclear	High	High	High	Unclear	No placebo used in control group
Alvim 2005	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	None
Charnigo 2017	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Subset of a RCT database
Daak 2013	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded
Daak 2018	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed
de Abood 1997	High	High	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed; No placebo used in control group
Eke 2003	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Baseline imbalances or not assessed

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Trial ID	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (personnal)	Blinding (outcome assessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Gail 1982	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	None
Gupta 1995	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	None
Heeney 2016	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
lsaacs 1972	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed; Industry funded
Mann 1974	Unclear	Unclear	High	High	Low	Unclear	Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study; No placebo used in control group
Manrique 1987	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	None
Oski 1968	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Industry funded; Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study
Reid 2014	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
Vinchinsky 2010	Unclear	Unclear	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	Industry funded
Wambebe 2001	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study
Zago 1984	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	High	Unclear	Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study

\* Note: Trial bolded were base case studies; Trials shaded in grey were not included in the final network meta-analyses.

Outcom

3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
/	
8	
9	
1	0
1	1
1	י ר
	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	, 0
	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
ר ר	2
2	2
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	۰ ۵
2	~
2	9
3	0
3	1
3	2
3	3
2	1
י ר	-
5	S
3	6
3	7
3	8
3	9
1	ń
7	1
4	1
4	2
4	3
4	4
4	5
⊿	6
-т л	7
4	/ c
4	8
4	9
5	0
5	1
5	ว
7	∠ ว
5	5
5	4
5	5
5	6
5	7
5	, Q
ר ר	0
5	9
6	0

1 2

			comparability		```	Jucconn					
Trial ID	Representativeness of the exposed	Selection of the nonpexposed	Ascertainment of exposure	Outcome of interest not present at start	Comparability: basic characteristics	Comparability: additional factors	Assessment of Outcome	Follow-Up Long Enough	Adequacy of follow- up		
Al Hashmi 2017		*	*		*				*	4	
Brandalise 2017		*	*		*	*	*		*	6	
Bridges 2017		*	*	-	-				*	3	
Bumma 2017		*	*		*					3	
Colombatti 2018	*	*	*		*	0		*	*	6	
Di Maggio 2018	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	7	
Hoppe 2017	*	*			*					3	
Keikhaei 2015	*	*	*						*	4	
Kwiatkowski 2017	*	*						*	*	4	
LeBlanc 2016		*	*	*				*	*	5	
Lemonne 2017		*	*				*	*	*	5	
NCT01476696		*							*	2	
Quarmyne 2017	*	*	*		*			*		5	
Rigano 2018	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	7	
Sethy 2018	*	*	*					*	*	5	
Styles 2010		*	*	*						3	
Youssry 2017	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	7	

Table 9: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment of non-randomized controlled trials included in the feasibility assessment

Comparability

Coloctio

4
5
6
7
8
a
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
77 15
45
40
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60



Figure 1: Cochrane assessment of randomized controlled trials included in the feasibility assessment for peer terier on

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table 10: Study characteristics of	trials included in the	feasibility assessment
------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

	Registry number	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Countiry
Adegoke 2013		Lime juice + Routine oral drugs	Control (Routine oral drugs)			Open	RCT	6 months	Nige Red t
Alvim 2005		Piracetam	Placebo	5		Double- blind	RCT, crossover	1 year (6 months, then crossover with 2 weeks washout	Saudext and data I Saudext and data I
Arruda 2013		Placebo	Vitamins C and	0		Double-	RCT	period) 180 days	Brazini
Ataga 2008	NCT00040677	Senicapoc (high-dose)	Senicapoc (low- dose)	Placebo		Double- blind	RCT	12 week	US 🤤 · P
Ataga 2011	NCT00102791	Senicapoc	Placebo		C	Double- blind	RCT	52 weeks	United State Jamana, Brazio France, Trinited a the United
Ataga 2017	NCT01895361	Crizanlizumab (high- dose)	Crizanlizumab (low-dose)	Placebo		Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	52 weeks	Brazita Jamara, L
Bao 2008		Zinc	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	3 months	US tech
Cabannes 1984		Ticlopidine	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	6 months	Afric
Charnigo 2017		PF-04447943	Placebo				RCT (Phase 1b)	29 days	 gies
Daak 2013	ISRCTN80844630	Omega-3	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	1 year	Sudan
Daak 2018		AltemiaTM	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	2 months	USA

d by copyright, including jopen-2019-034147 on 17

Page 42	of 151	
---------	--------	--

									0
Trial	Registry number	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
de Abood 1997		DMPA	Levonorgestrel + ethinyl estradiol	Surgical sterilized (iniectable)		Double- blind	RCT	12 months	Spair <mark>ses re</mark>
Deceulaer 1982		Medroxyprogesterone acetate	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT, crossover	2 years (9 months, then crossover after 6 months washout)	Jamement Superi Jamed to text an
Diop 2011		Sulfadoxine- pyrimethamine	Placebo			Open	RCT	3 months	Senegal da
Eke 2003		Placebo (Vitamin c)	Proguanil			Open	RCT (Phase 2)	9 months	Nige A
Gail 1982		Urea	Control			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	Average: 13.7 months	Ghan
Glassberg 2017	NCT02061202	Mometasone furoate	Placebo			Triple- blind	RCT	16 weeks	US Ç
Gupta 1995		Zinc	Placebo		C	Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	1.5 years	India
Heeney 2016	NCT01794000	Prasugrel	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 3)	A minimum of 9 months and a maximum of 24 months	Ametras, Eurose, As and Astrica
lsaacs 1972		Steroid (Testoserone/ Progesterone)	Saline				RCT, crossover (preliminary report before crossover)	4-6 months	Nige Nige
Mann 1974		Folic acid	Folic acid + Sodium bicarbonate				RCT, crossover	2 years (crossover after 1 year, no washout)	UK UK
Manrique 1987		Pentoxifylline	Placebo				RCT (Phase 2)	6 weeks	Brazil
NCT02482298	NCT02482298	Ticagrelor 45 mg	Ticagrelor 10 mg	Placebo		Double- blind	RCT	12 weeks	USA, Egypt France, Ita
	I		For peer revie	ew only - http	p://bmjopen.	bmj.com/	/site/about/	guidelines.»	khtml

Page 43 of 151

Trial	Registry number	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
									Keny
									Lebano Con
									Turkey 6. 9
Niihara 2018	NCT01179217	L-glutamine	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 3)	48 weeks	USA ated
Oski 1968		Promazine	Placebo			Double-	RCT,	3 months	
		hydrochloride				blind	crossover		
Pace 2003		NAC (high-dose)	NAC (mid-dose)	NAC (low-	Placebo	Double-	RCT	7 months	
				dose)		blind			
Reid 2014	NCT01601340	HQK-1001	Placebo	5		Double- blind	RCT	48 weeks	United ried
									Leba
									Egyp
									Jama
									Cana <b>d</b> a <b>()</b>
Schlaeger 2017		Pregabalin	Placebo		j-	Double- blind	RCT	3 months	USA G
Sins 2017	NCT01849016	NAC	Placebo			Double-	RCT	6 months	Netheland
						blind			Belgi🖬n, U <mark>K</mark>
Styles 2010		GMI-1070					Single-arm	1 month	USA inir
Tomer 2001		mehaden fish oil	Placebo (olive			Double-	RCT	12 months	US 🧔 🔁
			oil)			blind			ରୁ ମୁ
Vichinsky 2010		Transfusion	Standard of care				RCT		
Wambebe 2001		Niprisan	Placebo			Phase 2	RCT,	13 months	Nige 🔂 🗧
							crossover	(6 months	ilao
							(Phase 2)	per	
								treatment,	ie L
								1-month	j j
								washout in-	€ 1
								between)	- <del>-</del> 4
Wun 2013	NCT01167023	Prasugrel	Placebo			Double-	RCT (Phase	30 days	Unit States
						blind	2)		and Canada
Zago 1984		Aspirin	Placebo				RCT,	10 months	Brazil 0
						1	crossover	(5 months	H H
							(Phase 2)	per	Ac
								treatment)	l e

hce Bibliographique de l

d by copyright, including jopen-2019-034147 on 17

Page	44	of	1	5	1
------	----	----	---	---	---

Trial	<b>Registry number</b>	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
Al Hashmi 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	6 months	Oma
Brandalise 2017		Methotrexate					Single-arm	12 weeks	Brazi
Bridges 2017		GBT440					Single-arm	10 weeks	Unclear
Bumma 2017		Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programme					Single-arm	1 year	d to t
Colombatti 2018	NCT02709681	Hydroxyurea	0 k				Single-arm	1 years	Italy X
Di Maggio 2018		Hydroxyurea		5			Single-arm	Mean: 6.6 years	Italy nd o
Hoppe 2017	NCT00508027	Simvastatin					Single-arm	3 months	USA a
Keikhaei 2015		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	1 year	Iran B
Kwiatkowski 2017		Deferiprone		(			Single-arm	1 year	USA
LeBlanc 2016	NCT02709681	Methadone					Single-arm	Mean: 2.1 years	USA E
Lemonne 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	2 years	Guadello
NCT01476696	NCT01476696	Prasugrel				-	Single-arm (Phase 2 part B)	28 days	USA <b>ning</b> ,
Quarmyne 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	3 months	USA <b>and</b>
Rigano 2018		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	Median: 7 years	Italy SI.
Sethy 2018		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	12 months	India <b>a</b>
Youssry 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	up to 120 months	Egyp
ote: Trial bolded we	re base case studies; Trio	als shaded in grey were not inclu	ided in the final netw	ork meta-analyses.					nologies.
			For peer revie	ew only - http	o://bmjopen.l	omj.com/	/site/about/	′quidelines.	khtml

Table 11: Eligibility criteria of RCTs included in the feasibility assessment	
---	--

TrialInterventionsAgeGenotypepain/crises/complicationshydroxyurea treatment(exclusion criteria)content inclusion (exclusion criteria)Adegoke 2013Lime juice + Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil) vs Control (Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil))Steady state (no painful episode, anemic crisis, or infection on the day of recruitment)No hydroxyurea treatmentNo to on any other alternative medicine commonly used by spatients with SCA in Nigeria such as Aloe gel, Moringa oleifera Solamine syrup, and Discriovite suspension and or Nicosan (Nipr capsuleAlvim 2005Piracetam vs Placebo5-20 years yearsNo hydroxyurea treatmentRegular blood transfusion programmesArruda 2013Placebo vs Vitamins C and E≥ 18 yearsHbSS or HbSβ0°    
Adegoke 2013Lime juice + Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil) vs Control (Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil))Steady state (no painful episode, anemic crisis, or infection on the day of recruitment)No hydroxyurea treatment Not on any other alternative medicine commonly used by spatients with SCA in Nigeria such as Aloe gel, Moringa oleifera Solamine syrup, and Ciklavit (Cajanus caja suspension as well day Discriovite suspension and or Nicosan (Nipr capsuleAlvim 2005Piracetam vs Placebo5-20 years state stateNo hydroxyurea treatmentRegular blood transfusion programmes supersion as well day Discriovite suspension and or Nicosan (Nipr capsuleArruda 2013Placebo vs Vitamins C and E≥ 18 yearsHbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup> supersion supersion supersion supersion supersion supersion supersion supersion supersion treatment supersion sup
Alvim 2005Piracetam vs Placebo5-20 yearsNo hydroxyurea treatmentRegular blood transfusion programmesArruda 2013Placebo vs Vitamins C and E $\geq 18$ yearsHbSS or HbS $\beta^0$ Other investigational drugs in the last 12
Arruda 2013Placebo vs Vitamins C and E $\geq 18$ yearsHbSS or HbS $\beta^0$ Other investigational drugs in the last 12
months

**Commented [HT1]:** Vincent, is this the best table to use for patient characteristics? Note that I've added Vichinsky 2010 and Styles 2010 which weren't in the report.

<u> </u>	<u> </u>
çq	ð
ត្ត	eņ
ß	2
Yr.	ž
ğ	Ä
,ŧ	Ğ
ij	4
ŝ	7
J	9
Ĵu	ج
f	70

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Ataga 2008	Senicapoc (high- dose) vs Senicapoc (low-dose) vs Placebo	18-60 years	HbSS	≥ 1 nacute sickle- related painful episode that had required hospitalization, but none in the 4 weeks prior to screening	Stable dose for a minimum of 3 months at study enrollment.	Received a transfusion within 30 days of enrollment or undergone an exchange transfusion within 60 days of enrollment	One or more nonallowing of the one of more nonallowing of the one one of the one of the one of the one of the
Ataga 2011	Senicapoc vs Placebo	16-65 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> , HbSβ⁺	≥ 2 acute sickle- related painful crises in the previous 12 months	Received hydroxyurea for the preceding 12 months and their dose was stabilized for at least 3 months prior to the study	Participated in a chronic transfusion programme	Received previous ing treatment with senigopoind similar techn
Ataga 2017	Crizanlizumab (high-dose) vs Crizanlizumab (low-dose) vs Placebo	16-65 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ⁰, HbSβ⁺	2-10 SCD-related pain crises in the 12 months before enrollment		Undergoing long-term red- cell transfusion therapy	ologies.
			For p	peer review only - h	ittp://bmjopen.bm	ıj.com/site/abo	ut/guidelines.xhtml e

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicat ଡାନ୍ତ (exclusion criteria)
Bao 2008	Zinc vs Placebo		HbSS		No hydroxyurea treatment	receiving > 6 transfusions per year	ed to tex
Cabannes 1984	Ticlopidine vs Placebo			T Do			Received no antisick
Charnigo 2017	PF-04447943 vs Placebo		SCD		2		ABES) a minii
Daak 2013	Omega-3 vs Placebo			Steady state, defined as no evidence of fever, infection, or crisis for .4 wk before the start of the study	No hydroxyurea treatment	Prescence of blood transfusion	ng, Al training, and
Daak 2018	AltemiaTM vs Placebo	5–17 years		2-10 documented sickle cell crises during the 12 months prior to screening	Either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea	*	similar techno
de Abood 1997	DMPA vs Levonorgestrel + ethinyl estradiol vs Surgical sterilized (injectable)						logies.
			For	peer review only - h	http://bmjopen.bm	nj.com/site/abo	ut/guidelines.xhtml

jopen-2019-034147 on 1

					BMJ Ope	en	i by copyright, including to	the approximate including fo
Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicatত (exclusion criteria)	Dris
Deceulaer 1982	Medroxyprogester one acetate vs Placebo						ed to tex	ment Su
Diop 2011	Sulfadoxine- pyrimethamine vs Placebo			- Do			and dat	perieur (
Eke 2003	Placebo (Vitamin c) vs Proguanil	1-16 years	HbSS	-	2		min	ABES)
Gail 1982	Urea vs Control		HbSS				<sup>n</sup> g, v	ž • .
Glassberg 2017	Mometasone furoate vs Placebo	≥ 15 years	HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	< 15 ED visits for SCD pain over the prior 12 months	- '9			l trainin
Gupta 1995	Zinc vs Placebo	> 5 years	HbSS			- 61	Patients on drug the for some other dise	apy e
Heeney 2016	Prasugrel vs Placebo	2-18 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	≥2 VOC in the year prior to screening		History of chronic RBC transfusion for prevention of stroke or current chronic treatment with RBC for any reason.	similar technologies.	himilar taabaalaaina
			For p	beer review only - h	nttp://bmjopen.bm	nj.com/site/abo	ut/guidelines.xhtml	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicatତନ୍ତ (exclusion criteria)
Isaacs 1972	Steroid (Testoserone/Prog esterone) vs Saline		HbSS	Moderately severe pain at least once in 3 months (with little or no fever or exacerbations of jaundice)			ed to text and dat
Mann 1974	Folic acid vs Folic acid + Sodium bicarbonate	5-17 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ	Previously suffered painful crises	2		ABES) . a mining
Manrique 1987	Pentoxifylline vs Placebo		HbSS		- 0		, Al tra
NCT02482298 2017	Ticagrelor 45 mg vs Ticagrelor 10 mg vs Placebo	18-30 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>		Dose must have been stable for 3 months	Treatment with chronic red blood cell transfusion therapy.	Chronic treatment with anticoagulants or g antiplatelet drugs and sin
Niihara 2018	L-glutamine vs Placebo	> 5 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	≥ 2 pain crises (no upper limit) documented during the previous year	Stable dose within 3 months and continue during the trial	Received any blood products within 3 weeks before screening	Received treatment with I-glutamine within 38 days before the screaming
Oski 1968	Promazine hydrochloride vs Placebo			≥2 painful episodes during			<sup>9</sup>
			For p	peer review only - h	http://bmjopen.bm	nj.com/site/abo	ut/guidelines.xhtml

jopen-2019-034147 on 17 1 by copyright, including

at Agence Bibliographique de l

							รับ
Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicatରନ୍ତ (exclusion criteria)
			K	the 2 year period prior to study.			ed to tex
Pace 2003	NAC (high-dose) vs NAC (mid-dose) vs NAC (low-dose) vs Placebo	> 15 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	With dense cells greater than 6% and 2 or more VOC episodes per year for the 2 years prior to enrollment		Chronic transfusions	Investigational drug and data mining, therapy
Reid 2014	HQK-1001 vs Placebo	12-60 years	HbSS, HbSβ	≥ 1 acute SCD- related complication or leg ulcers in 12 months	No current (i.e., within 3 months prior to enrolment) hydroxyurea treatment	Regular transfusion program or transfusion in the preceding 3 months unless Hb A had decreased to less than 20%	Al training, and similar tech
Schlaeger 2017	Pregabalin vs Placebo	18-82 years		Pain now score ≥ 4 on a 0-10 scale at registration			e 14, 202 inologies

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicat	0rs
Sins 2017	NAC vs Placebo	≥ 12 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ⁰, HbSβ⁺	≥ 1 VOC per year in the past 3 years	Stable dose for 6 months piror to study	Chronic blood transfusion or transfusion in the preceding 3 months	Use of pain medicati for sickle-cell related pains on more than days per month in th past 6 months	ement Superie em to fexternd
Styles 2010	GMI-1070	18-50 years	HbSS and HBSB0thal					ur (ABES) . data mining
Tomer 2001	mehaden fish oil vs Placebo (olive oil)	≥ 18 years		Frequent pain episodes (≥3 events/year)	Not on hydroxyurea			- ΔI train
Vichinsky 2010	Transfusions vs standard of care	21-55 years			30% on hydroxyurea on transfusion, 50% on hydroxyurea on standard of care	-64		ing and similar
Wambebe 2001	Niprisan vs Placebo	2-45 years	HbSS	≥ 3 painful or vaso-occlusive crises in the previous year				echnologi

					ВМЈ Ор	en		l by copyright, including fo
Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medica (exclusion criteria)	itions
Wun 2013	Prasugrel vs Placebo	18 to 55 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> , HbSβ <sup>+</sup>	Did not have a diagnosis of acute VOC within 30 days of the study screening visit	Stable dose 30 days prior to randomization			ed to text and
Zago 1984 Al Hashmi 2017	Aspirin vs Placebo Hydroxyurea	 ≥ 18 years		 > 3 admissions with VOC/year, history of acute chest syndrome, history of priapism, history of splenic sequestration crises	 On hydroxyurea 5-10mg/kg/day	 Blood transfusion during the study		ur (ABES) . data mining, Al training, anc
Brandalise 2017	Methotrexate			> 3 severe VOC episodes/year, that were refractory to opioids for periods longer than 3 weeks duration.	Under chronic hydroxyurea treatment	6	-07/	similar technologi
Bridges 2017	GBT440		SCD and severe anemia, i.e.					es.
			For p	beer review only - h	nttp://bmjopen.bn	nj.com/site/abo	ut/guidelines.xhtr	nl

TrialInterventionsAgeGenotypeHistory of pain/crises/compl icationsStatus of hydroxyurea treatmentPrior transfusion (exclusionConcurrent me (exclusionBumma 2017Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programmeColombatti 2018Hydroxyurea programmeDi Maggio 2018Hydroxyurea programme2-3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or hospitalizations in the last yearDi Maggio 2018Hydroxyurea programme>3 painful VOC per year and/or >2 Acute Chest SyndromeNew to hydroxyurea treatmentHoppe 2017Simvastatin>10 yearsHbSS or HsSB <sup>0</sup> > 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in the preceding yearAt a stable dose for > 3 monthsRed cell transfusion within the 30 days prior to errolment						BMJ Ope	en		hv convright_including fo
Bumma 2017Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programmeColombatti 2018HydroxyureaDi Maggio 2018Hydroxyurea2-3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or hospitalizations in the last yearDi Maggio 2018Hydroxyurea>3 painful VOC per year and/or >2 Acute Chest SyndromeNew to hydroxyurea treatmentHoppe 2017Simvastatin>10 yearsHbSS or HSS <sup>0</sup> $\geq$ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in the preceding yearAt a stable dose for $\ge$ 3 monthsRed cell transfusion within the 30 days prior to enrolmentCurrent treatm statins, amided other drugs with metabolic inter within statins (e.g. enrolment	al	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicat	ori
Bumma 2017Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programme<				HB < 6.5 g/dL					ed to text a
Colombatti 2018Hydroxyurea2-3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or hospitalizations in the last yearDi Maggio 2018Hydroxyurea>3 painful VOC per year and/or >2 Acute Chest SyndromeNew to hydroxyurea treatmentHoppe 2017Simvastatin>10 yearsHbSS or HbS $\beta^0$ $\geq$ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in the preceding yearAt a stable dose for $\geq$ 3 monthsRed cell 	mma 2017	Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programme			- D <sub>0</sub>				nd data min
Di Maggio 2018Hydroxyurea>3 painful VOC per year and/or >2 Acute Chest SyndromeNew to hydroxyurea treatmentHoppe 2017Simvastatin>10 yearsHbSS or years $\geq$ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in 	lombatti 18	Hydroxyurea			2-3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or hospitalizations in the last year	91		(0	inn ∆ltrain
Hoppe 2017Simvastatin>10 yearsHbSS or HbS $\beta^0$ $\geq$ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in the preceding yearAt a stable dose for $\geq$ 3 monthsRed cell transfusion within the 30 days prior to enrolmentCurrent treatm statins, amioda other drugs wit metabolic inter 	Maggio 18	Hydroxyurea			>3 painful VOC per year and/or >2 Acute Chest Syndrome	New to hydroxyurea treatment	-04		ing and sin
metabolism)	ppe 2017	Simvastatin	>10 years	HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	≥ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in the preceding year	At a stable dose for ≥ 3 months	Red cell transfusion within the 30 days prior to enrolment	Current treatment w statins, amiodarone other drugs with kno metabolic interactio with statins (e.g. cytochrome P450 3/ metabolism)	hitardezhiolonies.
Keikhaei 2015     Hydroxyurea     6-18     SCD       Treatment other hydroxyurea       years     years        hydroxyurea	ikhaei 2015	Hydroxyurea	6-18 years	SCD				Treatment other that hydroxyurea	n

ppen-2019-034147 on 17 S by copyright, including fo	<u>~</u>	2
en-2019-034147 on 17 S / copyright, including fo	ੁ	ŏ
1-2019-034147 on 17 S copyright, including fo	2	ē
2019-034147 on 17 S pyright, including fo	ö	<u>ب</u>
)19-034147 on 17 S yright, including fo	ō	22
9-034147 on 17 S right, including fo	≤	2
-034147 on 17 S ght, including fo	<u> </u>	9
134147 on 17 S nt, including fo	<u> </u>	- <b>b</b>
4147 on 17 S including fo	, F	ω
147 on 17 S ncluding fo		4
.7 on 17 S cluding fo	2	4
on 17 S uding fo	<u>0</u>	- <b>- -</b>
n 17 S ding fo	Ē	0
17 S ng fo	<u>e</u> .	Š
7 S g fo	Ū.	<u> </u>
fos	0	7
	ō	S

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicatരനം (exclusion criteria)
Kwiatkowski 2017	Deferiprone						ed to t
LeBlanc 2016	Methadone		C	> 5 pain events per year			ext an
Lemonne 2017	Hydroxyurea			Absence of acute episodes (infection, VOC, ACS, stroke, priapisrn) at least one month before inclusion into the study.		No blood transftisions in the previous three months	Ided from http://bmjo eur (ABES) . d data mining, Al train
NCT01476696	Prasugrel	≥2 to <18 years of age and ≥ 12 kg body weigh t	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>		A stable dose for the 60 days prior to enrolment	Treatment with packed RBC or whole blood transfusion therapy within 30 days prior to dosing	Any nonsteroidal and inflammatory drug and (NSAID) use within 55 ays, prior to screening or any aspirin, warfarin, thienopyridine, or other antiplatelet medication use within 10 days pror to dosing or Anticipated use of aspirin, warfagn, thienopyridine, or other antiplatelet medication during the study period
			For p	peer review only - h	.ttp://bmjopen.bn	nj.com/site/abo	gence Bibliographique ut/guidelines.xhtml

# For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medicatතය (exclusion criteria)
Quarmyne 2017	Hydroxyurea		HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>			Concurrent chronic transfusion	ed to tex
Rigano 2018	Hydroxyurea			2–3 VOC and/or acute chest syndrome in the year prior	Received hydroxyurea therapy		t and data n
Sethy 2018	Hydroxyurea	≥ 18 years	HbSS	> 2 attacks of VOC per year and/or rate of transfusion 1–2 units/month	er ro		ining, Al tr
Youssry 2017	Hydroxyurea				On hydroxyurea ≥3 consecutive months	Chronic blood transfusion protocol	aining, a
- VOC: vaso-occlusive	e crisis; SCD: sickle cell disec	nse; ED: emerge	ncy department; No	te: Trial bolded were base cas	e studies; Trials shaded in gr	ey were not included in t	the final network meta-analyssmilar technologies.

## A.4 Outcome definitions

### Table 12: Definitions of crisis used in 5 RCTs included in adult network

Study	Treatments	Crisis
Ataga 2017	Placebo, High-dose Crizanlizumab, Low- dose Crizanlizumab	Sickle cell–related pain crises were defined as acute episodes of pain, with no medically determined cause other than a vaso-occlusive event, that resulted in a medical facility visit and treatment. with oral or parenteral narcotic agents or with a parenteral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug. The acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration, and priapism were also considered to be crisis events.
Ataga 2011	Placebo, senicapoc 🥏	A painful crisis was defined as an episode of acute pain with no cause other than a vaso-occlusive event that required a medical facility visit and treatment with oral or parenteral narcotics, or parenteral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Included in the definition of painful crisis were acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration, priapism, stroke and death (with the exception of homicide, suicide, or accidental death). To ensure consistency across sites, all protocol-defined sickle-related painful crises identified by the Investigators that resulted in a visit to a medical facility were adjudicated by an independent, blinded, Crisis Review Committee (CRC).
Ataga 2008	Placebo, senicapoc (low-dose), senicapoc (high-dose)	An independent, blinded crisis review committee adjudicated all sickle cell painful crises and related adverse event data (Document S1). A painful crisis was defined as a period of severe pain (with no explanation other than SCD) lasting 4 or more hours in duration, requiring a visit to a health care facility, and requiring parenteral opiate or other narcotic for relief
Pace 2003	Placebo, NAC (low- dose) 600 mg/day, NAC (mid-dose) 1200mg/day, NAC (high-dose) 2400mg/day	Defined as a visit to a medical facility that lasted more than 4 hr for acute pain related to vaso-occlusion requiring parenteral narcotics. The occurrence of acute chest syndrome, priapism, splenic, or hepatic sequestration was also counted as a VOC episode. Acute chest syndrome included those subjects with chest wall pain and a new infiltrate on chest X ray.
Niihara 2018	Placebo, L-glutamine	A pain crisis was defined as pain leading to treatment with a parenterally administered narcotic or ketorolac in an emergency department (ED) (or outpatient treatment center) or during hospitalization.

## A.5 Additional risk of bias results

Overall, the RCTs were considered to have low risk of bias based on assessment using the Cochrane Collaboration's tool. Almost 50% were at unclear risk of bias due to allocation concealment, selective reporting, and random sequence generation. Also, 10-15% were at high risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data, blinding of outcome assessor, and blinding of personnel. Full results are in the appendix.

Overall, the single-arm studies were at high risk of bias due on several domains of the Newcastle-Ottawa scaleFigure 4): 93.7% at high risk of bias due to outcome of interest not being present at start, 87.5% at high risk of bias due to assessment of outcome, and 75% at high risk of bias due to comparability on additional factors. Also, almost 50% were at high risk of bias due to representativeness of exposed cohort, comparability on basic factors, or the follow-up not being long enough. This high risk of bias further discourages use of the single-arm studies for analysis.

Figure 2: Cochrane risk of bias assessment of 9 randomized controlled studies included in network meta-analysis

	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (participant/personnal)	Blinding (outcome accessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting		
Ataga 2008	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Low
Ataga 2011	•	•	•	•	•	•	?	Uncle
Ataga 2017	•	•	•	•	?	•	-	High r
Glassberg 2017	•	•	•	•	•	•		
NCT02482298	?	?	•	•	•	•		
Niihara 2018	?	?	+	+	•	+		
Pace 2003	?	?	•	+	•	•		
Sins 2017	+	+	+	+	•	+		
Wun 2013	?	?	?	+	+	+		



Figure 3: Cochrane risk of bias assessment across all studies included in review presented as percentages across studies.

#### Selective reporting Incomplete outcome data Blinding (outcome assessor) Blinding (personnal) Allocation concealment Random sequence generation 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 ■Low □Unclear ■High

#### Figure 4: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment of non-randomized trials presented as percentages across studies.

Representativeness of the exposed cohort	9/16 (56.3%)
Selection of the nonpexposed cohort	17/16 (100%)
Ascertainment of exposure	14/16 (87.5%)
Outcome of interest not present at start	<mark>1/1</mark> 6 (6.3%)
Comparability: basic characteristics	9/16 (56.3%)
Comparability: additional factors	<mark>4/16 (25%)</mark>
Assessment of Outcome	<mark>2/16 (12.5</mark> %)
Follow-Up Long Enough	9/16 (56.3%)
Adequacy of follow-up	13/16 (81.3%)
	Low risk of bias High risk of bias

1 2 3 4 5		
4         5         6         7         8         9         10         11         12         13         14         15         16         17         18         19         20         21         22         23         24         25         26         27         28         29         30         31         32         33         34         35         36         37         38         39         40         41         42         43         44         45         46         47         48         49         50         51         52         53         54         55         56         57         58 <td></td> <td>Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.</td>		Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.
59 60		

	A.6 Tabl	e of characteristic	s and refe	erences fo	r of all	studies ic	BMJ Open	by SLR			by copyright, including for uses rela	iopen-2019-034147 on 17 September 2	
		•	•								eme	020	
uthor/Year/C ountry ef/Enrolment	Design Total N of PT (N of female):	Main in/exclusion criteria	Age (years)†	Total N of SCD	Participants Total N of	Baseline	Other baseline	Group	ventions Duration	0	nt Su	D B Sponsor	Pub
NCT registry	N of arm		Race (n, %)†	types (n, %)	HU use (n, %)	pain/crisis/VOC (n or %)†	characteristics (n or %)†			conce the	ongitaat eraay	nlo	
hlaeger 17 ≩A	RCT, double- blind Single centre 22 (16); 2	1. 18-82 years 2. history of SCD pain that was not well controlled (pain now score ≥ 4 on a 0-10 scale at registration) Exclusion: renal impairment	Adults Mean (SD): 33.1 (9.9) African american: 11 (100%)	HbSS: 15 (68%) HbSC: 6 (27%) HbSβ: 1 (5%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Pregabalin 75mg BID oral (n=11) 2. Placebo (n=11)	3 months	NR	eur (ABES) . d data mining	aded from http:	JA
ppe 2017 A T00508027	Single-arm Single centre 24 (13); 1	1. >10 years 2. history of ≥ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes requiring treatment with a prescribed oral or parenteral analgesic in the preceding year 3. Patients receiving treatment with HU at a stable dose for ≥3 months were eligible	Adults and children Overall mean: 18.5 (range 10- 34)	HbSS: 17 (89%) HbSβº: 2 (11%)	10 (53%)	NR	NR	Simvastatin (n=19*) OD oral Dose adjusted by weight: 40 mg (weight >60 kg); 30 mg (weight 45–60 kg); 25 mg (weight 35–44 kg)	3 months	NR	, Al training, and	DDCF, NHLBI and NCRR	JA
2014 to 2016 02061202	RCT, triple- blind Single centre 54 (23); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS or HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>≥15 years</li> <li>self-report of cough or wheeze over the preceding two months</li> <li>Exclusion: Diagnosis of asthma, incareration, pregnancy, ≥15 ED visits for SCD pain over the prior 12 months and discharge from the hospital within the previous 7 days</li> </ol>	Adults and adolescents Mean (SD): 30(8.56)	HbSS: 50 (96%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 2 (4%)	34 (65%)	NR	Prior ED Utilization (past 12 months) 0-5 visits: 71% 6-10 visits: 24% 11-15 visits: 6%	1. Mometasone furoate 220mcg OD inhale (n=35*) 2. Placebo (n=17*) In addition to standard SCD care	16 weeks	NR	d similar technologi	NHLBI	JA
				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://bn	njopen.bmj.	com/site/about/gu	uideline	s.xhtm	is.	125 at Agence Bibliographique de l	

Page 61 of 1 1 2 3 4 5	51						BMJ Open				by copyright, including		
6 7 Ataga 2017 Brazil, 8 Jamaica, USA 9 [4-8] 1 OAug 2013 to Jan 2015 1 INCT01895361 12 13 14	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 198 (109); 3	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ<sup>0</sup>, HbSβ<sup>+</sup></li> <li>16-65 years</li> <li>two to ten SCD-related pain crises in the 12 months before the enrolment</li> <li>Exclusion: long-term red-cell transfusion</li> </ol>	Adults and adolescents Median: 26 (range 16-56) Black, or African American: 60 (90%) White: 4 (6%) Other: 3 (4%)	HbSS: 141 (71%) HbSC: 32 (16%) HbSB <sup>0</sup> : 12 (6%) HbSB <sup>0</sup> : 10 5%) Other: 3 (2%)	123 (62%)	N of SCD-related pain crises during previous 12 months 2-4: 63% 5-10: 37%	NR	1. High-dose Crizanlizumab 5 mg/kg IV (n=67) 2. Low-dose Crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg IV (n=66) 3. Placebo (n=65) Two doses 2 weeks apart (loading dose) and then every 4 weeks. A total of 14 doses for 50 weeks	52 weeks	NR	Enseignement Superieur	Selexys Pharmaceuticals, NHLBI and OOPD	JA, JA supp
10_emonne 2017 17Guadeloupe 18 <sub>91</sub> 19 20 21 22	Single-arm Single centre 28 (13); 1	<ol> <li>at the beginning of the HU therapy</li> <li>patients were at steady state, i.e., no blood transfusions in the previous three months and absence of acute episodes (infection, VOC, ACS, stroke, priapism) at least one month before inclusion into the study.</li> <li>Exclusion: renal insufficiency, hepatic insufficiency or human immunodeficiency virus infection</li> </ol>	Adults Overall mean: 37.0(SD 11.6)	All SCA (50% with α- thalassemia)	N/A	Frequent hospitalized VOC: 14 (50%) N of ACS ≥ 1: 10 (36%)	NR	HU Therapy (n=28)	2 years	NR	(ABES) . ata mining, Al traini	Region of Guadeloupe.	JA
23 24 <sup>Quarmyne</sup> 25 <sup>JJSA</sup> 2610j 27 <sup>2009-2011</sup> 28 29	Single-arm Retrospective 134 (74); 1	1. HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> 2. started HU in 2009-2011 Exclusion: concurrent chronic transfusion and hydroxyurea therapy, underwent bone marrow transplant, no follow-up data	Adults and Children Overall Median: 7.5 ≤5 years: 39% 6-10 years: 33% 11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8%	NR	None	NR	NR	HU oral (n=78*) Dose: 20 mg/kg/day (initially), followed by dose escalation every 2 months to 25–30 mg/kg/day or maximum tolerated dose if lower	~3 months	NR	ng, and similar tech	NCATS, NIH and the Abraham J. & Phyllis Katz Foundation.	JA
30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 3 1USA 32 <sub>[11]</sub> 33 34	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 67(NR); 2	1.5–17 years 2. two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening 3. either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea (HU)	Children and Adolescents NR	NR	51 (76%)	NR	NR	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17)	2 months	NR	nologies.	NR SOS	CA
35 <sup>3</sup> Bridges 2017 36 37 38 39 40 41	Single-arm	Patients with SCD and severe anaemia, i.e. Hb < 6.5 g/dL	Adults	HbSS:6 (86%) HbSβ: 1 (14%)	NR	Baseline VOC admission (total n): 15	Baseline transfusions (total n): 24	GBT440 900mg OD (n=7)	10 weeks	NR		NR D	CA
42 43 44 45				For peer re	eview on	lly - http://bn	njopen.bmj.c	com/site/about/gu	uidelines	.xhtn	nl de l	2	

1							BMJ Open			i by copyright	jopen-2019-03	
2 3 4 5 6										, including to	4147 on 17 S	
7 <sub>[12]</sub> 8	Single centre 7(4); 1		Overall mean: 48.6(SD 15.8)							r uses	epteml Ens	
9 Charnigo 2017 10 <sup>Unclear</sup>	RCT (phase 1b)	Stable SCD patients	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1. PF-04447943 25mg or 5mg BID oral (n=22) 2. Placebo (n=7)	29 days	NR NR	eignem 202	CA
12 13Sins 2017 Netherlands, 14Belgium, UK 15 14, 15] 16Apr 2013 to 17Nov 2015 17Nov 2015 18 19 20 21 22	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 96 (40); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ<sup>0</sup>, HbSβ<sup>5</sup></li> <li>≥ 12 years</li> <li>History of at least 1.0 VOC per year in the past 3 years</li> <li>Exclusion: Chronic blood transfusion or transfusion in the preceding 3 months, VOC in the last 4 weeks, pregnancy, active gastric/duodenal ulcers, HU treatment with unstable dose in the last 3 months or started on HU shorter than 6 months prior to study, use of pain medication for SCD-related pains on more than 15 days per month in the past 6 months, poor compliance</li> </ol>	Adults Mean (SD): 28.4(8.9) Latin- America/Caribbea n: 17 (43%) Africa :23 (57%)	HbSS/HbSβ9: 46 (69%) HbSC/HbSβ <sup>2</sup> :21 (31%)	28 ((42%)	N of VOC over past three years Median: 11 (IQR 6-20)	Number of hospital admission over past three years Median: 3 (IQR 1- 6)	1. Placebo (n=40*) 2. NAC 600mg BID oral (n=27*)	6 months	to text and data mining, Al train	o. Downloaded from http://bmjop	JA
23 <sub>Niihara 2018</sub> 24US 25 <sub>16-20]</sub> 26 <sup>Jun 2010 to</sup> Dec 2013 274CT01179217 28	RCT, double- blind (phase 3) Multicentre 230 (124); 2	<ol> <li>5 years</li> <li>had had at least two pain crises (no upper limit) documented during the previous year</li> <li>HU at stable dose within 3 months and continue during the trial</li> </ol>	Adults and children Mean (SD): 21.4(12.42) Black: 144 (95%) Hispanic: 4 (3%) Other: 4 (3%)	SCA: 207 (90%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 21 (9%) HbSβ <sup>+</sup> : 2 (1%)	153 (66.5%)	N of SCD pain crises in the year before trial 0.1: 0.7% 2.5: 84.2% 6-9: 9.9% ≥ 10: 5.3%	NR	1. L-glutamine 0.3 g/kg BID oral (n=152) 2. placebo (n=78) Maximum dose: 30mg	48 weeks	NR, and similar t	Emmaus Medical	JA
29 <sub>Sethy 2018</sub> 30 <sup>ndia</sup> 31 <sub>[21]</sub> 32 <sup>2013 to 2016</sup> 33 34 35 36 37	Single-arm Single site 142 (46); 1	1. HbSS 2. ≥ 18 years 3. > 2 attacks of VOC per year and/or rate of transfusion 1–2 units/month were included in the study Exclusion: pregnancy, human immunodeficiency virus infection or medications that could potentially enhance HU toxicity, abnormal serum Cr/ALT levels	Adults	All HbSS	N/A	64% presented with repeated VOC, 13% with transfusion dependency and 23% with both the above features	NR	HU 10 mg/kg/day oral (n=128*)	12 months	All the part were ad the folio (5 mg/d go ensure adequates intake	Lents In R seid toe acid and tuid tuid tuid Agence	JA
38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45				For peer n	eview or	nly - http://br	njopen.bmj.	com/site/about/gi	uidelines	s.xhtml	Bibliographique de l	

Page 62 of 151

Page 63 of 1	151						BMJ Oper	1		я ру сору	jopen-201	
1 2 3 4 5										right, including f	9-034147 on 17	
67 Di Maggio 2018 8 Italy 9 [22] 1 Olanuary 2000 to April 2014 1 1	Single-arm Retrospective 140 (71); 1	1. start HU treatment 2. >3 painful vaso-occlusive crises per year and/or >2 Acute Chest Syndrome	Adults and children Median(range): 35 (0.4-61)	HbSS: 25 (18%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 54 (39%) HbSβ <sup>1</sup> : 56 (40%) HbSα-β: 4 (3%) HbSLepore: 1 (0.7%)	90 (64%)	NR	NR	HU oral (n=140) Starting dose: 10 mg/kg daily Titration: increased at a rate of 5 mg/kg/week	Mean follow-up: 6.6 years	or uses related	September 2020	JA, JA supp
1 2Youssry 2017 1 3 <sup>Egypt</sup> 1 4 <sup>[23]</sup> 1 5	Single-arm Retrospective 60 (37); 1	Patients who were on HU therapy for at least 3 consecutive months Exclusion: Chronic blood transfusion, chronic disabling hepatic/renal disease	Adults and children Mean: 12.8 (SD 5.5) (range 4 to 24)	HbSS: 27 (45%) HbSβ: 33 (55%)	N/A	NR	NR	HU 15-30mg/kg/day oral (n=60)	Up to 120 months	to text and d	). Downloade	JA
16 <sub>Bumma 2017</sub> 17USA 18 <sub>24]</sub> 19 <sup>1/1/2000 to</sup> 1/ <sup>1/5/2016</sup> 20	Single-arm Retrospective 104 (60); 1	NR	Adults and Adolescents Median (range): 24(15-62)	HbSS: 89 (86%)	13%	NR	NR	Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange (n=104)	1 year	r (ABES) . lata mining, A №	nR http://	CA
2 1 <sub>Kwiatkowski</sub> 22 <sup>2017</sup> 23 24 <sup>[25]</sup> 25	Single-arm Registry data 291 (166); 0	Inclusion on a patient registry has been maintained for all US patients who receive deferiprone	Adults and children Mean: 29.5 (SD15.7) ≤ 18years: 79	NR	NR	NR	NR	Deferiprone oral (n=291)	Mean: 1.3 years (range 0- 4.1)	l training, and	<sup>№</sup> NR	CA
26 <sup>Rigano 2018</sup> 27 <sup>Italy</sup> 28 <sup>[26]</sup> 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	Single-arm Retrospective cohort 652 (302); 1	1. On HU therapy 2. The indication for HU initiation was 2–3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or acute chest syndrome in the year prior	Adults and children Mean: 24.5 (SD 15) Median: 24 (range 1-67) Caucasian: 400/621 Africa: 221/621	HbSS: 277 (47%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 167 (28%) HbSβ <sup>+</sup> : 131 (20%) Other: 19 (3%) Total N: 594	N/A	NR	NR	HU oral (n=628*) 10 mg/kg/day, and adjusted or escalated according to tolerance	Median duration: 7 years (range <1- 29)	Folic ackews concompantly used in #13% of patient (n/N = 388/4486 388/4486 hnoologies.	com/ on June 14, 2025 at Age	JA
36 37 38 39 40 41											nce Bibliographi	
42 43 44 45 46				For peer r	eview o	nly - http://	bmjopen.bmj.	.com/site/about/g	uidelines	.xhtml	que de l	

1							BMJ Open				Jopen-zu19-us 3 by copyright		
2 3 4 5 6											, including fo		
7 Al Hashmi 2017 8 Oman 9 <sub>[27]</sub> 10 11 12	Single-arm Single centre 18 (6); 1	<ol> <li>Aged ≥ 18 years</li> <li>on HU 5-10mg/kg/day</li> <li>history of more than three admissions with vaso-occlusive crises /year, history of acute chest syndrome, history of priapism, history of splenic sequestration crises</li> <li>Exclusion: pregnancy, blood transfusion during the study follow-</li> </ol>	Adults	NR	N/A	NR	NR	HU 5-10mg/kg/day oral (n=18)	At least 6 months	NR	eptember 2020. D Enseignement r uses related to t	NR	CA
13 14Colombatti 15 <sup>2018</sup> 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Single arm Multicentre 204 (20); 1	up of < 6 months 1. On HU therapy	Children and adolescents Overall mean: 7.68 (range 11- 221 months) Nigeria: 65 (32%) Ghana: 32 (16%) Senegal: 12 (6%) Italy and Albania: 37 (18%) Central America and India: 10 (5%) Uhknown: 10	HbSS:172 (84%) HbSp: 22 (11%) HbSC: 8 (4%) HbSp: 3 (1.5%) Other: 1 (0.5%)	N/A	NR	NR	HU therapy (varied by centre) (n=204)	1 year	NR	ownloaded from http://omjopen Superieur (ABES) . ext and data mining, Al training	NR	JA
24 25Brandalise 26Brazil 27[29] 28 29RBR-2s9xvn 30	Single arm Single centre 14 (5); 1	1. Under chronic hydroxyurea treatment 2. >3 severe VOC episodes/year, that were refractory to opioids for periods longer than 3 weeks duration Exclusion: pregnancy, concomitant infection	(5%) Adults Overall median: 23.5 (range 18- 32)	HbSS:11(79%) HbSC:3 (11%)	14 (100%)	Previous VOC/month: 3.3 (95% CI 2.0-5.0) (excluding one PT with 19.3 VOC/month)	Avascular necrosis: 7	MTX 10mg weekly IM (n=14)	12 weeks	NR	, and similar techr	Boldrini Children's Cente and UNIEMP Institute.	JA er
3 1Keikhaei 2015 Iran 3 2 3 3 Cohort 3 3 3 0 3 4 2013 to 2014	Single-arm Single centre 48 (24); 1	1. admitted to Shafa Hospital, Ahvaz, Iran, from 2013 to 2014 2. aged 6-18	Children and adolescents Overall mean 13.7 (range 6 to 18)	NR	NR	NR	NR	HU 10 mg/kg/day oral (n=48)	1 year	NR	nologies.	Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences	JA
35 36 37 38 39 40 41											Agence Bibliograp		
42 43 44 45 46				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://br	njopen.bmj.	com/site/about/o	guideline	s.xhtr	nique ae i		

Page 64 of 151

Page 65 of 1 1 2 3	51						BMJ Open			d by copyright, inclu	insen-20010-034147	
4 5 6 7 8 9 31 1 0VCT02709681 1	Single-arm Retrospective cohort study 16 (6); 1	More than 5 pain events per year	Adults and adolescents Mean: 15.5 (SD 2.8)	HbSS: 14 (88%) HbSß <sup>p:</sup> 1 (6%) HbSC: 1 (6%)	NR	NR	ED visit/month: Mean 0.31 (SD 0.27) Hospitalization/mo nth: 0.19 Chronic transfusions: 10	Methadone oral (n=16) Flexible dose	Mean: 2.1 years	uding for uses related	nn 17 Cantember 9090	CA
12 13 <sup>Heeney 2016</sup> Americas, 14Europe, Asia 15 <sup>and Africa</sup> 16 <sup>32</sup> , 33] 17 <sup>Jun</sup> 2015 18 <sup>NCT01794000</sup> 19 20 21 22 23	RCT, double- blind (phase 3) Multicentre 341 (173); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>At least 2 VOC in the year prior to screening</li> <li>TCD within the last year for patients ≤16 years of age</li> <li>Children aged 2 to &lt;18 years</li> <li>Body weight ≥12 kg</li> <li>Exclusion: abnormal/conditional TCD, chronic transfusion, hepatic/renal dysfunction, history of transient ischemic attach or haemorrha, severe head traumatic stroke, chronic treatment with NSAID, use of anticoagulants or other antiplatelet drugs</li> </ol>	Children and adolescents Mean:10.6 (SD 4.3) White: 58/169 Black: 109/169 Multiple: 2/169	NR	153 (45%)	N of VOCs in previous year: Mean 4.0 (SD 7.9)	NR	1. Placebo (n=170) 2. Prasugrel oral (n=171) Individual dose-adjustment strategy: Initial dose: 0.08 mg/kg; maintenance: 0.04-0.12 mg/kg (maximum 10mg) by a targeted level of platelet reactivity	9 to 24 months	No anticage difference (ABES) . No anticage difference (ABES) . Autor of antiperiod (ABES) . No NSA antiperiod (ABES) . No NSA antiperiod (ABES) . Autor (ABES) . Autor (ABES) . No NSA antiperiod (ABES) . No NSA antiperiod (ABES) . No NSA antiperiod (ABES) . No NSA antiperiod (ABES) .	Daiichi Sankyo and Eli Lilly	JA
24 Reid 2014 United States, 25 Jebanon, 26 and Canada 27 734 28 Aug 2012 to 29 May 2013 NCT01601340 30 31 32 33	RCT, double- blind (phase 2, terminated early) Multicentre 76 (49); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS or HbSβ</li> <li>Aged 12-60 years</li> <li>at least one acute SCD-related complication or leg ulcers in 12 months prior to enrolment</li> <li>no current (i.e., within 3 months prior to enrolment) HU treatment</li> <li>Exclusion: regular transfusion, an acute vaso-occlusive event within 3 weeks, pulmonary hypertension requiring oxygen therapy, symptomatic untreated peptic ulcer or gastroesophageal reflux disease, history of pancreatitis, abnormal ALT/AST levels, HIV infection</li> </ol>	Adults and children Mean: 27.8 (range 12-55) Black or African- American: 24 (63%) White :14 (37%)	HbSS: 60 (79%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 16 (21%)	N/A	N of pain crises in the 12 months before enrolment 0-1: 13 >2: 25	NR	1. HQK-1001 15 mg/kg BID oral (n=38) 2. placebo (n=38)	48 weeks	Folic addaily	HemaQuest Pharmaceuticals	JA
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41											* Aronno Riklingraph	
42 43 44 45				For peer re	eview or	nly - http://bn	njopen.bmj.c	com/site/about/gu	uidelines	.xhtml		

1							BMJ Open			ł by copyright	jopen-2019-03		
2 3 4 5 6										, including fc	4147 on 17 S		
7 Adegoke 2013 Nigeria 8 9 [35] Jul to Dec 2011 10 11 12 13	RCT, open Multicentre 113 (56); 2	Steady state (no painful episode, anemic crisis, or infection on the day of recruitment) Exclusion: alternative medicine (Aloe vera gel, Moringa oleifera, Solamine syrup, and Ciklavit (Cajanus cajal) suspension), hydroxyurea, Discriovite suspension, Niprisan	Children and adolescents Mean: 4.55 (SD 3.57)	NR	NR	N of previous significant painful episodes Mean: 3.27 (SD 3.93)	N of previous Transfusion Mean: 1.29 (SD 0.77) N of Previous hospitalization Mean: 2.12 (SD 2.67)	1. Lime juice + Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguani) BID oral (n=58) 2. Control (Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil)) BID (n=55) Adjusted by body weight: ≤10kg: 5 ml; 11-20 kg: 10 mi ≥20 kg: 15 mg	6 months	Enseignement Sup r uses related to text №	eptember 2020. Down	JA	
14 15 <sup>Brrazil</sup> 16 136] 17Sep to Dec 18 <sup>2010</sup>	RCT, double- blind Single centre 83 (53); 2	1. HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup> Exclusion: hospitalized patients, pregancy, untreated iron overload, other investigational drugs in the last 12 months or contraindications to Vitamin C/E	Adults Overall median: 27 (range 18-68)	HbSS: 73 (88%)	NR	NR	Chronic use of NSAIDs: 52 Chronic use of opioids: 16 Transfused patients (past 12 months): 18	1. Placebo (n=39) 2. Vitamins C 1400 mg/day and E 800 mg/day oral (n=44)	6 months	and data minin	FAPESP and CNPq from ht	JA	
20 <sup>Wun 2013</sup> 21 <sup>Inited States</sup> 21 <sup>Inited States</sup>	RCT, double- blind (phase 2) Multicentre 62 (30); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ<sup>0</sup>, HbSβ<sup>2</sup></li> <li>aged 18 to 55 years</li> <li>did not have a diagnosis of acute VOC within 30 days of the study screening visit</li> <li>NSAIDs for treatment of pain were not permitted in the 5 days prior to randomization or for 25 consecutive days during the study period.</li> <li>HU was permitted in patients already on a stable dose 30 days prior to randomization</li> <li>Exclusion: hepatic/renal dysfunction, HCt &lt; 18%, risk of excessive</li> </ol>	Adults Mean:31.5	HbSS: 37 (61%) HbSC: 15 (25%) HbSβ <sup>p</sup> : 3 (5%) HbSβ þ+: 6 (8%)	NR	Vaso-occlusive crisis: 61% Pain intensity: Mean: 1.8 vs 2.4	Acute chest syndrome: 22.0% (prasugrel) vs 9.5% (placebo) Pulmonary hypertension: 17.1% (prasugrel) vs 9.5% (placebo)	1. Prasugrel 5 mg/day oral (n=41) 2. placebo (n=19*)	30 days	g, Al training, and similar t	Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. and El Lilly and Company.	JA i	
29 30 31 32		bleeding, history of bleeding disorders, haemorrhagic or ischemic stroke, retinal haemorrhage, TIA or intracranial haemorrhage								technologi	June 14, 2		
32 Daak 2013 33 Sudan 34 [40] 35Apr 2009 to 36 <sup>May 2010</sup>	RCT, double- blind Single centre 140 (61); 2	Steady state, defined as no evidence of fever, infection, or crisis for >4 week before the start of the study Exclusion: other chronic diseases, transfusion within 4 months,	Children and adolescents Mean (SD): 7.8(5.5)	All HbSS	NR	NR	Crisis-induced hospitalization (N/year) No. admission: 9.8%	1. Placebo (n=61*) 2. Omega-3 (n=67*)	1 year	All of the patients were receiving regular folate supplementation n, and those ,5	Marie Curie Transfer of Knowledge Programme, Efamol, and the Kitchner	JA	
37 38 39 40 41											ce Bibliograph		
42 43 44 45				For peer re	eview or	nly - http://bn	njopen.bmj.c	com/site/about/gu	uidelines	.xhtml	nique de l		

Page 66 of 151

Page 67 of 1 1	151						BMJ Open			d by copyrigh	ionen-2019-0:	
2 3 4 5 6										t, including fo	34147 on 17 S	
7 ISRCTN80844 630 8 9		hydroxyurea treatment, history of overt stroke, pregnancy					1-2: 43.7% 3-5: 24.1% > 5: 22.4%			y of age were receiving range standar grag prophylactice penicilling	Memorial Trus Fund and University of Khartoum	t
1 O <sub>Ataga 2011</sub> 1 IUnited 1 2 <sub>States</sub> , 1 3Jamaica, Brazil, France, 1 4Trinidad and 1 5 <sup>the United</sup> 1 6 <sup>K</sup> (ngdom. 1 7[41] 1 8 <sup>Feb 2005 to</sup> Apr 2007 1 9NCT00102791 20	RCT, double- blind (phase 3, terminated early) Multicentre 297 (160); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ<sup>0</sup>, HbSβ<sup>-</sup></li> <li>aged 16-65 years</li> <li>at least two acute sickle-related painful crises in the previous 12 months</li> <li>Patients were permitted to receive concomitant therapy with HU if they had received HU for the preceding 12 months and their dose was stabilized for at least 3 months prior to the study</li> <li>Exclusion: unstable cardiovascular, neurological, endocrine, hepatic, or renal disorders, Hb &lt; 40 or &gt; 110 g/L, chronic transfusion, cancer diagnosis within 5 years, or hepatitis B/C or HIV infection</li> </ol>	Adults and adolescents Mean: 28.5(SD 9.9) Black: 134 (92%) Multiracial: 6 (4%) Caucasian: 3 (2%) Other: 2 (2%)	HbSS: 245 (85%) HbSC: 16 (6%) HbSP: 21(7%) HbSP: 4 (1%) Other: 3 (1%)	163 (56%)	SCD crises history in past 12 months (%) 2-4: 59% >5: 41%	NR	1. Senicapoc 20mg/d BID (loading) and then 10mg/dOD oral (n=145*) 2. placebo (n=144*)	52 weeks	nement Superieur (ABES) . ated to text and data mining, Al	20 Icagen 17 Icagen Triangle Park Down	JA
2 2Diop 2011 Senegal 2 3 42, 43] 2 5 5 e 2007 to 2 5 5 e 5 2008 2 6 2 7 2 8	RCT, open Single centre 60 (31); 2	1. Follow-up at least 2 years before in the clinic with records of standardized clinical and laboratory Exclusion: allergic to sulfonamide	Adults and adolescents Mean: 23.2 (SD 6.9)	All SCA	NR	N of VOC/year: Mean 0.8 (SD 1.25)	N of SCD with chronic complications: 8	1. Sulfadoxine- pyrimethamine (S: 25 mg/kg/P: 1.25 mg/kg) OD oral (n=30) 2. Placebo (n=30) The treatment was given once during the following months: September, October, and November	3 months	1. Folic and paracetario during parts 2. Arteritisinin- based an combination therapy of injectabu- quinine an malaria araks	NR	JA
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41										echnologies.	lune 14 2025 at Agence Riblingraphic	
42 43 44 45 46				For peer re	eview or	nly - http://br	njopen.bmj.o	com/site/about/g	uidelines	.xhtml		

1							BMJ Open			d by copyright	jopen-2019-03		
2 3 4 5 6										t, including fo	34147 on 17 S	i	
7 Alvim 2005 Saudi Arabia 8 9 [44, 45] Sep 1998 to 1 (Dec 1999 11 12 13 14 15 16	RCT, crossover, double-blind 73 (40); 2	Exclusion: renal, hepatic, cardiac or coagulation disorders secondary or not to SCD, regular transfusion, hydroxyurea use, age > 20 or < 5 years, cognitive dysfunction	Adults and children Median: 12.1 (range 5 to 20)	HbSS: 42 (58%) HbSC: 26 (36%) HbSBP: 5 (7%)	NR	NR	History of transfusion: once: 13; 2-5 times: 19; More than 5: 18 Splenectomy: 5 Cholecystectomy: 5 Osteomyelitis: 11 Acute splenic sequestration: 12 Aplastic crisis: 1 Avascular necrosis of femoral head: 4	1. Piracetam 4.8 g/m^2/day QID (n=73*) 2. Placebo (n=73*)	6 months, then crossover with 2 weeks washout period	r uses related to text and data ≌	eptember 2020. Downloaded Enseignement Superieur (/	FAPEMIG, CNPq	JA
17 <sub>Bao</sub> 2008 18 <sup>US</sup> 1946] 20 21	RCT, double- blind Single centre 36 (14); 2	Exclusion: non-ambulatory, receiving more than 6 transfusions per year or taking hydroxyurea, history of substance abuse, neurological or psychiatric deficits that could affect compliance, use of immunosuppressive drugs, HIV and hepatitis B	Adults Overall mean: 32.9 (SD 9.7) (range 18-47) All black	HbSS: 32 (89%) HbSC: 3 (8%) HbSβ: 1 (3%)	None	N of sickle pain episode 3-month prior to the study: 5 (placebo); 3 (zinc)	NR	1. Placebo (n=18) 2. Zinc 25mg TID (n=18)	3 months	a mining, Al tra ™	from http://bmj ABES)	NR	JA
22 Ataga 2008 23US 24 <sub>1471</sub> 25Feb 2002 and 26 <sub>VICT000406777</sub> 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	RCT, double- blind (phase 2) Multicentre 90 (45); 3	1. HbSS 2. Aged 18-60 years 3. at least one prior acute sickle- related painful episode (commonly referred to as painful crisis) that had required hospitalization, but none in the 4 weeks prior to screening Exclusion: Hb< 40 g/L or > 100 g/L, received a transfusion within 30 days or underwent an exchange transfusion within 60 days, hepatitis B, HIV, cancer diagnosis within 5 years, mediations (eg, amiodarone, chlorperazine, disopyramide, dofedilide, haloperidol, procainamide, quinidine, risperidone, sotalol, thioridazine, trifluoperazine, warfarin sodium, and erythropoietin)	Adults Mean: 33.6(range 19-55)	All HbSS	24 (27%)	Hospitalizations due to painful episodes in previous 12 months: None: 12 (33%) 1.6 (19%) 2.3:6 (19%) ≥3:7 (23%)	NR	1. Placebo (n=30) 2. Senicapoc (low-dose): 100 mg (loading dose); 6 mg/d (maintenance) oral OD (n=29) 3. Senicapoc (high-dose): 150 mg (loading dose); 10 mg/d (maintenance) oral OD (n=31)	12 weeks	Ining, and similar technologies. №	open.bmj.com/ on June 14, 2025 at Agen	Icagen (Research Triangle Park, NC)	JA
37 38 39 40 41											nce Bibliograph		
42 43 44 45 46				For peer r	review or	nly - http://bi	mjopen.bmj.	com/site/about/gı	uidelines	s.xhtml	ique de l		

# Page 68 of 151

Page 69 of 1 1	51						BMJ Open				יפייבעיפיע by copyrigh ל		
2 3 4 5 6											13414/011/3	0.11.17 on 17 Q	
7 Eke 2003 Nigeria 9 [48] 10 11 12	RCT, open (phase 2) Single centre 101 (48); 3	1. HbSS 2. Aged 1-16 years 3. Stable condition Exclusion: loss to 2 consecutive follow-up, pregnancy	Children and Adolescents Mean: 8.1 (SD 4.3) (Range 2-16)	HbSS: 101 (100%)	NR	NR	Total N of malarial parasites: 20 (equally distributed)	1. Pyrimethamine 0.5 mg/kg once weekly oral (n=36*) 2. Proguanil 1.5 mg/kg OD oral (n=32*) 3. Placebo (Vitamin c 7 mg/kg) OD oral (n=29*)	9 months	NR	Enseignement	Combating Childhood Communicable Diseases (Atlanta, Georgia)	JA
13 <sup>Pace 2003</sup> 14 15 <sup>[49]</sup> 16 17 18	RCT, double- blind Single centre 21 (10); 4	<ol> <li>HbSS or HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>Aged above 15 years</li> <li>With dense cells greater than 6% and 2 or more VOC episodes per year for the 2 years prior to enrollment.</li> <li>Exclusion: pregnancy, narcotic addition, chronic transfusions, history of stroke, HIV, investigational drug</li> </ol>	Adults and Adolescents Mean:17.9 (SD1.2)	NR	NR	N of VOC episodes Mean: 5 (SD 2)	NR	1. Placebo (n=5) 2. NAC (low-dose) 600 mg/day (n=5) 3. NAC (mid-dose) 1200mg/day (n=5) 4. NAC (high-dose) 2400mg/day (n=6) All doses were divided by 3 to be taken	7 months	NR	Superieur (ABES) text and data minii	Zambon Corp.	JA
202001 21 <sup>Nigeria</sup> 2 <b>3</b> 23	RCT, cross- over, double- blind (Phase 2) 82 (46); 2	1. HbSS 2. Aged 2-45 years 3. at least 3 painful or vaso-occlusive crises in the previous year Exclusion: HIV, hepatitis, pregnancy	Adults and children Overall (years) < 9: 1 (1%) 10-19: 67 (82%) 20-29: 11 (13%) 30-39: 3 (4%)	All HbSS	NR	Mild to Moderate Pains (Mean): 18.38 Severe Pains: 12.67	NR	1. Niprisan 12 mg/kg OD (n= 70*) 2. Placebo (n=70*)	6 months, then crossover without washout	NR	ng, Al training, a	NR	JA
25 <sup>Tomer 2001</sup> 26 27 <sup>[51, 52]</sup>	RCT, double- blind Single centre 13 (NR); 2	1. Frequent pain episodes (≥3 events/year) 2. Not on HU	Adults NR	NR	None	Frequency of pain episodes in 12 months: 7.8	NR	1. Mehaden fish oil: 0.25 g/kg/day OD oral daily (n=5*) 2. Placebo (n=5*)	12 months	NR	and similar	NR	JA
29 de Abood 1997 29 spain 30 531 32 33 34	RCT, double- blind Single centre 43 (43); 3	1. HbSS 2. history of at least one painful crisis per month were included	Adults Overall range: 17- 39	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1. DMPA 150mg per month for first three months, then usual dose of 150mg every 3 months oral (n=13) 2. levonorgestrel/ethinyl estradiol (0.15/0.03 mg) OD oral (n=14) 3. Surgically sterilized (n=16) [not eligible]	12 months	NR	technologies.	Special Programme of Human Reproduction o WHO	JA .f
35 36 37 38 39 40 41											луенсе вняноўгарн		
42 43 44 45				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://bn	njopen.bmj.c	com/site/about/gu	uidelines	.xhtm	ul an l		

1 2 3 4 5							BMJ Open				jopen-2019-034147 on 17 (	
07 Gupta 1995 India 8	RCT, double- blind Phase 2	1. > 5 years 2. HbSS Exclusion: chronic persistent infection	Adults and children Mean: 16.4	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1. Zinc: 220 mg TID oral (n=65*) 2. Placebo (n=65*)	1.5 years	NR USES	Septemb Ense	JA
10 11	145 (34); 0	or exposed to extremes of temperature variation frequently, on drug therapy for some other disease, evidence of organ failure	(range12-27)							ופומנפע נ	er 2020. Signeme	
12 <sub>Manrique 1987</sub> 13 <sup>Brazil</sup> 14 <b>t</b> 55] 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	RCT Phase 2 60 (23); 2	HbSS Exclusion: acute infections	Adults and children Range: 7-34	All HbSS	NR	Overall pain events (n) None: 11 < 5 times: 7 < 10 times: 15 > 10 times: 11 Persistent: 14 Not clear: 2 Overall pain duration (days) None: 11 < 5 days: 17 > 10 days: 17 > 10 days: 4 Persistent: 14 Not clear: 2 All in 6 months observation period		1. Placebo (n=29*) 2. Pentoxifylline :(Adults: 1200mg; children: 400-600 mg, depending on body weight) oral (n=28*)	6 weeks	NR NR AND CARA INTEND	R ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■	JA
25zago 1984 26 <sup>Brazil</sup> 2 <b>7/56]</b> 28	RCT, crossover 42 (NR); 2	NR	Adults and children Median: 12 (range 4 - 31)	HbSS: 25 (86%) HbSβº: 4 (14%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Aspirin 17-45 mg/kg OD (n=29*) 2. Placebo (n=29*)	5 months, then crossover without washout	NR C	mj.com/ or	JA
29 <sup>Cabannes</sup> 1984 30 <sup>A</sup> frica 31 <sub>[57]</sub> 32 33 34 35 36	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 140 (NR); 2	No antisickling treatment for two months before admission to the study Exclusion: other than HbSS; uncontrolled parasitic disease; malnutrition; a history of drug abuse; glaucoma, prostatis hypertrophy, urinary retention, hypersensitivity to ticlopidine or anticholingeric drugs, acute cerebro-vascular accidents, severe intercurrent infection, pulmonary oedema or renal failure	Adults and adolescents Overall range 15- 45	All HbSS	NR	N of crises in 6 months before study: 223	NR	1. Ticlopidine 250mg BID if body weight <45kg; 250mg TID if body weight >45kg oral (n=70) 2. Placebo (n=70)	6 months	Acute cra treatment varied de on region including transfus antibiotica antibiotica anticoagu	the sends of the send of the s	JA
37 38 39 40 41											e Bibliograph	
42 43 44 45 46				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://bi	mjopen.bmj.c	com/site/about/gi	uidelines	.xhtml	iique de l	

Page 70 of 151
Page 71 of <sup>-</sup>	151						BMJ Open			d by соруг	innen-2019	
1 2 3 4 5										ight, including f	2-034147 on 17 S	
7 Gail 1982 Ghana 8 [58] 9 Sep 1976 to 1 O <sup>5ep</sup> 1978 11	RCT, double- blind Phase 2 79 (39); 2	HbSS Exclusion: other major illnesses	Adults and children Overall: < 5 years: 21 5-14 years: 28 > 14 years: 30	All HbSS	NR	Number of crises in the previous year 0-2: 18 > 2: 21	NR	1. Control (n=39) 2. Urea: 0.266 g/kg Low- dose: twice a week; High- dose: daily (n=40)	Average: 13.7 months	1. Folic acid (1 mg) and the second s	international Sickle Cell Anemia Research Institute and CSRPM	JA
13 <sub>Deceulaer</sub> 14¦982 15 <sup>Jamaica</sup> 16 <sup>59]</sup> 17	RCT, crossover, double-blind Single centre 25 (25); 2	HbSS	Adults Overall age range: 20-41	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1. placebo (n=10*) 2. medroxyprogesterone acetate 150mg every 3- month IM (n=13*)	2 years (9 months, then crossover after 6 months washout)	Superieur (AB ext and data m	NR NR	JA
18 <sub>Mann 1974</sub> 19 <sup>UK</sup> 2 <b>Q60</b> ] 21 22	RCT, crossover Single centre 18 (12); 2	1. HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ 2. 5-17 years 3. Previously suffered painful crises	Children and adolescents Overall mean 8.4 (SD 3.2)	HbSS: 15 (83%) HbSC: 2 (11%) HbSβ: 1 (6%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Folic acid 5 mg daily oral (n=25) 2. Folic acid 5mg + Sodium bicarbonate 0.06-0.2 gm/kg/day initially, then 0.1-0.4 mg/kg/day oral (n=25)	2 years (1 year than crossover without washout	ES) . iining, Al trair ≌	United Birmingham Hospitals and Endowment Research Fund	JA
23saacs 1972 24 <sup>Nigeria</sup> 25 <sup>61]</sup> 26 27	RCT, crossover (preliminary report before crossover) 44 (28); 2	1. HbSS 2. Moderately severe pain at least once in three months (with little or no fever or exacerbations of jaundice)	Adults and children Overall range 2- 35	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1. Saline IM (n=44*) 2. Steroid (Testoserone/Progesterone ) Male: testosterone 10 mg; Female: progesterone 10 mg every week IM (n=44*)	4-6 months	All patiens were or eggular folates and had high or remal serum-in or values	Glaxo Allenburys of Nigeria	Journ al article
28 <sub>0ski 1968</sub> 29 <sup>USA</sup> 3Qfe2] 31 3 <u>2</u>	RCT, crossover, double-blind 14 (5); 2	At least 2 painful episodes during the 2 year period prior to study	Adults and children NR	HbSS: 10 (71%) HbSC: 4 (29%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Promazine hydrochloride oral (n=14*) Based on weight: 2 tablets a day: 40- 80 pounds; 3 tablets a day: 80-120 pounds; 4 tablets a day: > 120 pounds 2. Placebo (n=14*)	3 months	ar technologie	NR	JA
33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41										<u>v</u>	95 at Anence Rihliographi	
42 43 44 45 46				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://br	mjopen.bmj.o	com/site/about/gi	uidelines	.xhtml	200	

1 2 3 4 5							BMJ Open				jopen-2019-034147 on 17 S I by copyright, including fi		
0 7 NCT02482298 USA, Egypt, 8 France, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, UK, 1 (Jurkey) 1 1[63] 1 2 <sup>Jul</sup> 2015 to Nov 2016 1 3	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 87 (47); 3	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>Aged 18-30</li> <li>If treated with hydroxyurea, the dose must have been stable for 3 months</li> </ol>	Adults Mean: 21.6 (SD 3.42) Black Or African American: 17 (57%) White: 13 (43%)	NR	NR	NR	NR	1. Placebo (n =30) 2. Ticagrelor 10MG BID oral (n=27) 3. Ticagrelor 45mg BID oral (n=30)	12 weeks	NR	September 2020. Dow Enseignement Su or uses related to text	AstraZeneca	СТ
1 4NCT01476696 1 5 <sup>USA</sup> 1 6[64] Feb 2014 to 1 7oct 2016 1 8 <sup>NCT01476696</sup>	Single-arm Phase 2 (Part B) 18 (NR); 1	1. HbSS, HbSβ 2. ≥2 to <18 years of age and ≥ 12 kg body weight 3. Participants on hydroxyurea must be on a stable dose for the 60 days prior to enrolment without signs of hematologic toxicity at screening	Children and adolescents NR (only reported overall, part A+B)	NR	NR	NR	NR	Prasugrel 0.06-0.12 mg/kg depending on their steady- state PD response oral (n=18)	14 ± 4 days	NR	nloaded from t perieur (ABES) t and data mini	Eli Lilly and Company	СТ
19 <sub>/ichinsky 2010</sub> 20 <sup>66]</sup> 21 22 23	RCT 36 (NR)	1. HbSS 2. Normal neurological exam, WAIS III PIQ score ≤ 90, hemoglobin ≤ 9 g/dL 3. Aged 21-55	Adults Mean: 29	All HbSS	HU: 14 (39%)	NR	Transfusion group had average of 5.6 transfusions (which differ from standard care group) ACS: 35%	1. Chronic transfusion (n = 20) maintaining a hemoglobin of 2 g/dL rise over baseline with matched red cells for D, C/c, E/e, and Kell antigens 2. Standard care (n = 16)	4 weeks	NR	nttp://bmjopen. ) . ng, Al training	NR	СТ
24 <sub>Styles</sub> 25JSA 26 <sub>67]</sub> 27 28	Single-arm Open-label ½ study Three centers 15 (0); 1	NR	Adults Mean: 32 (range 18-50) All African- American	HbSS: 13 HbSβº: 2	HU: 4 (26.7%)	VOC: 6 (past year)	ACS: 2 (past year) Transfusion: 2 (past year) Priapism: 1 (past year)	GMI-1070 20mg/kg (first dose) and 10 mg/kg after 10 hours	28 days	NR	, and similar to	NR	CT
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	<sup>†</sup> If not stated, onl *final number use ACS: Acute chest Foundation; ED: e Methotrexate; NA anti-inflammatory and Development	ly one arm data were shown as repre ed for analysis or crossover design : syndrome; ALT: Alanine transaminase amergency department; HbSS: Homozy D: N-acetylcysteine ;NCATS: National drugs; NR: Not reported; OOPD: FDA:	sentative y: CA: Conference ab gous sickle haemoglot Center for Advancing s Office of Orphan Pr	stract; Cr: creatinine in (HbS); HbSC: sickl Translational Scien oducts Developmen	; CSRPM: Ce le haemoglobin ces; NCRR: N t; PT: patient;	nter for Scientific Res I S and haemoglobin C lational Center for Re SCD: sickle cell dise	search into Plant Med ; HbSβ: sickle beta tha search Resources; N ase; TCD: transcrania	licine; CT: Clinical trial registr alassemia, type '0' or '+'; HU: h IHLBI: National Heart Lung a al Doppler; ZonMw: The Neth	y; DDCF: Dori ydroxyurea; J <i>i</i> nd Blood Instit erlands Orgar	s Duke C A: Journai ute; NSA nisation fo	June 14 2925 at Agence Bibliographic echnologi@s.	TX: roidal esearch	
42 43 44 45 46				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://br	mjopen.bmj.o	com/site/about/g	uidelines	s.xhtm	que de l		

jopen-2019-034147 on 17 Septemb Ense <sup>1</sup> bv coovright, including for uses r BMJ Open Reference Schlaeger JMM, Robert E.; Yao, Yingwei; Suarez, Marie L.; Golembiewski, Julie; Wilkie, Diana J.; Votta-Velis, Gina: Management of SickleCell Pain 1. Using Pregabalin: A Pilot Study. Pain Management Nursing 2017, 18(6):391-400. Hoppe CJ. Eufemia: Styles, Lori: Kuypers, Frans: Larkin, Sandra: Vichinsky, Elliott: Simvastatin reduces vaso-occlusive pain in sickle della Haemia: 2. a pilot efficacy trial. British Journal of Haematology 2017, 177(4):620-629. Glassberg JM, Caterina; Cromwell, Caroline; Cytryn, Lawrence; Kraus, Thomas; Skloot, Gwen S.; Connor, Jason T.; Rahman, Adee Bing deleurer, 3. William J.: Inhaled steroids reduce pain and sVCAM levels in individuals with sickle cell disease: A triple-blind, randomized trial American Journal of Hematology 2017, 92(7):622-631. Ataga KIK, Abdullah; Kanter, Julie; Liles, Darla; Cancado, Rodolfo; Friedrisch, Joao; Guthrie, Troy H.; Knight-Madden, Jennifer; Alvar 😎 4. Gordeuk, Victor R.; Gualandro, Sandra; Colella, Marina P.; Smith, Wally R.; Rollins, Scott A.; Stocker, Jonathan W.; Rother, Russell P.: C and Construction and for the Prevention of Pain Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. New England Journal of Medicine 2017, 376(5):429-439. 5. Ataga KIK, A.; Kanter, J.; Liles, D.; Cancado, R.; Friedrisch, J.; Guthrie, T. H.; Knight-Madden, J.; Alvarez, O. A.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Gualandra, 😨 📿 Collela. M. P.; Smith, W. R.; Rollins, S. A.; Stocker, J. W.; Rother, R. P.: SUSTAIN: A multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-bling 22month study to assess safety and efficacy of selo1 with or without hydroxyurea therapy in sickle cell disease patients with sickle cell crises. Blood Conference: 58th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology. ASH 2016. 128(22). Kutlar AK, J; Liles, D; Cancado, R; Bruederle, A; Shi, M; Zhu, Z; Ataga, Ki: Crizanlizumab, A P-selectin inhibitor, increases the like 6. experiencing a sickle cell-related pain crisis while on treatment: results from the phase II sustain study. Haematologica Conference: 22th congress of the european hematology association Spain 2017, **102**:166. Kanter JK, A; Liles, D; Cancado, R; Bruederle, A; Shi, M; Zhu, Z; Ataga, Ki: Crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg increased the time to first on-treament sickle 7. cell pain crisis: a subgroup analysis of the phase ii sustain study. Blood Conference: 59th annual meeting of the american society of hematology, ASH 2017 United states 2017, 130(Supplement 1) (no pagination). 8. Washko JKK, A.; Liles, D.; Cancado, R.; Shi, M.; Zhu, Z.; Ataga, K.: Crizanlizumab 5.0mg/kg increased the time to first on-treatment Siekle Cell Pain Crisis (SCPC) and the likelihood of not experiencing SCPC while on treatment: Subgroup analyses of the phase 2 sustain stordy. Rediatric Blood and Cancer 2018, 65 (Supplement 1):S81.

- 9. Lemonne NM, B.; Charlot, K.; Garnier, Y.; Waltz, X.; Lamarre, Y.; Antoine-Jonville, S.; Etienne-Julan, M.; Hardy-Dessources, M. D.; Tomana, M.; Connes, P.: Effects of hydroxyurea on blood rheology in sickle cell anemia: A two-years follow-up study. Clin Hemorheol Marcoric 2017, 67(2):141-148.
- Quarmyne MOD, W.: Theodore, R.: Anand, S.: Barry, V.: Adisa, O.: Buchanan, I. D.: Bost, J.: Brown, R. C.: Joiner, C. H.: Lane, P. A.: Evdraxvurea 10. effectiveness in children and adolescents with sickle cell anemia: A large retrospective, population-based cohort. American Journal of Hematology 2017, 92(1):77-81.
- Daak AH, M.; Dampier, C.; Fuh, B.; Kanter, J.; Alvarez, O.; Black, V.; McNaull, M.; Callaghan, M.; George, A.; Neumayr, L.; Hilliard, La Sarkilio, F.; 11. Rabinowicz, A.: Clinical effect of SC411 (Alternia TM) on children with sickle cell disease in the scot trial: A phase 2 randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, dose-finding multi-center study. Pediatric Blood and Cancer 2018, 65 (Supplement 1):S8.
- 12. Bridges KRG, B.: Bronte, L.: A single center experience of GBT440 treatment of severe anemia in sickle cell disease (SCD). Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, **130**(Supplement 1). ence Bibliographique

de

#### 44 45 46

43

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

	BMIOnen	jope d by
		sub-2
		019 oyri
		9-03 ght
		, 414
		17 o clu
		in 1 ding
		7 S g fo
13.	Charnigo RJT, B.; Rybin, D.; Pittman, D. D.; Sivamurthy, K. M.; Beidler, D.; Clarke, N.: Safety and tolerability of PF-04447943 acro	ss a clingeal trial
14.	Sins JWRF, K.; Rijneveld, A. W.; Boom, M. B.; Kerkhoffs, J. L. H.; van Meurs, A. H.; de Groot, M. R.; Heijboer, H.; Dresse, M. F.; Le	, P. <b>B</b> . <b>J</b> . <b>B</b> rmans,
	P.; Vanderfaeillie, A.; Van Den Neste, E. W.; Benghiat, F. S.; Kesse-Adu, R.; Delannoy, A.; Efira, A.; Azerad, M. A.; de Borgie, C. A	.; Bign Bind, B. J.:
	2017.	
15.	Sins JWRF, K.; Rijneveld, A. W.; Boom, M. B.; Kerkhoffs, J. L.; Van Meurs, A. H.; De Groot, M. R.; Heijboer, H.; Dresse, M. F.; Fers	ter, A. d lormans,
	Biemond, B. J.: N-acetylcysteine in patients with sickle cell disease: A randomized controlled trial. Blood Conference: 58th A	Annue Me S. M.,
16	the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2016, <b>128</b> (22).	
10.	in Sickle Cell Disease. N Engl J Med 2018, 379(3):226-235.	a o d d e d d e d
17.	Niihara YT, Lan; Razon, Rafael; Stark, Charles; Macan, Henry: Decrease in the Severity of Painful Sickle Cell Crises with Oral Pg	lg [confference].
18.	Niihara YK, Han A.; Tran, Lan; Razon, Rafael; Macan, Henry; Stark, Charles; Wun, Ted; Adams-Graves, Patricia: A Phase 3 Study	/ of E-
10	Therapy for Sickle Cell Anemia and Sickle beta(0)-Thalassemia [Conference]. Blood 2014, 124(21).	
19.	and sickle beta0 -thalassemia subgroup analyses show consistent clinical improvement. Blood Conference: 58th Annual Meetir	ig of the American
20	Society of Hematology, ASH 2016, 128(22).	
20.	glutamine in sickle cell disease: Analyses of time to first and second crisis and average cumulative recurrent events. Blood	Conference: 59th
~ 1	Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, 130(Supplement 1).	ning in the
21.	Sethy SP, T.; Jena, R. K.: Beneficial Effect of Low Fixed Dose of Hydroxyurea in Vaso-occlusive Crisis and Transfusion Requile HbSS Patients: A Prospective Study in a Tertiary Care Center. Indian Journal of Hematology and Blood Transfusion 2018. 34(2):	294≌298.⊒
22.	Di Maggio RH, M. M.; Zhao, X.; Calvaruso, G.; Rigano, P.; Renda, D.; Tisdale, J. F.; Maggio, A.: Chronic administration of hy	ydroxyurga (HU)
23.	Youssry IA-S. A.: Ismail. R.: Bou-Fakhredin. R.: Mohamed Samy. R.: Ezz El-Deen. F.: Taher. A. T.: Enhancing Effect of Hydroxy	vurea.on alb Fin
	Sickle Cell Disease: Ten-Year Egyptian Experience. Hemoglobin 2017, 41(4-6):267-273.	ilar .
24.	Bumma NK, A.; Surapaneni, M.; Kim, S.; Swerdlow, P.: Scheduled outpatient red blood cell exchange program reduces complications in sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology. ASH 2017.	1300 Supplement
		hne
25.	Kwiatkowski JLI, F.; Rozova, A.: Safety of deferiprone in individuals with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 59th Annu American Society of Hematology. ASH 2017. 130(Supplement 1).	al Meeting of the
26.	Rigano PDF, L.; Sainati, L.; Piga, A.; Piel, F. B.; Cappellini, M. D.; Fidone, C.; Masera, N.; Palazzi, G.; Gianesin, B.; Forni, G. L.: Rea	Il-lifeexperience
	with hydroxyurea in sickle cell disease: A multicenter study in a cohort of patients with heterogeneous descent. Blood Cell. Diseases 2018. 69:82-89.	s, Mfölec شوهs, and پر
27.	Al Hashmi KA-D, H.; Jose, S.; Al-Khabori, M. K.: Hydroxyurea: Clinical and hematological effects in omani patients with sic	kle cell disease.
	Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, <b>130</b> (Supplement 1).	Jen
		Ce E
		Bibl
		iog
		rap
		hiq
	For near review only - http://hmionen.hmi.com/cita/about/quidalines.yk	
	r or peer review only - http://binjopen.binj.com/site/about/guidelines.xi	e I

44 45

Page

75 of 151	BMJ Open BMJ Open	
	0 PY 01	
	44	
	Since a standard st	
	ing 7	
28.	Colombatti RP, G.; Masera, N.; Notarangelo, L. D.; Bonetti, E.; Samperi, P.; Barone, A.; Perrotta, S.; Facchini, E.; Miano, M.; Del Vecchie Guerzoni, M. E.; Corti, P.; Menzato, F.; Cesaro, S.; Casale, M.; Rigano, P.; Forni, G. L.; Russo, G.; Sainati, L.: Hydroxyurea prescription analise and use for children with sickle cell disease in Italy: Results of a National Multicenter survey. Pediatric Blood and Cancer 2018, 353	G. C.; ability 2) (no
29.	rationale borrowed from rheumatoid arthritis. Experimental Hematology and Oncology 2017, 6 (1) (no pagination)(18).	y with
30.	Keikhaei BY, H.; Bahadoram, M.: Hydroxyurea: Clinical and Hematological Effects in Patients With Sickle Cell Anemia. Global journation of science 2015, 8(3):252-256.	health
31.	LeBlanc ZV, C.; Zhang, J.; Macksoud, S. R.; Battle, S.; Hilliard, L.; Lebensburger, J. D.; Howard, T. H.: Management of severe chrog 2016, 128(22).	1 with 4, ASH
32.	Heeney MMH, Carolyn C.; Abboud, Miguel R.; Inusa, Baba; Kanter, Julie; Ogutu, Bernhards; Brown, Patricia B.; Heath, Lori E.; Jakubo A.; Zhou, Chunmei; Zamoryakhin, Dmitry; Agbenyega, Tsiri; Colombatti, Raffaella; Hassab, Hoda M.; Nduba, Videlis N.; Oyieko, Janet B.; Ran Nancy; Segbefia, Catherine I.; Rees, David C.: A Multinational Trial of Prasugrel for Sickle Cell Vaso-Occlusive Events. New Englanding Medicine 2016, 374(7):625-635.	oseph vitaille, rnal of
33.	Heeney MH, C.; Abboud, M.; Inusa, B.; Kanter, J.; Ogutu, B.; Brown, P.; Heath, L.; Jakubowski, J.; Zhou, C.; Zamoryakhin, D.; Ageorge Colombatti, R.; Hassab, H.; Nduba, V.; Oyieko, J.; Robitaille, N.; Segbefia, C.; Rees, D.: Determining effects of platelet inhibition on vage of events (DOVE) trial: A double-blind, placebo-controlled, study of prasugrel in paediatric patients with sickle cell anaemia. Haemato 2016. 101 (Supplement 1):136-137.	ja, T.; I <b>usive</b> Mogica
34.	Reid MEEB, Amal; Inati, Adlette; Kutlar, Abdullah; Abboud, Miguel R.; Haynes, Johnson, Jr.; Ward, Richard; Sharon, Bruce; Taher, Ali T.; Smith Manwani, Deepa; Ghalie, Richard G.: A double-blind, placebo-controlled phase II study of the efficacy and safety of 2,2-dimethylbutyrate (	Wally; ( <b>HQK-</b>
35.	Adegoke SAS, Umar Abdullahi; Mohammed, Lasisi Oluwafemi; Sanusi, Yunusa; Oyelami, Oyeku Akibu: Influence of Lime Juice on the Seven Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine 2013, 19(6):588-592.	rity of
36.	Arruda MMM, Grazielle; Rodrigues, Celso A.; Matsuda, Sandra S.; Rabelo, Iara B.; Figueiredo, Maria S.: Antioxidant vitami supplementation increases markers of haemolysis in sickle cell anaemia patients: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlle trian Journal of Haematology 2013. 160(5):688-700.	and E British
37.	Wun TS, Denis; Frelinger, Andrew L.; Krishnamurti, Lakshmanan; Novelli, Enrico M.; Kutlar, Abdullah; Ataga, Kenneth I.; Knupp, Charles , Kutlar, Lillian E.; Strouse, John J.; Zhou, Chunmei; Heath, Lori E.; Nwachuku, Chuke E.; Jakubowski, Joseph A.; Riesmeyer, Jeffrey S.; Winters Kenneth A double-blind, randomized, multicenter phase 2 study of prasugrel versus placebo in adult patients with sickle cell disease. Jeffrey A double-blind, randomized, multicenter phase 2 study of prasugrel versus placebo in adult patients with sickle cell disease. Jeffrey A double-blind, randomized, multicenter phase 2 study of prasugrel versus placebo in adult patients with sickle cell disease.	lahon, eth J.: <i>rnal of</i>
38.	Soulieres DK, L.; Kutlar, A.; Ataga, K.; Zhou, C.; Heath, L.E.; Nwachuku, C.; Jakubowski, J.A.; Winters, K.J.; Riesmeyer, J. S.; Wun, T.: A Randon Double-Blind, Adaptive Phase 2 Multi-Center Study of Prasugrel Compared to Placebo in Adults with Sickle Cell Disease American Jou Hematology 2012, 87(7):E18-E19	<b>nized,</b> Irnal of
39.	Wun TS, Denis; Krishnamurti, Lakshmanan; Kutlar, Abdullah; Ataga, Kenneth; Zhou, Chunmei; Heath, Lori E.; Nwachuku, Chuke E.; Jak Joseph A.; Winters, Kenneth J.; Riesmeyer, Jeffrey S.: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Adaptive Phase 2 Multi-Center Study of Press Compared to Placebo in Adults with Sickle Cell Disease. <i>Blood</i> 2011, <b>118</b> (21):847-847.	owski, <b>sugrel</b>
	gence B	
	graph ph	
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

BMJ Open

d by copyright, including jopen-2019-034147 on 17 40. Daak AAG, Kebreab; Hassan, Zahir; Attallah, Bakhita; Azan, Haj H.; Elbashir, Mustafa I.; Crawford, Michael: Effect of omega-3 (n-3) fatty acid supplementation in patients with sickle cell anemia: randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. American Journal of Clincal autrition 2013. 97(1):37-44. Ataga KIR, Marvin; Ballas, Samir K.; Yasin, Zahida; Bigelow, Carolyn; St James, Luther; Smith, Wally R.; Galacteros. Frederic: Kutlar. Azcellar: Hull. 41. James H.; Stocker, Jonathan W.: Improvements in haemolysis and indicators of erythrocyte survival do not correlate with acute va 20 3 clusive crises in patients with sickle cell disease: a phase III randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study of the gardos chame grocker senicapoc (ICA-17043). British Journal of Haematology 2011, 153(1):92-104. Diop SS, Fabienne; Seck, Moussa; Gueye, Youssou Bamar; Dieye, Tandakha Ndiaye; Fall, Awa Oumar Toure: Sall. Abibatou: Thian Doudou: 42. Diakhate, Lamine: Sickle-cell disease and malaria: evaluation of seasonal intermittent preventive treatment with sulfadoxine-pytree amine in Senegalese patients-a randomized placebo-controlled trial. Annals of Hematology 2011, 90(1):23-27. Diop SS. Moussa: Gueve, Youssou Bamar: Soudre, Fabienne: Fall, Awa Oumar Toure: Sall, Abibatou: Thiam, Doudou: Sickle-Cell Bisease and 43. Malaria: Evaluation of Seasonal Intermittent Preventive Treatment with Sulfadoxine-Pyrimethamine in Senegalese patients-a Radiomized Placebo-Controlled Trial [Conference]. Blood 2010, 116(21):686-686. Viana MBA, R. C.: Painful Crises in Children with Sickle Cell Disease Are Not Prevented by Piracetam. Acta Haematologica 2009, #28 19-9.10. 44. Alvim RCV, M. B.; Pires, M. A. S.; Franklin, Hmoh; Paula, M. J.; Brito, A. C.; Oliveira, T. F.; Rezende, P. V.: Inefficacy of piracetam in the method 45. of painful crises in children and adolescents with sickle cell disease. Acta Haematologica 2005, 113(4):228-233. Bao BP, Ananda S.; Beck, Frances W. J.; Snell, Diane; Suneja, Anupam; Sarkar, Fazlul H.; Doshi, Nimisha; Fitzgerald, James T.; Swerdlow, Paul: Zinc 46. supplementation decreases oxidative stress, incidence of infection, and generation of inflammatory cytokines in sickle cell disease patients. Translational Research 2008, 152(2):67-80. Ataga KIS, Wally R.; De Castro, Laura M.; Swerdlow, Paul; Saunthararajah, Yogen; Castro, Oswaldo; Vichinsky, Elliot; Kutlar, Abdulah; Grringer, 47. Eugene P.; Rigdon, Greg C.; Stocker, Jonathan W.: Efficacy and safety of the Gardos channel blocker, senicapoc (ICA-17043), in patients with sickle cell anemia. Blood 2008. 111(8):3991-3997. Eke FUA, I.: Effects of pyrimethamine versus proguanil in malarial chemoprophylaxis in children with sickle cell disease: A and mized, 48. placebo-controlled, open-label study. Current Therapeutic Research-Clinical and Experimental 2003, 64(8):616-625. Pace BSS, A.; Pack-Mabien, A.; Mulekar, M.; Ardia, A.; Goodman, S. R.: Effects of N-acetylcysteine on dense cell formation in sickle cell disease. 49. American Journal of Hematology 2003, 73(1):26-32. Wambebe CK, H.; Momoh, J. A. F.; Ekpeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, O. S.; Bamgboye, E. A.; Nasipuri, R. N.; Kunle, O. O.; Okogun, J. 🛃; Eawerem, 50. M. N.; Audam, J. G.; Gamaniel, K. S.; Obodozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, O.; Double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomise@crossover clinical trial of NIPRISAN (R) in patients with Sickle Cell Disorder. Phytomedicine 2001, 8(4):252-261. Tomer AK, S.; Connor, W. E.; Clark, S.; Harker, L. A.; Eckman, J. R.: Reduction of pain episodes and prothrombotic activity in sickler cell gisease 51. by dietary n-3 fatty acids. Thrombosis and Haemostasis 2001, 85(6):966-974. Tomer AH, L. A.; Kasey, S.; Eckman, J. R.: Dietary n-3 fatty acid treatment reduces the frequency of pain episodes and the prothroabotic state 52. in sickle cell disease (SCD) [Conference]. Blood 1997, 90(10 SUPPL. 1 PART 1):445A-445A. de Abood MdC, Z.; Guerrero, F.; Espino, M.; Austin, K. L.: Effect of Depo-Provera (R) or Microgynon (R) on the painful crises of sicklecellenemia 53. patients. Contraception 1997. 56(5):313-316. 54. Gupta VLC, B. S.: Efficacy of zinc therapy in prevention of crisis in sickle cell anemia: a double blind, randomized controlled clinical teal. The Journal of the Association of Physicians of India 1995, 43(7):467-469. Manrique RV: Placebo Controlled Double-Blind-Study of Pentoxifylline in Sickle-Cell Disease Patients. Journal of Medicine 1987, 18(56):277-55. 291. Bibliographique For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml de

2 3 4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

<ol> <li>Zago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottina, C.; Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. <i>Acta Heernactologica</i> 1994, 72(1):694.</li> <li>Cabannes R., J.; Castaigne, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Pisssard, A.; Zohoun, I.: Clinical and biological double-bind reaction is seen to the second disease crises. <i>Agents and actions Supplement</i> 1984, 15:199-212.</li> <li>Sa Mi M.; Dukin, K.; Luwis, R.; Minora, M.; A. Davis, R.; Minora, M.; A.; Bavis, R.; Minora, M.; A.; Bavis, R.; Minora, M.; A.; Bavis, R.; Minora, M.; Bavis, M.; Martina, M.; Tamarina, M.; S.; Waka, B.; Obi, S.; Maka, B.; Obi, G.; Qianyala, P. O.; Efficado vi Instantis, M.; Bavis, M.; Marting, D.; Tiggettor, In <i>Acadistica</i> 1004 (2007) (2017) (</li></ol>	Page 77 of 15	BMJ Open	jopen d by c
<ul> <li>56. Zago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.: Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. <i>Acta Haematologica</i> 1984, 72(1):64.</li> <li>57. Gabanos RL, J.; Castajone, J. P.; Onda, A.; Plassard, A.; Zohoun, L.: Clinical and biological double-bind-study of ticlopidine is generative treatment of isckle-cell disease crises. <i>Agents and actions</i> Supplements 1984, 15(1):99-210.</li> <li>58. Gall MB, J.; Dark, A.; Lewis, R.; Morrow, H.; A Double-Blind Randomized Trial of Low-Dose Oral Ures to Prevent Sickle-Cell Oriseses Lancet 1982, 59(1):229-210.</li> <li>59. Dark A.; R.; Studev, C.; Sorgianti, G. R.; Medroxyprogesterone Actate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 59(7):229-210.</li> <li>50. Mann JRS, J.; Sodium-Bicardonater Porphylasis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. <i>Pediatrics</i> 1974, 53(3):414-416.</li> <li>11. Isaacs WAA, O.; Elliong, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 1977, 19750; 5950 (2000).</li> <li>50. Aki TC, F. L.; Lessen, L.; Falluro P formazine He Parleping Tim Kith Sickle Cell Anemia. <i>Journal of Pediatrics</i> 1986, 1987, 1987, 1987, 2087, 2087, 2088, 2083, 2014, 20</li></ul>			öp
<ul> <li>Sago MAC, F, F; Ismael, S, J.; Tone, L, G.; Bottra, C.; Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. <i>Acta Haematologica</i> 1984, 72(1):49-64.</li> <li>Cabannes RL, J.; Castaigne, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Pissaard, A.; Zohoun, L: Clinical and biological double-bind-study of ticlopidine is generative of <i>Chronic Diseases</i> 1982, 35(2):151-161.</li> <li>Daeculare RK, R.; Guber, C.; Sarpiani, G. R.; Medroxyprogesterone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 67(2):1223-120.</li> <li>Man, JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Diale Point Point Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 67(2):1225-126.</li> <li>Mann, JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 67(2):595-595.</li> <li>Oakl TC, F. L; Lessen, L; Failure of Promazine Hol to Preven Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 77(2):595-595.</li> <li>Oakl TC, F. L; Lessen, L; Failure of Promazine Hol to Preven Paintul Episodes in Sickle Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 77(2):595-595.</li> <li>Oakl TC, F. L; Lessen, L; Failure of Promazine Hol to Preven Paintul Episodes in Sickle Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 77(2):595-595.</li> <li>NUT04747269: A Study to Arsaugrol In Pediatric Participants Wth Sickle Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 77(1):595-596.</li> <li>Warnbee COB, E. A.; Bartin, B. O.; Kharndu, H; Mornin, J. A.; Experging, M., Audu, B. S.; Nickleva S. O; Nanjami, N. R; Konle, O. C. L, Gottau, J. Y. Kutar, A.; Chringer, F. P.; Ceckarto, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdow, P. S.; Besman, J. D.; Swyder, R.; Strouse, J.; J.; Harrington, T. B.; Wighelon, L; Gotdu, J.; Wringer, F. P.; Ceckarto, L. M.; Field, J.; Warnbee COB, C. A.; Barting, B. O.; Kharndu, H; Mornin, J.; Swerdow, P. S.; Besman, J. D.; Swyder, R.; Strouse, J.; J.; Marrington, T. B.; Wighelon, L; Gotdu, J.; Wringer, F. P.; Ceckarto, L. M.; Field, J.; Wrinner, M.; Kasten, J.; Jarvara, S.; Strouse, J.; J.; Marrington, T.; Billygeabon, L; Gottau, L, M.; Kasten, J.; Jarvara, J.; Strouse, J.; J.; Ma</li></ul>			vrig
<ul> <li>Sago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.: Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. <i>Acta Haematologica</i> 1984, <b>7</b>(1): 694.</li> <li>Cabannes RL, J.; Castalijne, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Pisssard, A.; Zahoun, I.: Clinical and biological double-biind-study of ticlopidine is generative treatment of sickle-cell disease crites. <i>Agent and actions</i> Signed ments 1984, <b>1</b>: 619–912.</li> <li>Call MB, J., Dark, A.; Laws, R.; Morrow, H.: A Double-Bind Randomized Trial of Low-Dose of Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Crises and <i>Biology</i> 2019.</li> <li>Decoduler KH, R.; Gruber, C.; Serjeant, G. R.: Metrowynogesterone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, <i>4</i>(5): 222-233.</li> <li>Mann JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophysixis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. <i>Peolatics</i> 1974, <b>3</b>(3):414-416.</li> <li>Isaacs WAA, O.; Elfinong, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, <i>4</i>(7):600-620.</li> <li>Oakir CC, F. L.; Lassen, L.: Falaure of Promazine VII to Prevent Sickle Cell Crisis. <i>Peolatics</i> 1974, <b>3</b>(3):416-416.</li> <li>Isaacs WAA, O.; Elfinong, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Asemai. <i>Journal of Pediatrica</i> 5987, <b>9</b>(2):25-236.</li> <li>McTortarBose, <b>5</b>. Atudy of Prasargel in Pediatric Participans: With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Wambele COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khannolu, H.; Mormoh, J. A.; Expeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Nokus, S. O., Nasiguri, N. R.; Kune, O. O.; Seruel, B.; F. (Delice, G.; Ogunyale, F. O.; Efficacy of Inpistan in the provphylactic Biosese and the start and House in Lawsen, A.; Harrington, T.; Buffer, A.; Coldozia, C. O.; Saruel, B.; F. (Delice, G.; Ogunyale, F. O.; Steroer, R.; J.; Armstrow, F. B.; Bostand, J. J.; Weirer, M. V.; Katon, J.; Tranzo, D.; Sindyer, F. O.; Sceler, K.; Mahmoud Hussin, A.; Harrington, T.; Buffer, Cold, J.; Weirer, M. J.; Kithandi, J.; Swerdia, J.; Swerdia, R.; J.; Canada, J.; Coldina, P.; Die, Cold, J.; Weirer, M.; J.; Kithana, J.; Tranzo, D.; Sindye</li></ul>	1		ant og
<ul> <li>Zago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.: Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Asplrin. Acta Haematologica 1981, 75(1):66(4).</li> <li>Cabannes RL, J.; Castaigne, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Plassard, A.; Zohoun, I.: Clinical and biological double-bind-study of ticologilance in the green treatment of sickle-cell disease crises. <i>Agents and actions: Supplements</i> 1984, 15(19):212.</li> <li>Gall MS, J.; Orta, A.; Lews, R.; Morrow, H.: A Double-Bind Radmonized Trial of Low-Dose On Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Crises Biological double-bind-study of ticologilance in the green treatment of sickle-cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 15(1):229-231.</li> <li>Mann JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophytaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. <i>Pediatrics</i> 1974, 53(3):414-16.</li> <li>Isaacs WAA, O.: Elfong, C.E.: Stroid Treatment In Prevention Or Paintid Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 15(4):502-503.</li> <li>Oski FC, F. L.; Lesson, L.: Falluro of Promazine Hci to Prevent Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 15(4):502-503.</li> <li>Oski FC, F. L.; Lesson, L.: Balluro of Promazine Hci to Prevent Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 15(4):502-503.</li> <li>Nicro2428205: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagoro in Reducing the Number of Days With Fain In Patients With Sickle Gell Bisease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 15(4):503-503.</li> <li>K.: Obodozie. O. C.: Study of Dresagna In Podiatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Vichinsky, F.; Neumay, L.; Gold, J.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Torran, D.; Sietsman, J. D.; Sindyer, R.; Strouge, J. J.; Amstrong F. P. D. Envertement (SCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormilites in neurologically intact adult patients wittgicklet cell disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>Vichinsky, F.; Neumay, L.; Gold, J.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Torran, D.; Sietsman, J. D.; Sindyer, R.; Strouse, J.; Amstrong F. P. D. Envertement (SCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and</li></ul>	2		· 4
<ul> <li>Gardines RL, J.; Castajane, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Plassard, A.; Zohou, I.: Clinical and biological adouble-blind-study of ticlopidine is memory treatment of sickle-cell Diseases with Aspirin. Acta Haematologica 1981, 72(1): effect of Cabanes RL, J.; Castajane, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Plassard, A.; Zohou, I.: Clinical and biological adouble-blind-study of ticlopidine is memory of the adout the supervise treatment of sickle-cell Disease crises. <i>Agent and actions</i> Supplements 1984, 15(19-212).</li> <li>Gail MB, J.; Dark, A.; Lawsi, R.; Morrow, H.: A Double-Blind Randomized Trial of Low-Dose Orl Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 49(1):51(-16).</li> <li>Decculier KN, R.; Gruder, C.; Serjeant, G. R.: Medroxyprogesterone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 49(2):54(-50).</li> <li>Board J, S.; Sodium-Bicznonate Prophylaxia of Sickle-Cell Crisis. <i>Pediatrics</i> 1984, 53(3):414-416.</li> <li>Isaasas WAA, O.; Elliong, C. E.: Steroid Traatment in Provention of Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1972, 45(3):54(-56).</li> <li>NCT02482298: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrelor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Get Baess. <i>Cancet</i> 1972, 55(3):</li></ul>	3		47 Icli
<ul> <li>Zago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.: Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. Acta Heemstologica 1984, 77 (1):99 64.</li> <li>Cabarnes RL, J.: Castalgne, J. P.: Ondo, A.; Plassard, A.; Zohoun, L: Clinical and biological double-bind-study of ticlopidine is measurement of sickle-cell disease crises. <i>Agents and actions Supplements</i> 1984, 45:198-219.</li> <li>Daw, A.; Lewis, K., Mortev, H A. Double-Bind Randomized Thai of Lew-Dose Oral Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Grises. <i>Heart Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crises. Pediatrics</i> 1974, 35(3):14:416.</li> <li>Issacs WAA, O.; Effing, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Paintel Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1982, 67(4):259-231.</li> <li>Mann JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. <i>Pediatrics</i> 1974, 35(3):41:416.</li> <li>Issacs WAA, O.; Effing, C. E.: Steroid Treatories in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patient With Sickle Gell Rifesses. 2012.</li> <li>Manna JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Marona JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Marona JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Waroteke CoB, E. A.; Badu, B. O.; Niamouri, H.: Moroni, J.: Pickpargon, M.; Audu, B. S.; Nioku, S. O.; Nasjouri, N. R.; Kunie, O. O.; Semaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Foluk, S. O.; Nasjouri, N. R.; Kunie, O. O.; Semaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Foluk, S. O.; Nasjouri, N. R.; Kunie, O. O.; Semaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Foluk, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.; Siever, R.; Kunie, O. O.; Semaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Foluk, S.; Polynaer, K.; Kunie, R.; Kunie, O. O.; Semaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Foluk, S.; Polynaer, N.; Kunie, O.; Cillogent, J.; Sartova, P.; Sensan, J. S.; Shordi P. Carlos, M.; Thrana, D.; Sinyder, C.; Kester, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A; Harrington, T. By Wardeke Cool, S. K.; Badh</li></ul>	4		di n
<ul> <li>2ago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.; Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. <i>Acta Haematologica</i> 1984, <b>7</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b>, <b>1</b></li></ul>	5		17 17
<ul> <li>Szago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.; Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. Acta Haematologica 1984, 77 (1):67-84.</li> <li>Szago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.; Treatment of Sickle-Cell Disease. Acta and biological double-bind-study of ticloptiane generative reatment of sickle-cell disease crises. Agains and automs Supplements 1984, 15:198-21.</li> <li>Sa, Dath, A.; Lewis, R., Mortow, H.; A. Double-Bind Randomized Triad of Lew-Dose Oral Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 25(2):181-161.</li> <li>Isaacs WAA, D.; Effond, C. E.; Storoid Tratament in Prevention of Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 25(2):182-161.</li> <li>Isaacs WAA, O.; Effond, C. E.; Storoid Tratament in Prevent Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(750):56-50.</li> <li>Ockler, C.F. L.; Lessen, L.; Failure of Promazine Hcl to Prevent Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(750):56-50.</li> <li>Ockler, C.F. L.; Lessen, L.; Failure of Promazine Hcl to Prevent Paintul Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(750):57, 56-50.</li> <li>McTro17425233. Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagriotin In Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Gene Effect of Ticagriotin In Reducing the Number of Days With Pain In Patients With Sickle Gene Gene Cell Assess. Letter Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(750):57, 57, 57, 56, 50.</li> <li>McTro1742523. Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagriotin In Reducing the Number of Days With Pain In Patients With Sickle Gene Gene Gene Cell Assess and Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(750):57, 57, 50.</li> <li>Kuthinsky, F. W.; Ganania, B. S.; Dobdozio, O.; O.; Samuel, B.; Folue, G.; Qounya, P. O.; Efficacy O. Inprison in the prevention of Sickle Cell Patients Optimum Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(750):57, 57, 57, 57, 57, 57, 57, 57, 57, 57,</li></ul>	6		ธ์ รู
<ul> <li>57. Cadadhis R. J., Cadadhis, J. P., Oldo, A., Plassin, A., Zohou, T., Cuinea, and Douglech aduate-bind-study of incloped in a gramitive intrational of skilke-cell desease crises. <i>Agriculture</i> <b>1</b>, 2010, 116, 119, 122, 2010, 116, 119, 119, 2012, 2010, 116, 119, 119, 2012, 2010, 116, 119, 119, 2012, 2010, 116, 119, 119, 2010,</li></ul>	7 56	Zago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.: Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin. Acta Haematologica 1984, 7/	2 1):68-64.
<ol> <li>Gall MB, J.; Dark, A.; Lewis, R.; Morrow, H.; A Double-Bilind Randomized Trial of Low-Dose Oral Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Crises, Segment of Chronic Deceases 1982, 352(1):511-61.</li> <li>Deceulaer KH, R.; Gruber, C.; Serjeant, G. R.; Medroxyprogesterone Acetate and Homoxygous Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 47(5):554-56.</li> <li>Mann JRS, J.; Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. Pediatrics 1974, 53(3):414-416.</li> <li>Isaace WAA, O.; Effiong, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(7):5554-56.</li> <li>Oski FC, F. L.; Lassen, L.; Failure of Promazine Hci to Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 17(7):5554-56.</li> <li>MCT01476396. A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. Journal of Pediatrics 1966, 7766 Sciences. 2016.</li> <li>NCT01476396. A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamolu, H.; Momoh, J. A.; Ekgepong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. O.; Nasipari, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.; Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamolu, H.; Momoh, J. A.; Ekgepong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. O.; Nasipari, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.; Withinsky, E; Neumayr, L; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Turan, D.; Snyder, C.; Kesler, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. B.; McRahon, L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, F. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Suessana, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Stroue, J. J.; Armstroag, F. B.; Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and Denefit of transferitor on advectory of the advectory of the Subte cell of transferitoric and transferitoric and</li></ol>	8	treatment of sickle-cell disease crises. Agents and actions. Supplements 1984. 15:199-212	
<ul> <li>Chronic Diseases 1982, 35(2):151-161.</li> <li>Deceulaer KR, R.; Gruber, C.; Serjeant, G. R.; Medroxyprogesterone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 3(2):475-01.</li> <li>Mann JRS, J.; Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. Pediatrics 1974, 53(3):414-416.</li> <li>Isaatas WAA, O.; Elfinong, C. E.; Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 1(7750):557-467 (2):20-20.</li> <li>Oskir C.F.; Lessen, L.; Failuro of Promazine Hci to Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 1(7750):557-467 (2):20-20.</li> <li>Oskir C.F.; Lessen, L.; Failuro of Promazine Hci to Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 1(7750):557-467 (2):20-20.</li> <li>NCT02482286: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrolor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2016.</li> <li>NCT04780806: A Study of Assauge In Pediatic Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Wambbe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khanolu, H.; Mornol, J. A.; Ekpeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njeku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kurle, O. O.; Greger, J. J. I.; Erwertenn, N. M., Gamaniel, S. K.; Dobotozie, J. O.; Samuel, B.; Folyle, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.; Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic distages. Current Therapoult, Rasaurch-Clinica and Exponmental 2010, 62(1):26-34.</li> <li>Vichinsky, E.; Neumary, L.; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Truran, D.; Snyder, C.; Kasten, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. &amp; Biodo Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. Anadomical trial of the safety and benefit of transfiguino vs. standar dare in the prevention of sickle cell elrelated complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase 100-100, page -26 (2000).</li> <li>Styles LW, Y.; Kutat, A.; O.; M.; J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: safge and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adul</li></ul>	9 58	. Gail MB, J.; Dark, A.; Lewis, R.; Morrow, H.: A Double-Blind Randomized Trial of Low-Dose Oral Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Cris	S. Laurnal of
<ol> <li>Deceulaer KH, R., Gruber, C.; Serjeant, G. R.: Medroxyprogestrone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1992, digraph 229-231.</li> <li>Mann JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. Pediatrics 1974, 53(3):414-416.</li> <li>Isaacs WAR, O.; Efflorg, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Pediatrics 1988, 79745 d5:256.</li> <li>NCT02422328: A Study to Assess the Effect of Treagencior in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Cell Bisease. 2016.</li> <li>NCT01476696: A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamofu, H.; Momoh, J. A.; Epeyeng, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.; Smarth, J. J.; Enwerenn, N. M.; Gamanled, S. K.; Obodie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fujule, G. Quinyale, P. O.; Efflexy of Inprisan in the prophylactic difference of patients with sickle cell disease. <i>Current Therapeuta Research-Clinical and Experimental</i> 2001, 62(1):26-34.</li> <li>Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstrong, F. B.</li> <li>Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the after data benefit of transferion or society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the after data patients with Sickle cell disease. 2010;16(21).</li> <li>Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, H. J.; Kramer, W.; Haaner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Saffgy and WK in a phase 107,116(21).</li> <li>Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Haaner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Saffgy and WK in a phase 102,116(21).</li> <li>Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Hanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-select</li></ol>	10	Chronic Diseases 1982, <b>35</b> (2):151-161.	r 2 gn
<ul> <li>12 60. <sup>11</sup>/<sub>1</sub>, IRS, J.: Sedium-Bicarbonate Prophytoxic of Sickle-Cell Crisis, <i>Pediatrics</i> 1974, 53(3):414-415. <sup>12</sup>/<sub>1</sub>, 52(4):25(4)</li></ul>	11 59	. Deceulaer KH, R.; Gruber, C.; Serjeant, G. R.: Medroxyprogesterone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982,	( <u>8</u> 267):229-
<ul> <li>13 61. Isaacs WAA. C., Elliong, C. E.; Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Paintu Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. <i>Lancet</i> 1972, 1(7750):55:96</li> <li>20sk F.C., F.L.; Lassen, L., Failure of Prozent Paintu Episodes in Sickle Cell Anemia. <i>Journal of Pediatrics</i> 1988, 776</li> <li>2016.</li> <li>20. Cox F.C., Ellionson, J. E., Stanon, J. M., Bromoth, H., Momoth, J. A.; Epoyeng, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. C., Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O. C.; Bernwerem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obodzie, O. C.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.; Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic difference in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults. <i>J.</i>; Signesman, J. D.; Sinyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Amstroge, F. S. 19</li> <li>66. Wichinsky, E.; Neumayr, L.; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Truran, D.; Sinyder, C.; Kesler, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. J.; McGrahon, L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Tellad, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Sinyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Amstroge, F. 31.</li> <li>18 lood Conference: S2A1 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transition on society of Hematology. ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transition in adults. <i>J.</i>; Thartan, J.; Sinyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Amstroge, F. 32.</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pariselectin inhibitor. Safety of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the family adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A rano Society of Hematology, ASH</li></ul>	12 60	Z31. Mann JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis, Pediatrics 1974, 53(3):414-416.	to nt C
<ul> <li>62. Oski FC, F. L.; Lessen, L.; Falure of Promazine HcI to Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Pediatrics 1968, 75 £ 5:266.</li> <li>63. NCT0242298: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrelor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Cell Bisease. 2016.</li> <li>64. NCT01476696: A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>65. Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamofu, H.; Mornoh, J. A.; Ekpeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. O.; Nasipuir, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.; Worgen, J. I.; Enverem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Foljuć, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.; Efficacy of Inpiresan in the prohylactic affectment of patients with sickle cell disease. <i>Current Therapoulic Research-Chinel and Experimental</i> 2010, 52(1):26-34.</li> <li>66. Vichinsky, E; Neumayr, L; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Turran, D.; Snyder, C; Kesler, K; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. &amp; McTahon, J. A.; Eld, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Besman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstrong, F. S. J. Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the phase INHLIBIC comprehises in the phase INHLIBIC comprehises in Additional care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complication in adults: A preliminary report from the phase INHLIBIC comprehises in the Sickle cell disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safg and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, Age 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safg and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, A</li></ul>	13 61	Isaacs WAA, O.; Effiong, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 1(7750):5	<u>ହ</u> ିତ୍ୟ ଚୁ
<ul> <li>63. MCT02482298: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagretor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Gett Bisease. 2016.</li> <li>64. MCT01476696: A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.</li> <li>65. Wambebe COB, E, A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamofu, H.; Khomoh, J. A.; Ekpevong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njeku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.; Gibergm, J. J.; Turs, D.; Snyder, S.; Njeku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O., Oidfergm, J. J.; Finewerem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obdodzie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.; Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic material control (21):26-34.</li> <li>66. Vichinsky, E; Neumayr, L.; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W; Kasten, J.; Truran, D.; Snyder, R.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. J.; McTahano, L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstrong, F. B.; Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized triansfusion and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients with Sickle cell disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Hanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>73. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Hanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: S2nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2000;116(21).</li> <li>74. 2000;116(21).</li> <li>75. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Hanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and Pathon 2000;116(21).</li> <li>76.</li></ul>	14 <sup>62</sup>	. Oski FC, F. L.; Lessen, L.: Failure of Promazine Hcl to Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Pediatrics 1968, 7	<b>ຈີ່ ເຊັ່</b> :265-266.
<ul> <li>A. 2010.</li> <li>2010.</li>     &lt;</ul>	15 63	. NCT02482298: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrelor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle (	Sett Disease.
<ul> <li>65. Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. Ö.; Khanotu, H.; Memoh, J. A.; Ekgevong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Nloku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O. O., Bern, J. J.; Enwerem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obdozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.; Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic information of patients with sickle cell disease. <i>Current Therapeulic Research-Clinical and Experimental</i> 2001, 62(1):26-34.</li> <li>66. Vichinsky, E.; Neumayr, L.; Gold, J. J.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Truran, D.; Synyder, C.; Kester, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. &amp; McRahon, L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kuttar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Synyder, R.; Toruse, J. J.; Amstroge, F. B.; B.</li> <li>810od Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transition vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehasiogiscike cell enters (SCC) Study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, A Styles UW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, A 2010;116(21).</li> <li>72 2010;116(21).</li> <li>73 51/es L. J. De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, A 2010;116(21).</li> <li>74 2010;116(21).</li> <li>75 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51</li></ul>	16 64	2010. NCT01476696: A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease 2012	dec
<ul> <li>Enverem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obodozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.: Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic and Experimental 2001. 62(1):26-34.</li> <li>K.; Obodozie, O. M.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Filed, J.; Swerdow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstrog, F. B.</li> <li>Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transfision vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehensiosic kickle cell disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>G. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safed PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology. ASH. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>G. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safed PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology. ASH. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml</li> </ul>	17 65	. Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamofu, H.; Momoh, J. A.; Ekpeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.;	Bka Gran, J. I.;
<ul> <li>of patients with sickle cell disease. Current Therapeutic Research-Chinese and Experimental 2001, 62(1):26-34.</li> <li>G. Vichinsky, F.; Neumary, L.; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Turuan, D.; Snyder, C.; Kesler, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. E. Mikrathon, L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstroug, F. B.</li> <li>Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transfision vs. Standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults. A preliminary report from the pase II NHEIR Comprehension Sickle cell centers (CSCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients withgicket cell disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and BPK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASM 2010;116(21).</li> <li>72. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>73. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Planner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and BPK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASM 2010;116(21).</li> <li>74. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>75. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Frauer, D.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and BPK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASM 2010;116(21).</li> <li>76. Styles LW, Terey M. Safety A. Safety A.</li></ul>	17	Enwerem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obodozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.: Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic	Bamagement
<ul> <li>bi. Vichinsky, E; Neumayr, L; Gold, J. I; Weiner, M. W; Kasten, J.; Hruran, D.; Shyder, C; Kesler, K.; Malmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, I. E Mcatanon, L; Gordeuk, V. R; Kular, A.; Ortnger, E. P; Bo Castro, L. M.; Field, J; Swerdlow, P. S; Bessman, J. D.; Shyder, R.; Strouse, J. J. Armström, F. St. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transfusion vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehipsivogiscikle cell centers (CSCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroinging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients withgicked cell disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safery and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>72. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>73. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safery and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>74. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>75. 303</li> <li>76. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Frae, M.; Piend, J.; Yaramer, M.; Banger, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safery and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. 4000000000000000000000000000000000000</li></ul>	10	of patients with sickle cell disease. Current Therapeutic Research-Clinical and Experimental 2001, 62(1):26-34.	nis) <mark>h</mark>
<ul> <li>L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kultar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swardlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstrong, F. B.,</li> <li>Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of temsing ion</li> <li>vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehensive sickle cell</li> <li>disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and BP K in</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH.</li> <li>2010;116(21).</li> <li>a these strong LM, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, N. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and BP K in</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH.</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH.</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH.</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH.</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology.</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology.</li> <li>a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease.</li> <li>b provide the study of the</li></ul>	19 66	. Vichinsky, E ; Neumayr, L.; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Truran, D.; Snyder, C.; Kesler, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. J	<b>G</b> Mc <mark>y</mark> lahon,
Blood Conterence: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of temstigsion vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehensive sickle cell centers (CSCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients with disease. 2010;116(21). 567. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safey and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2010;116(21). 289 300 311 32 333 34 35 36 36 37 38 39 40 40 41 42 42 43 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	20	L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstroi	<b>∑8</b> , F. <mark>2</mark> 8
<ul> <li>vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI compremasive sickle cell cellsease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, A94 2010;116(21).</li> <li>87. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, A94 2010;116(21).</li> <li>88. Safety A and Safety</li></ul>	21	Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of t	anstasion
cell centers (CSCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients with sickle cell disease. 2010;116(21). 67. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety are PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hernatology, Assert 2010;116(21). </td <td>22</td> <td>vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehe</td> <td>Sivesickle</td>	22	vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehe	Sivesickle
<ul> <li>disease. 2010;116(21).</li> <li>67. Styles LW, T; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, American Society 100,116(21).</li> <li>28.</li> <li>29.</li> <li>30.</li> <li>31.</li> <li>32.</li> <li>33.</li> <li>34.</li> <li>35.</li> <li>36.</li> <li>37.</li> <li>38.</li> <li>39.</li> <li>40.</li> <li>41.</li> <li>42.</li> <li>43.</li> <li>For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml</li> </ul>	23	cell centers (CSCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients with	Bickle cell
<ul> <li>67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety area PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, Asternor of the adults and the adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, Asternor of the adults and the adults are the adults are the adults are the adults are the adults and the adults are the adult adults and the adults are the adults are the adult adu</li></ul>	24	disease. 2010;116(21).	ar br
26       a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, Age       00         27       2010;116(21).       2010;116(21).       100         30       31       32       33       34         33       34       35       36       37       38       39         39       40       41       42       43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml       45       45	25 67	. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Saf	and PK in
2/       2010;116(21).         28	26	a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, AS	SHI ON
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 40 41 41 42 43 43 45 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	2/	2010;116(21).	nila √o
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 40 41 42 43 50r peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 45	28		r n te L
30       iii ologies.         31       iii ologies.         33       iii ologies.         34       iii ologies.         35       iii ologies.         36       iii ologies.         37       iii ologies.         38       iii ologies.         39       iii ologies.         40       iii ologies.         41       iii ologies.         42       iii ologies.         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         44       for peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	29		iun i
31       iogies.         32       iogies.         33       iogies.         34       iogies.         35       iogies.         36       iogies.         37       iogies.         38       iogies.         39       iogies.         40       iogies.         41       iogies.         42       iogies.         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         44       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	30		e 1
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	31		۹, loc
33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	32		20) 11es
34     at Agence Bibliographique della service       35     36       36     37       38     39       40     41       42     43       43     For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml       44       45	33		s. 25
35     36       36     37       38     39       40       41       42       43       44       45   For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	34		at
36     37       37     38       39     40       40     41       42     43       43     For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml       44       45	35		Ag
37       Se Bibliographique         38       39         40       40         41       42         42       43         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml       de 1         44       45	36		enc
38     Bibliographique       39       40       41       42       43       44       45	37		ĕ
39     biliographic       40       41       42       43       44       45	38		Bib
40 41 42 43 44 44 45	39		vlio
41 42 43 44 45 41 45	40		ğra
42 43 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml <b>d</b> 44 45	41		ldε
43 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 44 45	42		niq
44 45	43		, Le
45 <b>—</b>	44	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtm	de
	45		-

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

# Appendix C. Additional details of the network meta-analysis

#### B.1 Methods of the network meta-analysis

We first define the Bayesian network meta-analysis (NMA) statistical models used to synthesize transformed outcomes, on the log hazard scale, from each randomized controlled trial (RCT). The link functions to connect these models to the different data summaries are then presented. The same statistical models are used for crisis, hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events but the link functions vary depending on what data is reported by each RCT (see main text for outcomes analyzed). The NMA models are in line with the recommendations of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Decision Support Unit (DSU) technical support documents (TSD), in particular NICE DSU TSD 2. OpenBUGS code is provided for each outcome in appendix **B.4**.

For all random parameters (i.e.  $\mu_{..}$  and  $d_{..}$ ) vague *Normal*(0, 0.001) priors were used.

#### Fixed-effects network meta-analysis model

When the available evidence consists of a network of multiple pairwise comparisons (i.e. AB-trials, AC-trials, BC-trials, etc.) the standard fixed effects model for NMA can be specified as follows:

$$\theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} \mu_{jb} & \text{if } k = b \\ \mu_{jb} + d_{bk} = \mu_{jb} + d_{Ak} - d_{Ab} & \text{if } k > b \\ d_{AA} = 0 \end{cases}$$
(3)

There are *k* treatments labelled as A, B, C, etc., and treatment A is taken to be the reference treatment for the analysis.  $\mu_{jb}$  is the (transformed) outcome in study *j* on 'baseline' treatment *b* which will vary across studies.  $d_{bk}$  is the fixed effect of treatment *k* relative to 'baseline treatment' *b*.  $d_{bk}$  are identified by expressing 0them in terms of the reference treatment A:  $d_{bk} = d_{Ak} - d_{Ab}$  with  $d_{AA} = 0$ .

#### Random-effects network meta-analysis model

$$\theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} \mu_{jb} & \text{if } k = b \\ \mu_{jb} + \delta_{jbk} & \text{if } k > b \end{cases}$$
(4)

$$\delta_{jbk} \sim Normal(d_{bk}, \sigma^2) = Normal(d_{Ak} - d_{Ab}, \sigma^2)$$
  
 $d_{AA} = 0$ 

 $\delta_{jbk}$  is the trial-specific treatment effect of *k* relative to treatment *b*. These trial-specific effects are drawn from a random-effects distribution:  $\delta_{jbk} \sim N(d_{bk}, \sigma^2)$ . Again, the pooled effects,  $d_{bk}$ , are identified by expressing them in terms of the reference treatment A. The heterogeneity  $\sigma^2$  is assumed constant for all treatment comparisons. (A fixed effect model is obtained if  $\sigma^2$  equals zero.)

#### **BMJ** Open

This random-effects model treats multiple-arm trials (>2 treatments) without taking account of the correlations between the trial-specific  $\delta$ s that they estimate. Bayesian random-effects models with a heterogeneity parameter for  $d_{Ak}$  can be easily extended to fit trials with 3 or more treatment arms by decomposing a multivariate normal distribution as a series of conditional univariate distributions.<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta_{jbk_1} \\ \vdots \\ \delta_{jbk_p} \end{pmatrix} \sim Normal \begin{pmatrix} d_{bk_1} \\ \vdots \\ d_{bk_p} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & \cdots & \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{2} & \cdots & \sigma^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}$$
(5)

Then the conditional univariate distributions for arm *i* given the previous 1, ....(*i*-1) arms are:

$$\delta_{jbk_i} \mid \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{jbk_1} \\ \vdots \\ \delta_{jbk_{i-1}} \end{pmatrix} \sim Normal \left( d_{bk_i} + \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( \delta_{jbk_j} - d_{bk_j} \right), \frac{(i-1)}{2i} \sigma^2 \right)$$
(6)

#### Random-effects network meta-analysis model with constant covariate interaction term

$$\theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} \mu_{jb} & \text{if } k = b \\ \mu_{jb} + \delta_{jbk} & \text{if } k > b \end{cases}$$
  
$$\delta_{jbk} = \begin{cases} Normal(d_{Ak} - d_{Ab} + \beta X_j, \sigma^2) & \text{if } b = A \\ Normal(d_{Ak} - d_{Ab}, \sigma^2) & \text{if } b \neq A \end{cases}$$
  
$$d_{AA} = 0$$

 $X_j$  is the trial-specific covariate value.  $\beta$  is the corresponding treatment-by-covariate interaction term, which is the same for all interventions.

#### Link functions for shared parameter models

As described above, the available data is connected to the model via the likelihood and the link function  $\theta_{jk} = g(\gamma_{jk})$ . If different data summaries are used by different studies, it is necessary to use a shared parameter model, where different link functions and likelihoods are used for each study<sup>2</sup>. Our underlying model will be on the log hazard ratios *d*.., which can be fixed or random and include meta-regression effects as discussed. In SCD it will be necessary to connect the following data summaries.

1) Estimated annualized event log rate  $log(\lambda_{jk})$  (mean or median) with standard error  $se_{jk}$  are modelled with identity link and Normal likelihood

$$\log(\lambda_{jk}) \sim Normal(\theta_{jk}, se_{jk}^2)$$

2) Total number of events  $r_{jk}$  over exposure  $E_{jk}$  are modelled with log link and Poisson likelihood

$$r_{jk} \sim Pois(\lambda_{jk}E_{jk})$$
  
 $\theta_{jk} = \log(\lambda_{jk})$ 

- 3) Mean number of events per patient  $\bar{r}_{jk}$  over  $n_{jk}$  patients is transformed to total number of events  $r_{jk}$  and modelled as type 2 data.
- 4) Number of patients w<sub>ij</sub> with ≥1 event over mean follow-up time t<sub>ij</sub> are modelled with a binomial likelihood and complementary log log (cloglog) link with log time as offset

$$r_{jk} \sim Binomial(P_{jk}, n_{jk})$$
$$cloglog(P_{jk}) = \log(-\log(P_{jk})) = \log(t_{jk}) + \theta_{jk}$$

5) Log hazard ratio or log rate ratio  $log(hr_{jk})$  with standard error  $se_{jk}$  between active arm k and control arm b. This is slightly different as we no longer have data on both arms, only on the contrasts.

$$log(hr_{jk}) \sim Normal(\theta_{jk}, se_{jk}^2), \text{ for } k > b$$

and

 $\theta_{jk} = d_{bk} \text{ if fixed effects}$   $\theta_{jk} = \delta_{jbk}, \text{ if random effects or meta-regressions}$ 

An adjusted standard error is needed for log hazard ratios if trials have more than 2 arms, as there is induced correlation between arms due to the common control.

## Table 1 Summary of analyses planned for different outcome measures on each of the outcomes

Outcome	Outcome		Analysis	Why this analysis
	measure		planned	
Crisis	Total crises	pain	Poisson likelihood, log link (Type 2 data)	Multiple events per patient so modelling underlying log hazard with a Poison likelihood.
			uulu)	

	Mean or rate	Scale to total	Mean per patient gives total when scaled
	pain crises	pain crises	by patient number.
	Patients with ≥1	Binomial	At most one such 'event' per patient,
	pain crisis	likelihood	giving a binomial. Convert to log hazard
		with cloglog	scale modelled via Poisson using a
		link (type 4	cloglog function and a log follow-up time
		data)	offset.
	Risk	Normal	Direct observation of difference in log
	ratio/hazard	likelihood	rates/hazards.
	ratio of crisis	with identity	
		link (type 5	
		data)	
Hospitalization	Total	Poisson	Multiple events per patient so modelling
	hospitalization	likelihood, log	underlying log hazard with a Poison
	days	link (Type 2)	likelihood.
	Mean, median,	Scale to total	Mean per patient gives total when scaled
	or rate	hospitalizatio	by patient number.
	hospitalization	n days	
	days	Ì.	
Adverse	Total events	Poisson	Multiple events per patient so modelling
events or		likelihood, log	underlying log hazard with a Poison
serious adverse		link (Type 2)	likelihood.
events	No. of patients	Binomial	At most one such 'event' per patient,
	with $\geq$ 1 event	likelihood	giving a binomial. Convert to log hazard
		with cloglog	scale modelled via Poisson using a
		link (type 4	cloglog function and a log follow-up time
		data)	offset.
	% patients with	Scale to	Percentage gives total when multiplied by
	≥ 1 event	number of	patient numbers
		patients with	

## B.2 Outcome definitions used in the analyzed trials

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

2
2
5
4
5
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
15
16
17
18
19
20
20 21
21
22
23
24
25
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
21
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
38
39
40
41
42
12
43
44
45
46
47
<u>4</u> 8
40
49
50
51
52
53
54
54
22
56
57
58
59

60

1

Study	Treatments	Crisis
Ataga 2017	Placebo High-dose	Sickle cell-related pain crises were defined as acute episodes of pain with
raga zorr	Crizanlizumab.	no medically determined cause other than a vaso-occlusive event, that
	Low-dose	resulted in a medical facility visit and treatment, with oral or parenteral
	Crizanlizumab	narcotic agents or with a parenteral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug.
		The acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration.
		and priapism were also considered to be crisis events.
Ataga 2011	Placebo, senicapoc	A painful crisis was defined as an episode of acute pain with no cause
		other than a vaso-occlusive event that required a medical facility visit and
		treatment with oral or parenteral narcotics, or parenteral non-steroidal
		anti-inflammatory drugs. Included in the definition of painful crisis were
		acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration,
		priapism, stroke and death (with the exception of homicide, suicide, or
		accidental death). To ensure consistency across sites, all protocol-defined
		sickle-related painful crises identified by the Investigators that resulted in
		a visit to a medical facility were adjudicated by an independent, blinded,
		Crisis Review Committee (CRC).
Ataga 2008	Placebo, senicapoc	An independent, blinded crisis review committee adjudicated all sickle cell
	(low-dose),	painful crises and related adverse event data (Document S1). A painful
	senicapoc (high-	crisis was defined as a period of severe pain (with no explanation other
	dose)	than SCD) lasting 4 or more hours in duration, requiring a visit to a health
		care facility, and requiring parenteral opiate or other narcotic for relief
Pace 2003	Placebo, NAC (low-	Defined as a visit to a medical facility that lasted more than 4 hr for acute
	dose) 600 mg/day,	pain related to vaso-occlusion requiring parenteral narcotics. The
	NAC (mid-dose)	occurrence of acute chest syndrome, priapism, splenic, or hepatic
	1200mg/day, NAC	sequestration was also counted as a VOC episode. Acute chest syndrome
	(high-dose)	included those subjects with chest wall pain and a new infiltrate on chest
	2400mg/day	X ray.
Niihara 2018	Placebo, L-	A pain crisis was defined as pain leading to treatment with a parenterally
	glutamine	administered narcotic or ketorolac in an emergency department (ED) (or
		outpatient treatment center) or during hospitalization.

#### Table 3: Adverse events reported in the 8 RCTs in the base case adverse events network

Study	Treatments	Outcome name	Adverse events included
Ataga 2017	Placebo, High-dose Crizanlizumab,	Adverse events	"Headache, Back pain, Nausea, Arthralgia, Pain in extremity, Urinary tract infection, Upper respiratory tract infection, Pyrexia, Diarrhea,

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
20	
40	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
22	

		Museuleskalatelesie Drumitus Versities Chest
Low-dose		
Crizanlizumab		pain
	Serious	Pyrexia, Influenza, Pneumonia
	adverse	
	events	
Placebo, senicapoc	Adverse	Nausea, Urinary tract Infection, Headache,
	events	Arthralgia, Upper respiratory tract Infection,
		Vomiting, Pyrexia, Pneumonia, Back pain, Pain
		in extremity, Nasopharyngitis, Cough,
		Constipation, Fatigue, Hypokalaaemia,
		Haematuria, Diarrhoea, Abdominal pain,
		Pharyngolaryngeal pain, Pruritus, Drug
		hypersensitivity
	$\sim$	
Placebo, senicapoc	Adverse	Diarrhea, Nausea, Constipation,
(low-dose),	events	Gastroenteritis, Upper respiratory tract
senicapoc (high-		infection, Chest pain, Increased SGOT,
dose)		Arthralgia, Back pain
Placebo, L-	Adverse	Tachycardia, Constipation, Nausea, Vomiting,
glutamine	events	Abdominal pain upper, Diarrhea, Chest pain
		(noncardiac), Fatigue, Urinary tract infection,
		Pain in extremity, Back pain, Headache,
		Dizziness, Nasal congestion
	Serious	A serious adverse event was defined as any
	adverse	adverse event, occurring while the patient was
	events	dose, that resulted in death, a life-threatening
		event, inpatient hospitalization or prolongation
		clinically significant disability or incapacity, or a
		congenital
		that might not have resulted in death, been life-
		threatening or required hospitalization could be
		considered serious adverse events if it was
		determined on the basis of appropriate medical
		determined, on the basis of appropriate medical
		determined, on the basis of appropriate medical judgment, that they could place the patient's
		determined, on the basis of appropriate medical judgment, that they could place the patient's health in jeopardy and might require medical or
		determined, on the basis of appropriate medical judgment, that they could place the patient's health in jeopardy and might require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the
		determined, on the basis of appropriate medical judgment, that they could place the patient's health in jeopardy and might require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed in the definition of serious
	Low-dose Crizanlizumab Placebo, senicapoc (low-dose), senicapoc (high- dose) Placebo, L- glutamine	Low-dose Crizanlizumab Placebo, senicapoc (low-dose), senicapoc (high- dose) Placebo, L- glutamine Adverse events events senicapoc (high- dose) Placebo, L- glutamine Serious adverse events

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
2	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
10	
20	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
20	
30	
31	
32	
22	
33	
34	
35	
26	
50	
37	
38	
30	
10	
40	
41	
42	
12	
40	
44	
45	
46	
47	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
EA	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1

Glassberg	mometasome		Hoarseness of voice thrush sore throat
2017	placebo		
2017			
Sins 2017	NAC	Adverse	Gastro-intestinal complaints, Pruritus / Rash,
	placebo	events	plus Discontinuation of study drug or placebo
		0.0110	because of adverse event and serious adverse
			events
			events
		Serious	Acute Chest Syndrome, Liver/spleen
		adverse	sequestration, Pyelonefritis with admission,
		events	Cholelithiasis with admission, Gastrointestinal
			perforation, Pulmonary embolism, Pneumonia
			with admission
Wun 2013	Prasugrel, placebo	Any serious	No detail given but they were non-hemorrhagic
		adverse event	events
NCT0248229	Placebo TICAGRELOR	Adverse	Sickle cell anaemia with crisis, Abdominal pain,
8	10MG	events	nausea, toothache, vomiting, fatigue, non-
			cardiac chest pain, pain, pneumonia, Upper
	45MG		respiratory tract infection, Urinary tract
	431010		infection, Arthralgia, Back pain,
			Musculoskeletal chest pain, Musculoskeletal
			pain, pain in extremity, Headache,
			Dysmenorrhoea, Cough, Epistaxis,
			Oropharyngeal pain
		Serious	Reticulocytopenia, Sickle cell anemia with
		adverse	crisis, Local swelling, Hepatic ischemia,
		events	Cellulitis, Gastroenteritis, Lower respiratory
			tract infection, Face injury, Arthralgia, Back
			pain, Musculoskeletal chest pain, headache,
			Acute chest syndrome, Vascular occlusion
Cleast			
Glassberg	placebo		noarseness of voice, thrush, sore thr oat
2017			

## **B.3 Additional results of the network meta-analysis**

Extended network for potential indirect evidence

#### **BMJ** Open

 We wished to assess whether additional direct or indirect evidence would be provided on comparators studied in the 9 RCTs of the adult only NMA by including the 25 excluded non-adult RCTs as well as Vichinsky 2010 on transfusions under the assumption that their standard of care was a placebo. To do this we plotted the evidence networks including non-adult RCTs reporting on crisis, hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events and connected to high-dose crizanlizumab. However, there were only additional RCTs connected to high-dose crizanlizumab reporting on the crisis outcome. No additional RCTs connected to high-dose crizanlizumab reported on hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events.

The extended evidence network for crisis is presented in Figure 1. This network consists of 9 RCTs, including 4 RCTs not in the adult only network: Daak 2018 (AlterniaTM vs placebo)<sup>3</sup>, Heeney 2016 (prasugrel vs placebo)<sup>4</sup>, Reid 2014 (HQK-1001 vs placebo)<sup>5</sup>, Vichinsky 2010 (transfusions vs standard of care)<sup>6</sup>. The extended network included 3 treatments not in the base case (AlterniaTM, HQK-1001, and Prasugrel). However, these additional RCTs did not provide direct or indirect evidence on any comparisons in the base case network.





Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

\* Network included adult (base case) and non-adult studies. Adult studies: Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Ataga 2011 (senicapoc vs placebo), Ataga 2008 (senicapoc low-dose, senicapoc high-dose vs placebo), Pace 2003 (NAC vs placebo), Niihara 2017 (L-glutamine vs placebo), Vichinsky 2010 (transfusion vs placebo). Non-adult studies: Daak 2018 (AltemiaTM vs placebo), Heeney 2016 (prasugrel vs placebo), Reid 2014 (HQK-1001 vs placebo)

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

## Sensitivity analysis using >18 years old subgroup results from Niihara 2018 on L-glutamine

As our target population was patients  $\geq$ 16 years old the Niihara 2018 study with 51 patients aged 5-12, 67 aged 13-18, and 112 aged >18 potentially differed in important effect modifiers. We used the reported rate ratio of 0.64 with 95% confidence interval (0.45, 0.89) in a subgroup of patients aged >18 years old to repeat our NMA. The results are presented as forest plots in Figure 2 with p-value table in Table 4 and pairwise results in Table 13. Notably, the hazard ratio for crises on crizanlizumab vs L-glutamine is 0.86 (0.57, 1.29) with p-value 0.77; this is higher and more uncertain that the hazard ratio of 0.67 (0.51, 0.88) and p-value >0.99 estimated using the full results of Niihara 2018.

#### Figure 2. Forest plot using >18 years old subgroup results from Niihara 2018 on L-glutamine



Sd

Table 4. Bayesian probabilities that crizanlizumab is superior or inferior on each outcome analyzed using >18 year old subgroup results from Niihara 2018.

2	
3	
1	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
1	^
1	1
I	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	/
1	ğ
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	2
2	ر ۸
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8
2	g
2	^
2	1
3	1
3	2
3	3
3	4
3	5
2	6
2	-
3	/
3	8
3	9
4	0
4	1
⊿	2
1	2
4	ر
4	4
4	5
4	6
4	7
4	8
4	9
5	0
5	1
5	1
5	2
5	3
5	4
5	5
5	6
5	7
5	/ 0
5	ğ
- 5	9

60

Treatment	Probability superior
Placebo	>0.9999
NAC (high-dose 2400mg)	0.1495
L-glutamine	0.7707
Low-Dose Crizanlizumab	0.9454
Senicapoc	>0.9999
High-Dose Senicapoc	0.8066
Low-Dose NAC	0.9429
Low-Dose Senicapoc 📈	0.8354
Mid-Dose NAC	0.6649

#### Model assessment of the crisis network meta-analysis

Model fit and meta-regressions were explored. The base case fixed effects model fit well (total residual deviance close to number of data points<sup>7</sup>) but the meta-regressions did not converge (Gelman-Rubin Rhat statistic far from 1.000, very wide credible intervals for the regression coefficient). This was because there was only one RCT on each treatment contrast. Deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification as they are similar to the fixed effects analysis.

Table 5. C	risis among	the adult	population:	Model	comparison
------------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-------	------------

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman- Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	14	15.44 (6.11, 25.85)	102.8	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	14	15.59 (6.14, 26.23)	102.9	45.66 (-83.88, 188.64)	1.681

	1/	16.07 (6.23,	103.8	-3.89 (-4.95, -	0.650
Mean age FE	14	27.08)	105.0	2.85)	7.0JZ
	1/	15.4 (6.15,	102.7	44.14 (8.16,	2 010
Proportion HbSS FF	14	25.73)	102.7	72.78)	2.010
TIBOOTE					
	14	15.29 (6.18,	102.5	76.07 (47.4,	7 202
Proportion HU		25.44)		106.76)	1.372
00011					
	1/	15.18 (6,	102 F	-7.35 (-50.24,	7 500
Trial duration	14	25.34)	102.5	37.51)	1.020
Proportion	14	15.77 (6.37,	102.2	-2.93 (-78.26,	21 211
	14	26.29)	103.3	72.71)	21.211
		$\mathbf{O}$			

#### Model assessment of the hospitalization days network meta-analysis

Model assessment and exploration of meta-regressions are presented in Table 6. The base case fixed effects model fits well (total residual deviance close to number of data points). Meta-regressions did not converge (Rhat statistic far from 1.000 and very wide credible intervals on the regression coefficient) as there was only one study on each treatment contrast. The deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification.

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman-Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	9	10.32 (3.02, 18.67)	72.69	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	9	10.46 (2.93, 19.2)	72.6	37.75 (-98.37, 172.76)	24.655
Mean age FE	9	10.52 (3.09, 19.2)	72.57	-5.85 (-7.09, - 4.67)	6.029
Proportion HbSS FE	9	10.28 (2.91, 18.68)	72.71	39.4 (-33.02, 108.38)	21.868

#### Table 6. Hospitalization days among the adult population: Model comparison

Proprotion HU use FE	9	10.22 (2.99, 18.53)	72.44	78.51 (15.98, 139.67)	7.582
Trial duration FE	9	10.03 (2.9, 18.16)	72.33	16.54 (-3.57, 36.27)	34.345
Proportion black FE	9	9.99 (3.05, 17.91)	72.25	29.18 (-26.53, 86)	27.376

#### Model assessment for the adverse events network meta-anlaysis

Model assessment and exploration of meta-regressions are presented in Table 7. The base case fixed effects model fits well (total residual deviance close to number of data points). Meta-regressions did not converge (Rhat statistic far from 1.000 and very wide credible intervals on the regression coefficient) as there was only one study on each treatment contrast. The deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification.

Table 7.	Adverse events	among the adul	t population	: Model comparison
----------	----------------	----------------	--------------	--------------------

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman-Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	11	12.38 (4.25, 21.55)	71.72	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	11	12.51 (4.27, 21.81)	71.96	57.94 (2, 114.04)	1.838
Mean age FE	11	12.35 (4.11, 21.73)	71.46	0.27 (-4.32, 4.95)	38.731
Proportion HbSS FE	11	12.65 (4.22, 22.29)	71.84	-45.33 (- 137.28, 42.08)	10.813
Proprotion HU use FE	11	12.15 (4.25, 21.02)	71.4	-25.25 (-81.24, 28)	5.985

Trial duration FE	11	12.02 (4.18, 20.87)	71.11	21.33 (-1.45, 43.98)	20.575
Proportion black FE	11	12.31 (4.33, 21.3)	71.61	-20.3 (-48.26, 3.68)	4.349

#### Model assessment for the serious adverse events network meta-anlaysis

Model assessment and exploration of meta-regressions are presented in Table 8. The base case fixed effects model fits well (total residual deviance close to number of data points). Meta-regressions did not converge (Rhat statistic far from 1.000 and very wide credible intervals on the regression coefficient) as there was only one study on each treatment contrast. The deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification.

Table 8. Serious adverse events a	among	the adult	population:	model	comparison

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman- Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	12	13.49 (4.86, 23.2)	70.89	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	12	13.87 (4.96, 23.98)	71.27	-57.35 (-183.99, 65.33)	1.204
Mean age FE	12	13.98 (5.08, 24.06)	71.49	-2.06 (-4.45, 0.36)	40.773
Proportion HbSS FE	12	14.08 (5.04, 24.24)	71.96	51.6 (35.74, 65.75)	1.652
Proportion HU use FE	12	13.49 (4.92, 23.1)	70.99	-140.71 (-210.66, - 68.54)	13.326
Trial duration FE	12	13.62 (4.92, 23.54)	70.87	-19.04 (-34.58, -3.28)	15.267

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52 53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Proportion black FE	12	13.37 (4.75, 23.13)	70.66	-5.77 (-118.35, 104.8)	36.318
------------------------	----	------------------------	-------	------------------------	--------

#### **B.3 OpenBUGS code for the network meta-analysis**

The code for the four shared parameter models used to analyze crisis, hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events are presented below. This code was run in OpenBUGS version 3.2.3 <sup>8</sup> with two MCMC chains of 400,000 iterations for burn-in and 30,000 iterations for posterior sampling.

#### Fixed effects model used for analyzing crisis.

model{ # Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2 # Poisson likelihood, log link # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials **#LOOP THROUGH STUDIES** for(i in 1:ns2){ # vague priors for all trial baselines *mu2[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001)* # LOOP THROUGH ARMS for (k in 1:na2[i]) { r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]\*E2[i,k] # failure rate \* exposure # model for linear predictor log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]] #Deviance contribution dev2[i,k] <- 2\*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]\*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k])) # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]]) totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])</pre> #Total Residual Deviance totresdev<-totresdev2+0 # Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods d[1]<-0 # treatment effect is zero for control arm # vague priors for treatment effects for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) } for(k in 1:nt) { # Bayesian one-sided p-values # Probability that treatment j has higher hazard than treatment k # step(x) is 1 if x>=0 for (j in 1:nt){ pval[j,k] <- step(d[j]-d[k]) } } } # Data in BUGS format (some data is redundant) list(E2= structure(.Data= c(6.50000E+01, 6.70000E+01, 6.60000E+01, NA, 1.44000E+02, 1.45000E+02, NA, 6.92308E+00, 7.15385E+00, 6.69231E+00, NA. NA, 1.75000E+00, 2.91667E+00, 2.33333E+00, 2.91667E+00, 7.20000E+01, 1.40308E+02, NA, NA), .Dim=c(5, 4)),t2= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, 7.00000E+00, 9.00000E+00, NA, NA, 1.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, 1.00000E+01, 1.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00, NA, NA), .Dim=c(5, 4)), r2=

NA, 8.90000E+01, 1.06000E+02,

structure(.Data= c(1.93700E+02, 1.09210E+02, 1.32660E+02,

**BMJ** Open

NA, NA, 5.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, NA, 8.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00, 1.20000E+01, 9.00000E+00, 3.04200E+02, 4.86400E+02, NA), .Dim=c(5, 4)), n4= NA, structure(.Data= c(3.80000E+01, 3.80000E+01), .Dim=c(1, 2)), ns1=0.00000E+00, ns2=5.00000E+00, ns4=0.00000E+00, ns5=0.00000E+00, na1=0.00000E+00, na2=c(3.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 0.00000E+00), 3.00000E+00. 4.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00), na4=c(0.00000E+00, na5=c(0.00000E+00, 0.00000E+00), nt=1.00000E+01, x= structure(.Data= c( NA, NA. NA, NA. NA, 5.50505E-01, 2.80152E+01, 7.12121E-01, 6.21212E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.19192E-01, NA. NA. NA, NA. NA. NA. NA, NA, 5.53633E-01, 2.89983E+01, 8.47751E-01, 5.64014E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.51557E-01, NA. NA, NA. NA, 5.00000E-01, 3.54833E+01, 1.00000E+00, 5.37603E-01, 2.30769E-01, 8.14103E-01, NA. NA, NA, NA, NA. NA, NA, NA, NA. NA, NA. NA, NA. NA. NA. NA. NA, NA, 4.76190E-01, 2.05286E+01, 8.49869E-01, 5.37603E-01, 5.83333E-01, 8.14103E-01, NA, NA. NA, 5.39130E-01, 2.20609E+01, 9.00000E-01, 6.65217E-01, 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01, NA. NA. NA, 01, 2.52754E+01, 8.49869E-01, 5.37603E-01, 9.51465E-01, 8.14103E-01), r2.base=c(1.93700E+02, 1.22000E+02, 8.90000E+01, 5.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, 3.04200E+02), E2.base=c(6.50000E+01, 1.27500E+02, 1.44000E+02, 6.92308E+00, 1.75000E+00, 7.20000E+01), r4.base=1.90000E+01, time4.base=4.61538E-01, n4.base=3.80000E+01, ns2.base=6.00000E+00, ns4.base=1.00000E+00)

# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant) # Inits 1

list(B=5.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, sd=1.00000E+00, mu.base=1.00000E+00, mu2=c(1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00))

#### # Inits 2

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52 53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

*list*(*B*=1.00000*E*-01, d=c( NA, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, sd=5.00000*E*-01, mu.base=5.00000*E*-01, mu2=c(7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01))

#### Fixed effects model used for analyzing hospitalization days.

model{ # Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2 # Poisson likelihood, log link # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials **#LOOP THROUGH STUDIES** for(i in 1:ns2){ *mu2[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001)* # vague priors for all trial baselines for (k in 1:na2[i]) { **# LOOP THROUGH ARMS** r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]\*E2[i,k] # failure rate \* exposure # model for linear predictor log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]] #Deviance contribution dev2[i,k] <- 2\*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]\*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k])) # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]]) totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[]) #Total Residual Deviance totresdev<-totresdev2+0 # Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods # treatment effect is zero for control arm d[1]<-0 # vague priors for treatment effects for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) } for(k in 1:nt) {

1	
2	
3	# Bayesian one-sided p-values
4	# Probability that treatment i has higher hazard than treatment k
5	# step(x) is 1 if $x \ge 0$
6	for (i in 1:nt){ pval[i,k] <- step(d[i]-d[k]) }
7	}
8	}
9	,
10	# Data in BUGS format (some data is redundant)
11	list(ns5=0.00000E+00, ns4=0.00000E+00, E2= structure(.Data= c(6.53846E+00, 1.34615E+01, NA,
12	6.50000E+01, 6.70000E+01, 6.60000E+01, 8.50000E+00, 5.00000E+00, NA, 7.20000E+01,
13	1.40308E+02, NA), .Dim=c(4, 3)), t2= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, NA,
14	1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00,
15	4.00000E+00, NA), .Dim=c(4, 3)), r2= structure(.Data= c(6.95300E+01, 9.34500E+01, NA,
15	4.46550E+02, 2.68000E+02, 4.53420E+02, 5.30000E+01, 9.00000E+00, NA, 1.81000E+01,
10	1.21000E+01, NA), .Dim=c(4, 3)), ns1=0.00000E+00, ns2=4.00000E+00, na1=0.00000E+00,
17	na2=c(2.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00), nt=6.00000E+00, x=
18	structure(.Data= c( NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, 4.42308E-01, 3.19615E+01, 9.61538E-01,
19	5.23307E-01, 3.07692E-01, 8.09945E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA
20	NA,
21	6.21212E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.19192E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA
22	NA,
23	6.86567E-01, 4.17910E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.67164E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA,
24	NA,
25	9.00000E-01, 6.65217E-01, 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA,
26	NA, NA, NA, NA, NA), .Dim=c(4, 4, 6)), mx=c(5.32240E-01, 2.81176E+01, 8.15057E-01,
27	5.23307E-01, 6.82692E-01, 8.09945E-01))
28	
29	
30	# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant)
31	# Inits 1
32	list(B=5.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00,
33	1.00000E+00), sd=1.00000E+00, mu.base=1.00000E+00, mu2=c(1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00,
34	1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00))
35	
36	# Inits 2
37	list(B=1.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01),
38	sd=5.00000E-01, mu.base=5.00000E-01, mu2=c(7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-
39	01))
40	
41	
42	Fixed effects model used for analyzing adverse events.
43	
44	model{
45	# Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2
46	# Poisson likelihood, log link
47	# Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
47	for(i in 1:ns2){    #LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
40 70	mu2[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) # vague priors for all trial baselines
49	for (k in 1:na2[i]) { # LOOP THROUGH ARMS
50	r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood
50	theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]*E2[i,k] # failure rate * exposure
J∠ E2	# model for linear predictor
55 E 4	log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i, 1]]
54	#Deviance contribution
55	dev2[i,k] <- 2*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k]))
56	}
57	# summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
58	resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]])
59	}
60	totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])

#### **BMJ** Open

	# Data type 4: number of patients r4 out of n4 with >=1 event in time4
	# Binomial likelihood, cloglog link
	# Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
	for(i in 1:ns4){ #LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
	$m_{\rm H}$ mu4lil ~ dnorm(0, 0001)
	for (k in 1 na4[i]) { # I OOP THROUGH ARMS
	$r4li kl \sim dbin(n[i k] n4li kl) # Binomial likelihood$
	# model for linear predictor
	cloaloa(p[i,k]) <- loa(time4[i,k]) + mu4[i] + d[t4[i,k]] - d[t4[i,1]]
	rhat[i,k] <- $p[i,k] * n4[i,k] $ # expected value of the numerators
	#Deviance contribution
	dev4[i,k] <- 2 * (r4[i,k] * (log(r4[i,k])-log(rhat[i,k]))
	+ (n4[i,k]-r4[i,k]) * (log(n4[i,k]-r4[i,k]) - log(n4[i,k]-rhat[i,k]))) }
	# summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
	resdev4[i] <- sum(dev4[i,1:na4[i]])
	}
	totresdev4 <- sum(resdev4[]) #Total Residual Deviance
totre	esdev<-totresdev2+totresdev4+0
	# Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods
	d[1]<-0 # treatment effect is zero for control arm
	# vague priors for treatment effects
	for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) }
	for(k in 1:nt)
	{
	# Bayesian one-sided p-values
	# Probability that treatment J has higher hazard than treatment K
	$\# \operatorname{step}(X) \text{ is } 1 \text{ if } X \ge 0$
	$10r(j m 1.m) \{ pval[j,k] <- step(d[j]-d[k]) \}$
ı	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
ſ	
# Di	ata in BUGS format (some data is redundant)
list(	rs5=0.00000E+00, $rs1=0.00000E+00$ , $E2=structure(Data=c(3.92308E+00, 8.07692E+00)$
2.40	0000E+01, 2.40000E+01, 1.44000E+02, 1.45000E+02), Dim=c(3, 2)), t2= structure(Data=
c(1.	00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00), Dim=c(3.00000E+00), Dim=c(3.000000E+00), Dim=c(3.00000E+00), Dim=c(3.00000E+00000E+00000E+00), Dim=c(3.000000E+00000E+00000E+00000E+00000E+00000E+000000
2)).	$r^{2}$ = structure(.Data= c(9.00000E+00, 3.20000E+01, 3.60000E+01, 3.90000E+01, 1.19000E+02,
1.27	7000E+02). Dim=c(3, 2)). time4= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.0000E+00, 1.000E+00, 1.000E+0
9.23	3077E-01, $9.23077E-01$ , NA), $Dim=c(2, 3)$ , $n4=$ structure( $Data=c(6.20000E+01, 6.60000E+01)$
6.40	0000E+01. 7.80000E+01. 1.52000E+02. NA)Dim=c(2. 3)). t4= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00.
5.00	D000E+00, 7.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, NA), Dim=c(2, 3)), r4= structure(.Data=
c(5.	50000E+01, 5.70000E+01, 5.60000E+01, 7.75000E+01, 1.48460E+02, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)).
ns2	=3.00000E+00, ns4=2.00000E+00, na2=c(2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00),
na4	=c(3.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00), nt=7.00000E+00, x= structure(.Data= c( NA, NA, NA, NA, NA,
NA,	NA, 4.42308E-01, 3.19615E+01, 9.61538E-01, 5.31449E-01, 3.07692E-01, 8.45348E-01,
5.50	D505E-01, 2.80152E+01, 7.12121E-01, 6.21212E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.19192E-01, NA, NA,
NA,	NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, S.97015E-01, 2.88836E+01,
6.86	5567E-01, 4.17910E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.67164E-01, 5.39130E-01, 2.20609E+01, 9.00000E-01,
6.65	5217E-01, 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA
NA,	NA, NA, 5.53633E-01, 2.89983E+01, 8.47751E-01, 5.64014E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.51557E-
01,	NA, $NA$ , $NA$ ), $.Dim=c(3, 4, 1)$
6)),	mx=c(5.36518E-01, 2.82643E+01, 8.21596E-01, 5.31449E-01, 7.46154E-01, 8.45348E-01),
r2.b	ase=c(9.00000E+00, 3.60000E+01, 1.19000E+02), E2.base=c(3.92308E+00, 2.40000E+01,
1.44	4000E+02), r4.base=c(5.50000E+01, 7.75000E+01), time4.base=c(1.00000E+00, 9.23077E-01),

# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant) # Inits 1

n4.base=c(6.20000E+01, 7.80000E+01), ns2.base=3.00000E+00, ns4.base=2.00000E+00)

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

*list*(*B*=5.00000*E*-01, d=c( NA, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00), sd=1.00000*E*+00, mu.base=1.00000*E*+00, mu2=c(1.40000*E*+00, 1.40000*E*+00), mu4=c(5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01))

# Inits 2

*list*(*B*=1.00000*E*-01, *d*=*c*( NA, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, *mu*.*base*=5.00000*E*-01, *mu*2=*c*(7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01), *mu*4=*c*(2.50000*E*-01, 2.50000*E*-01))

#### Fixed effects model used for analyzing serious adverse events.

```
model{
         # Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2
        # Poisson likelihood, log link
        # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
        for(i in 1:ns2){
                                     # LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
                 mu2[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001)
                                                 # vague priors for all trial baselines
                                            # LOOP THROUGH ARMS
                 for (k in 1:na2[i]) {
                         r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood
                          theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]*E2[i,k] # failure rate * exposure
                         # model for linear predictor
                         log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]]
                          #Deviance contribution
                          dev2[i,k] <- 2*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k]))
                         # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
                         resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]])
        totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])</pre>
                                              #Total Residual Deviance
        # Data type 4; number of patients r4 out of n4 with >=1 event in time4
        # Binomial likelihood, cloglog link
        # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
        for(i in 1:ns4){
                                     # LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
                 mu4[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001)
                                                 # vague priors for all trial baselines
                 for (k in 1:na4[i]) {
                                            # LOOP THROUGH ARMS
                         r4[i,k] ~ dbin(p[i,k],n4[i,k]) # Binomial likelihood
                         # model for linear predictor
                         cloglog(p[i,k]) <- log(time4[i,k]) + mu4[i] + d[t4[i,k]] - d[t4[i,1]]
                         rhat[i,k] <- p[i,k] * n4[i,k]
                                                        # expected value of the numerators
                         #Deviance contribution
                          dev4[i,k] <- 2 * (r4[i,k] * (log(r4[i,k])-log(rhat[i,k]))
                 + (n4[i,k]-r4[i,k]) * (log(n4[i,k]-r4[i,k]) - log(n4[i,k]-rhat[i,k])))
                                                                                    }
                         # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
                         resdev4[i] <- sum(dev4[i,1:na4[i]])
                 }
        totresdev4 <- sum(resdev4[])
                                               #Total Residual Deviance
totresdev<-totresdev2+totresdev4+0
        # Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods
                    # treatment effect is zero for control arm
        d[1]<-0
        # vague priors for treatment effects
        for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) }
        for(k in 1:nt)
        ł
                 # Bayesian one-sided p-values
                 # Probability that treatment j has higher hazard than treatment k
                 \# step(x) is 1 if x>=0
                 for (j in 1:nt){ pval[j,k] <- step(d[j]-d[k]) }
        }
}
```

# Data in BUGS format (some data is redundant)

list(ns5=0.00000E+00, ns1=0.00000E+00, E2= structure(.Data= c(2.40000E+01, 2.40000E+01, NA, NA, 6.92308E+00, 6.92308E+00, 6.00000E+00), .Dim=c(3, 3)), t2= 1.56164E+00, 3.36986E+00, structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, NA. 1.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00), .Dim=c(3, 3)), r2= structure(.Data= c(2.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, NA, 4.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, NA, 6.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00), .Dim=c(3, 3)), time4= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 9.23077E-01, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), n4= structure(.Data= c(6.20000E+01, 6.60000E+01, 6.40000E+01, 9.23077E-01, 7.80000E+01, 1.52000E+02, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), t4= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 7.00000E+00, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), r4= structure(.Data= c(1.70000E+01, 1.70000E+01, 2.10000E+01, 6.79380E+01, 1.18864E+02, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), ns2=3.00000E+00, ns4=2.00000E+00. na2=c(2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00. 3.00000E+00). na4=c(3.00000E+00. 2.00000E+00), nt=8.00000E+00, x= structure(.Data= c( NA, NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. 5.97015E-01, 2.88836E+01, 6.86567E-01, 4.17910E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.67164E-01, 5.50505E-01, 2.80152E+01, 7.12121E-01, 6.21212E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.19192E-01, NA. NA. NA. NA. NA, 4.83871E-01, 3.24258E+01, 5.96774E-01, NA, NA, NA. NA, NA, NA, NA, 5.23307E-01, 6.45161E-02, 7.39642E-01, 5.39130E-01, 2.20609E+01, 9.00000E-01, 6.65217E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, 5.40230E-01, 2.22448E+01, 7.23866E-01, 5.23307E-01, 2.30769E-01, 5.28736E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA), .Dim=c(3, 4, 6)), mx=c(5.42150E-NA, NA. NA. 01, 2.72162E+01, 7.23866E-01, 5.23307E-01, 5.43672E-01, 7.39642E-01), r2.base=c(2.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00),E2.base=c(2.40000E+01, 1.56164E+00, 6.92308E+00), r4.base=c(1.70000E+01, 6.79380E+01). time4.base=c(1.00000E+00, 9.23077E-01), n4.base=c(6.20000E+01, 7.80000E+01), ns2.base=3.00000E+00, ns4.base=2.00000E+00)

# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant) # Inits 1

*list*(*B*=5.00000*E*-01, *d*=*c*( NA, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, *sd*=1.00000*E*+00, *mu.base*=1.00000*E*+00, *mu2*=*c*(1.40000*E*+00, 1.40000*E*+00), *mu4*=*c*(5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01))

#### # Inits 2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

*list*(*B*=1.00000E-01, *d*=*c*(*NA*, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, sd=5.00000E-01, mu.base=5.00000E-01, mu2=c(7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01), *mu4=c*(2.50000E-01, 2.50000E-01))

### **B.4 Pairwise results of the NMA**

#### Table 9 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on crisis\*

	1.83 (1.45,	3.48 (1.06,	1.22 (1.06,	1.49 (1.19,	0.84 (0.64,	1.03 (0.28,	0.88 (0.33,	0.97 (0.26,	1.48 (0.55,
	2.31)	13.60)	1.40)	1.85)	1.12)	3.88)	2.15)	3.49)	3.90)
Placebo									
	High-Dose								
0.55 (0.43,	Crizanlizum	1.91 (0.57,	0.67 (0.51,	0.81 (0.63,	0.46 (0.32,	0.57 (0.15,	0.48 (0.18,	0.53 (0.14,	0.81 (0.29,
0.69)	ab	7.58)	0.88)	1.05)	0.67)	2.17)	1.21)	1.95)	2.18)
0.29 (0.07,	0.52 (0.13,	High-Dose	0.35 (0.09,	0.43 (0.11,	0.24 (0.06,	0.30 (0.04,	0.25 (0.07,	0.27 (0.04,	0.42 (0.11,
0.95)	1.76)	NAC	1.16)	1.42)	0.82)	1.77)	0.74)	1.65)	1.32)
0.82 (0.71,	1.50 (1.14,	2.85 (0.86,	L-	1.22 (0.94,	0.69 (0.50,	0.85 (0.23,	0.72 (0.27,	0.80 (0.21,	1.21 (0.44,
0.95)	1.97)	11.31)	glutamine	1.59)	0.95)	3.22)	1.79)	2.90)	3.22)
				Low-Dose					
0.67 (0.54,	1.23 (0.96,	2.34 (0.70,	0.82 (0.63,	Crizanlizum	0.57 (0.40,	0.70 (0.18,	0.59 (0.22,	0.65 (0.17,	1.00 (0.36,
0.84)	1.59)	9.28)	1.07)	ab	0.81)	2.65)	1.48)	2.39)	2.65)
1.18 (0.89,	2.17 (1.50,	4.12 (1.22,	1.45 (1.05,	1.76 (1.23,		1.23 (0.32,	1.04 (0.38,	1.15 (0.30,	1.75 (0.62,
1.57)	3.13)	16.55)	1.99)	2.53)	senicapoc	4.75)	2.63)	4.29)	4.75)
0.97 (0.26,	1.77 (0.46,	3.39 (0.57,	1.18 (0.31,	1.44 (0.38,	0.82 (0.21,	High-Dose	0.84 (0.17,	0.93 (0.25,	1.42 (0.27,
3.63)	6.74)	22.44)	4.43)	5.47)	3.15)	Senicapoc	4.19)	3.47)	7.25)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1.1	4 (0.46,	2.09 (0.82,	3.97 (1.36,	1.39 (0.56,	1.70 (0.68,	0.97 (0.38,	1.19 (0.24,	Low-Dose	1.11 (0.22,	1.70 (0.71,
3.0	0)	5.65)	15.03)	3.68)	4.58)	2.62)	6.02)	NAC	5.61)	4.16)
1.0	3 (0.29,	1.89 (0.51,	3.65 (0.61,	1.26 (0.34,	1.54 (0.42,	0.87 (0.23,	1.08 (0.29,	0.90 (0.18,	Low-Dose	1.53 (0.30,
3.8	8)	7.20)	23.66)	4.76)	5.86)	3.38)	3.97)	4.46)	Senicapoc	7.79)
0.6	8 (0.26,	1.23 (0.46,	2.36 (0.76,	0.82 (0.31,	1.00 (0.38,	0.57 (0.21,	0.70 (0.14,	0.59 (0.24,	0.65 (0.13,	Mid-Dose
1.8	3)	3.46)	8.95)	2.26)	2.80)	1.61)	3.67)	1.41)	3.35)	NAC

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= Nacetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

Table 10 Hazard rati	os comparing all trea	tments on all-cause h	ospitalization days*					
	1.72 (1.48, 2.00)	3.57 (1.85, 7.95)	2.97 (1.44, 6.35)	1.53 (1.12, 2.09)	1.00 (0.88, 1.14)			
Placebo								
	High-Dose							
0.58 (0.50, 0.68)	Crizanlizumab	2.08 (1.06, 4.66)	1.73 (0.82, 3.76)	0.89 (0.63, 1.26)	0.58 (0.50, 0.68)			
0.28 (0.13, 0.54)	0.48 (0.21, 0.95)	Low-Dose NAC	0.83 (0.28, 2.28)	0.43 (0.18, 0.89)	0.28 (0.12, 0.55)			
0.34 (0.16, 0.70)	0.58 (0.27, 1.22)	1.21 (0.44, 3.52)	L-glutamine	0.51 (0.23, 1.13)	0.34 (0.16, 0.71)			

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 99 of 151	
----------------	--

0.66 (0.48, 0.90)	1.13 (0.80, 1.58)	2.35 (1.13, 5.47)	1.95 (0.89, 4.41)	Mometasome	0.66 (0.47, 0.92)
1.00 (0.88, 1.14)	1.72 (1.48, 2.00)	3.57 (1.82, 8.03)	2.97 (1.42, 6.45)	1.52 (1.09, 2.14)	Low-Dose Crizanlizumab

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagreior=twice daily 45mg. Low-Dose Ticagreio=twice daily 10mg: Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg. Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg: Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance for daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

	0.92 (0.59, 1.46)	0.57 (0.25, 1.13)	0.94 (0.74, 1.21)	1.09 (0.70, 1.70)	1.42 (0.79, 2.97)	1.05 (0.67, 1.64)
Placebo						
1.08 (0.69, 1.71)	Low-Dose NAC	0.61 (0.25, 1.42)	1.02 (0.61, 1.72)	1.19 (0.62, 2.24)	1.56 (0.74, 3.66)	1.14 (0.60, 2.17)
1.77 (0.88, 4.01)	1.64 (0.70, 4.08)	Mometasome	1.67 (0.80, 3.86)	1.95 (0.84, 4.83)	2.55 (1.02, 7.58)	1.86 (0.80, 4.59)
1.06 (0.82, 1.36)	0.98 (0.58, 1.65)	0.60 (0.26, 1.25)	Senicapoc	1.16 (0.69, 1.91)	1.51 (0.80, 3.30)	1.11 (0.67, 1.86)
				High-Dose		
0.91 (0.59, 1.43)	0.84 (0.45, 1.60)	0.51 (0.21, 1.19)	0.86 (0.52, 1.44)	Crizanlizumab	1.31 (0.62, 3.08)	0.96 (0.61, 1.48)
0.70 (0.34, 1.26)	0.64 (0.27, 1.36)	0.39 (0.13, 0.98)	0.66 (0.30, 1.25)	0.76 (0.32, 1.60)	L-glutamine	0.73 (0.31, 1.53)
				<b>)</b> .		
						Low-Dose
0.95 (0.61, 1.50)	0.88 (0.46, 1.68)	0.54 (0.22, 1.25)	0.90 (0.54, 1.50)	1.04 (0.67, 1.63)	1.37 (0.65, 3.21)	Crizanlizumab

Table 11 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on adverse events\*

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

Page 101 of 151

BMJ Open

1	
2	
3	
<u>л</u>	
-	
5	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
20	
29	
50 21	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

		0.22	(0.03,	1.04	(0.27,	1.22	(0.35,	0.88	(0.27,	1.08	<b>(</b> 0.54,	1.34	<b>(</b> 0.95,	0.80	(0.42,
		0.92)		3.36)		4.39)		2.85)		2.14)		1.89)		1.53)	
Placebo															
4.50	(1.08,			4.67	(0.68,	5.70	(0.81,	4.05	(0.59,	4.92	(1.00,	6.05	(1.40,	3.66	(0.75,
37.94)		Low-Do	ose NAC	50.13)		63.02)		43.70)		42.52)		50.86)		31.45)	
0.96	(0.30,	0.21	(0.02,			1.19	(0.22,	0.85	(0.16,	1.04	(0.27,	1.30	(0.38,	0.78	(0.20,
3.64)		1.48)		Prasugr	el	7.18)		4.95)		4.55)		5.12)		3.32)	
0.82	(0.23,	0.18	(0.02,	0.84	(0.14,	High-Do	ose	0.72	(0.20,	0.87	(0.21,	1.10	(0.29,	0.65	(0.16,
2.82)		1.24)		4.63)		Ticagre	lor	2.42)		3.69)		3.97)		2.66)	
1.14	(0.35,	0.25	(0.02,	1.18	(0.20,	1.40	(0.41,	Low-Do	se	1.23	(0.32,	1.53	(0.45,	0.92	(0.24,
3.75)		1.69)		6.24)		5.00)		Ticagrel	or	4.86)		5.28)		3.52)	
0.93	(0.47,	0.20	(0.02,	0.96	(0.22,	1.14	(0.27,	0.81	(0.21,	High-Do	ose	1.24	(0.58,	0.75	(0.39,
1.87)		1.00)		3.74)		4.81)		3.17)		Crizanli	zumab	2.70)		1.43)	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

0.74	(0.53,	0.17	(0.02,	0.77	(0.20,	0.91	(0.25,	0.65	(0.19,	0.80	(0.37,			0.60	(0.29,
1.05)		0.71)		2.64)		3.41)		2.22)		1.72)		L-glutai	mine	1.24)	
1.24	(0.65,	0.27	(0.03,	1.29	(0.30,	1.54	(0.38,	1.09	(0.28,	1.34	(0.70,	1.67	(0.81,	Low-Dos	se
2.40)		1.33)		4.95)		6.35)		4.20)		2.58)		3.47)		Crizanliz	umab

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

Table 13 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on crisis	s us	sing	s >18 year old subgroup results from Niihara 2018*

	1.83 (1.44,	3.49 (1.09,	1.56 (1.11,	1.48 (1.19,	0.85 (0.64,	1.02 (0.28,	0.88 (0.34,	0.97 (0.26,	1.47 (0.55,
	2.32)	13.48)	2.19)	1.86)	1.12)	3.75)	2.10)	3.52)	3.90)
Placebo									
	High-Dose								
0.55 (0.43,	Crizanlizum	1.91 (0.58,	0.86 (0.57,	0.81 (0.63,	0.46 (0.32,	0.56 (0.15,	0.48 (0.18,	0.53 (0.14,	0.81 (0.29,
0.69)	ab	7.46)	1.29)	1.05)	0.67)	2.10)	1.18)	1.96)	2.20)
0.29 (0.07,	0.52 (0.13,	High-Dose	0.45 (0.11,	0.43 (0.11,	0.24 (0.06,	0.29 (0.04,	0.25 (0.07,	0.27 (0.04,	0.42 (0.11,
0.92)	1.72)	NAC	1.52)	1.40)	0.81)	1.66)	0.74)	1.60)	1.32)
0.64 (0.46,	1.17 (0.77,	2.24 (0.66,	L-	0.95 (0.63,	0.54 (0.35,	0.65 (0.17,	0.56 (0.20,	0.62 (0.16,	0.94 (0.33,
0.90)	1.77)	8.93)	glutamine	1.43)	0.84)	2.51)	1.43)	2.35)	2.66)

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
5	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
32	
34	
35	
36	
30 27	
2/	
38	
39 40	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	

				Low-Dose					
0.67 (0.54,	1.23 (0.96,	2.35 (0.71,	1.05 (0.70,	Crizanlizum	0.57 (0.40,	0.69 (0.18,	0.59 (0.22,	0.65 (0.17,	0.99 (0.37,
0.84)	1.59)	9.19)	1.58)	ab	0.81)	2.57)	1.45)	2.43)	2.69)
1.18 (0.89,	2.16 (1.50,	4.14 (1.23,	1.85 (1.19,	1.76 (1.23,		1.21 (0.32,	1.04 (0.38,	1.14 (0.30,	1.75 (0.62,
1.57)	3.12)	16.30)	2.88)	2.51)	Senicapoc	4.58)	2.60)	4.29)	4.79)
0.00 (0.07	1 70 (0 40		1 52 (0 40	1 45 (0.00	0.00 (0.00	Libeta Dana	0.0/ /0.10	0.04 (0.05	1 42 (0 20
0.98 (0.27,	1.79 (0.48,	3.45 (0.60,	1.53 (0.40,	1.45 (0.39,	0.82 (0.22,	Hign-Dose	0.86 (0.18,	0.94 (0.25,	1.43 (0.28,
3.61)	6.83)	22.24)	5.91)	5.48)	3.14)	Senicapoc	4.13)	3.47)	7.35)
1 1 2 /0 1 0	0.00 (0.05	0.00 (1.05	1 77 (0 70	1 (0 (0 (0	0.04 (0.00	1 17 (0 0 4		1.10 (0.00	1 (0 (0 70
1.13 (0.48,	2.08 (0.85,	3.98 (1.35,	1.77 (0.70,	1.68 (0.69,	0.96 (0.38,	1.17 (0.24,	Low-Dose	1.10 (0.23,	1.68 (0.72,
2.94)	5.48)	14.62)	4.89)	4.45)	2.61)	5.71)	NAC	5.49)	4.17)
1.04 (0.28,	1.89 (0.51,	3.66 (0.63,	1.63 (0.43,	1.54 (0.41,	0.88 (0.23,	1.07 (0.29,	0.91 (0.18,	Low-Dose	1.53 (0.30,
3.84)	7.17)	23.10)	6.32)	5.82)	3.39)	3.93)	4.36)	Senicapoc	7.76)
0.68 (0.26,	1.24 (0.46,	2.36 (0.76,	1.06 (0.38,	1.01 (0.37,	0.57 (0.21,	0.70 (0.14,	0.60 (0.24,	0.65 (0.13,	Mid-Dose
1.81)	3.41)	9.08)	3.00)	2.73)	1.60)	3.53)	1.39)	3.31)	NAC

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

#### References

- 1. Cooper NJ, Sutton AJ, Morris D, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Addressing between-study heterogeneity and inconsistency in mixed treatment comparisons: Application to stroke prevention treatments in individuals with non-rheumatic atrial fibrillation. *Stat Med.* 2009;28(14):1861-1881.
- 2. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making.* 2013;33(5):607-617.
- 3. Daak AH, M.; Dampier, C.; Fuh, B.; Kanter, J.; Alvarez, O.; Black, V.; McNaull, M.; Callaghan, M.; George, A.; Neumayr, L.; Hilliard, L.; Sancilio, F.; Rabinowicz, A. Clinical effect of SC411 (Alternia TM) on children with sickle cell disease in the scot trial: A phase 2 randomized, doubleblind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, dose-finding multi-center study. *Pediatric Blood and Cancer.* 2018;65 (Supplement 1):S8.
- Heeney MH, C.; Abboud, M.; Inusa, B.; Kanter, J.; Ogutu, B.; Brown, P.; Heath, L.; Jakubowski, J.; Zhou, C.; Zamoryakhin, D.; Agbenyega, T.; Colombatti, R.; Hassab, H.; Nduba, V.; Oyieko, J.; Robitaille, N.; Segbefia, C.; Rees, D. Determining effects of platelet inhibition on vasoocclusive events (DOVE) trial: A double-blind, placebo-controlled, study of prasugrel in paediatric patients with sickle cell anaemia. *Haematologica*. 2016;101 (Supplement 1):136-137.
- Reid MEEB, Amal; Inati, Adlette; Kutlar, Abdullah; Abboud, Miguel R.; Haynes, Johnson, Jr.; Ward, Richard; Sharon, Bruce; Taher, Ali T.; Smith, Wally; Manwani, Deepa; Ghalie, Richard G. A double-blind, placebo-controlled phase II study of the efficacy and safety of 2,2dimethylbutyrate (HQK-1001), an oral fetal globin inducer, in sickle cell disease. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2014;89(7):709-713.
- 6. Vichinsky EP, Neumayr LD, Gold J, Weiner MW. A Randomized Trial of the Safety and Benefit of Transfusion Vs. Standard Care In the Prevention of Sickle Cell-Related Complications In Adults: a Preliminary Report From the Phase II NHLBI Comprehensive Sickle Cell Centers (CSCC) Study of Neuropsychological Dysfunction and Neuroimaging Abnormalities In Neurologically Intact Adult Patients with Sickle Cell Disease. *Blood (abstract only)*. 2010;116:3221.
- Dias S, Welton N, Sutton A, Ades A. NICE DSU Technical Support Document 2: A Generalised Linear Modelling Framework for Pairwise and Network Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials. *Report by the Decision Support Unit.* 2011 (last updated September 2016).
- 8. Lunn D, Jackson C, Best N, Thomas A, Spiegelhalter DJ. *The BUGS book : a practical introduction to Bayesian analysis.* Boca Raton ; London: CRC Press; 2013.

## Appendix D. PRISMA Checklist

PRISMA NMA Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting A Systematic Review Involving a Network Meta-analysis

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review incorporating a network meta-analysis (or related form of meta-analysis).	Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	<ul> <li>Provide a structured summary including, as applicable:</li> <li>Background: main objectives</li> <li>Methods: data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal; and synthesis methods, such as network meta-analysis.</li> <li>Results: number of studies and participants identified; summary estimates with corresponding confidence/credible intervals; treatment rankings may also be discussed. Authors may choose to summarize pairwise comparisons against a chosen treatment included in their analyses for brevity.</li> <li>Discussion/Conclusions: limitations; conclusions and implications of findings.</li> <li>Other: primary source of funding; systematic review registration number with registry name.</li> </ul>	Page 2 (but used 'objectives' rather than 'background' to align with BMJ Open style guide.
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known, <i>including mention of why</i> <i>a network meta-analysis has been conducted</i> .	Page 3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed, with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	Page 4 (Table 1)
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists and if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address); and, if available, provide registration information, including registration number.	Appendix D and E.
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as	Page 4 &5(Table 1&2)

2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
∠∠ วว
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
20
21
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
16
40
47
48
49
50
51
52
52
55
54 55
55
56
57
58
59
60

		criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. <i>Clearly</i> describe eligible treatments included in the treatment network, and note whether any have been clustered or merged into the same node (with justification).		
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	Page 4	
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Page 4 and Appendix A, D, and E	
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	Page 4&5	
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	Page 4 (Table 1, appendix)	
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Page 4 (Table 1)	
Geometry of the network	S1	Describe methods used to explore the geometry of the treatment network under study and potential biases related to it. This should include how the evidence base has been graphically summarized for presentation, and what characteristics were compiled and used to describe the evidence base to readers.	Page 5	
Risk of bias within individual studies	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), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	Page 4	
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Also describe the use of additional summary measures assessed, such as treatment rankings and surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) values, as well as modified approaches used to present summary findings from meta-analyses.	Page 4&5	
Planned methods of analysis	14	<ul> <li>Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies for each network meta-analysis. This should include, but not be limited to: <ul> <li><i>Handling of multi-arm trials;</i></li> <li><i>Selection of variance structure;</i></li> <li><i>Selection of prior distributions in Bayesian analyses; and</i></li> <li><i>Assessment of model fit.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Page 5 and Appendix B	
Assessment of Inconsistency	S2	Describe the statistical methods used to evaluate the agreement of direct and indirect evidence in the treatment network(s) studied. Describe efforts taken to address its presence when found.	Page 5 and Appendix B	
	Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	Page 4
---	------------------------------------	------------	---	---------------------------
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	Additional analyses RESULTS†	16	<ul> <li>Describe methods of additional analyses if done, indicating which were pre-specified. This may include, but not be limited to, the following: <ul> <li>Sensitivity or subgroup analyses;</li> <li>Meta-regression analyses;</li> <li>Alternative formulations of the treatment network; and</li> <li>Use of alternative prior distributions for Bayesian analyses (if applicable).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Page 5, and appendix B
2 3 4 5	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.	Page 5 (Figure 1)
6 7 8	Presentation of network structure	<b>S</b> 3	Provide a network graph of the included studies to enable visualization of the geometry of the treatment network.	Figure 2
9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	Summary of network geometry	S4	Provide a brief overview of characteristics of the treatment network. This may include commentary on the abundance of trials and randomized patients for the different interventions and pairwise comparisons in the network, gaps of evidence in the treatment network, and potential biases reflected by the network structure.	Page 6
7 8 9	Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Table 2, Appendix
0	studies	19	available, any outcome level assessment.	Page 6 and Appendix A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates and confidence intervals. <i>Modified approaches may be</i> <i>needed to deal with information from larger</i> <i>networks</i> .	Table 2
9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence/credible intervals. <i>In larger</i> <i>networks, authors may focus on comparisons versus</i> <i>a particular comparator (e.g. placebo or standard</i> <i>care), with full findings presented in an appendix.</i> <i>League tables and forest plots may be considered to</i> <i>summarize pairwise comparisons.</i> If additional summary measures were explored (such as treatment rankings), these should also be presented.	Figure 3 and appendix

Exploration for inconsistency	S5	Describe results from investigations of inconsistency. This may include such information as measures of model fit to compare consistency and inconsistency models, <i>P</i> values from statistical tests, or summary of inconsistency estimates from different parts of the treatment network.	Page 7 (no independent loops of evidence on which to test for inconsistency)
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies for the evidence base being studied.	Appendix A
Results of additional analyses	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression analyses, <i>alternative network geometries studied</i> , <i>alternative choice of prior distributions for Bayesian analyses</i> , and so forth).	Page 6, 9, and Appendix B
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy-makers).	Page 7-9
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Comment on the validity of the assumptions, such as transitivity and consistency. Comment on any concerns regarding network geometry (e.g., avoidance of certain comparisons).	Page 8 and 9
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	Page 9
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. This should also include information regarding whether funding has been received from manufacturers of treatments in the network and/or whether some of the authors are content experts with professional conflicts of interest that could affect use of treatments in the network.	Page 10

PICOS = population, intervention, comparators, outcomes, study design.

\* Text in italics indicateS wording specific to reporting of network meta-analyses that has been added to guidance from the PRISMA statement.

<sup>†</sup> Authors may wish to plan for use of appendices to present all relevant information in full detail for items in this section.

### Box. Terminology: Reviews With Networks of Multiple Treatments

Different terms have been used to identify systematic reviews that incorporate a network of multiple treatment comparisons. A brief overview of common terms follows.

*Indirect treatment comparison:* Comparison of 2 interventions for which studies against a common comparator, such as placebo or a standard treatment, are available (i.e., indirect information). The direct treatment effects of each intervention against the common comparator (i.e., treatment effects from a comparison of interventions made within a study) may be used to estimate an indirect treatment comparison between the 2 interventions (**Appendix Figure 1, A**). An indirect treatment comparison (ITC) may also involve multiple links. For example, in **Appendix Figure 1, B**, treatments B and D may be compared indirectly on the basis of studies encompassing comparisons of B versus C, A versus C, and A versus D.

Network meta-analysis or mixed treatment comparison: These terms, which are often used interchangeably, refer to situations involving the simultaneous comparison of 3 or more interventions. Any network of treatments consisting of strictly unclosed loops can be thought of as a series of ITCs (**Appendix Figure 1, A and B**). In mixed treatment comparisons, both direct and indirect information is available to inform the effect size estimates for at least some of the comparisons; visually, this is shown by closed loops in a network graph (**Appendix Figure 1, C**). Closed loops are not required to be present for every comparison under study. "Network meta-analysis" is

an inclusive term that incorporates the scenarios of both indirect and mixed treatment comparisons.

*Network geometry evaluation:* The description of characteristics of the network of interventions, which may include use of numerical summary statistics. This does not involve quantitative synthesis to compare treatments. This evaluation describes the current evidence available for the competing interventions to identify gaps and potential bias. Network geometry is described further in **Appendix Box 4**.

to beer terien only

### Appendix Box 1. The Assumption of Transitivity for Network Meta-Analysis

Methods for indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis enable learning about the relative treatment effects of, for example, treatments A and B through use of studies where these interventions are compared against a common therapy, C.

When planning a network meta-analysis, it is important to assess patient and study characteristics across the studies that compare pairs of treatments. These characteristics are commonly referred to as *effect modifiers* and include traits such as average patient age, gender distribution, disease severity, and a wide range of other plausible features.

For network meta-analysis to produce valid results, it is important that the distribution of effect modifiers is similar, for example, across studies of A versus B and A versus C. This balance increases the plausibility of reliable findings from an indirect comparison of B versus C through the common comparator A. When this balance is present, the assumption of transitivity can be judged to hold.

Authors of network meta-analyses should present systematic (and even tabulated) information regarding patient and study characteristics whenever available. This information helps readers to empirically evaluate the validity of the assumption of transitivity by reviewing the distribution of potential effect modifiers across trials.

### Appendix Box 2. Differences in Approach to Fitting Network Meta-Analyses

Network meta-analysis can be performed within either a frequentist or a Bayesian framework. Frequentist and Bayesian approaches to statistics differ in their definitions of probability. Thus far, the majority of published network meta-analyses have used a Bayesian approach.

Bayesian analyses return the posterior probability distribution of all the model parameters given the data and prior beliefs (e.g., from external information) about the values of the parameters. They fully encapsulate the uncertainty in the parameter of interest and thus can make direct probability statements about these parameters (e.g., the probability that one intervention is superior to another).

Frequentist analyses calculate the probability that the observed data would have occurred under their sampling distribution for hypothesized values of the parameters. This approach to parameter estimation is more indirect than the Bayesian approach.

Bayesian methods have been criticized for their perceived complexity and the potential for subjectivity to be introduced by choice of a prior distribution that may affect study findings. Others argue that explicit use of a prior distribution makes transparent how individuals can interpret the same data differently. Despite these challenges, Bayesian methods offer considerable flexibility for statistical modeling. In-depth introductions to Bayesian methods and discussion of these and other issues can be found elsewhere.

### Appendix Box 3. Network Meta-Analysis and Assessment of Consistency

Network meta-analysis often involves the combination of direct and indirect evidence. In the simplest case, we wish to compare treatments A and B and have 2 sources of information: direct evidence via studies comparing A versus B, and indirect evidence via groups of studies comparing A and B with a common intervention, C. Together, this evidence forms a closed loop, ABC.

Direct and indirect evidence for a comparison of interventions should be combined only when their findings are similar in magnitude and interpretation. For example, for a comparison of mortality rates between A and B, an odds ratio determined from studies of A versus B should be similar to the odds ratio comparing A versus B estimated indirectly based on studies of A versus C and B versus C. This assumption of comparability of direct and indirect evidence is referred to as *consistency* of treatment effects.

When a treatment network contains a closed loop of interventions, it is possible to examine statistically whether there is agreement between the direct and indirect estimates of intervention effect.

Different methods to evaluate potential differences in relative treatment effects estimated by direct and indirect comparisons are grouped as *local approaches* and *global approaches*. Local approaches (e.g., the Bucher method or the node-splitting method) assess the presence of inconsistency for a particular pairwise comparison in the network, whereas global approaches (e.g., inconsistency models, *l*<sup>2</sup> measure for inconsistency) consider the potential for inconsistency in the network as a whole.

Tests for inconsistency can have limited power to detect a true difference between direct and indirect evidence. When multiple loops are being tested for inconsistency, one or a few may show inconsistency simply by chance. Further discussions of consistency and related concepts are available elsewhere.

Inconsistency in a treatment network can indicate lack of transitivity (see **Appendix Box 1**).

### Appendix Box 4. Network Geometry and Considerations for Bias

The term *network geometry* is used to refer to the architecture of the treatment comparisons that have been made for the condition under study. This includes what treatments are involved in the comparisons in a network, in what abundance they are present, the respective numbers of patients randomly assigned to each treatment, and whether particular treatments and comparisons may have been preferred or avoided.

Networks may take on different shapes. Poorly connected networks depend extensively on indirect comparisons. Meta-analyses of such networks may be less reliable than those from networks where most treatments have been compared against each other.

Qualitative description of network geometry should be provided and accompanied by a network graph. Quantitative metrics assessing features of network geometry, such as *diversity* (related to the number of treatments assessed and the balance of evidence among them), *co-occurrence* (related to whether comparisons between certain treatments are more or less common), and *homophily* (related to the extent of comparisons between treatments in the same class versus competing classes), can also be mentioned.

Although common, established steps for reviewing network geometry do not yet exist, however examples of in-depth evaluations have been described related to treatments for tropical diseases and basal cell carcinoma and may be of interest to readers. An example based on 75 trials of treatments for pulmonary arterial hypertension (**Appendix Figure 3**) suggests that head-to-head studies of active therapies may prove useful to further strengthen confidence in interpretation of summary estimates of treatment comparisons.

Appendix Box 5. Probabilities and Rankings in Network Meta-Analysis Systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses can provide information about the hierarchy of competing interventions in terms of treatment rankings.

The term *treatment ranking probabilities* refers to the probabilities estimated for each treatment in a network of achieving a particular placement in an ordering of treatment effects from best to worst. A network of 10 treatments provides a total of 100 ranking probabilities—that is, for each intervention, the chance of being ranked first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and so forth).

Several techniques are feasible to summarize relative rankings, and include graphical tools as well as different approaches for estimating ranking probabilities. **Appendix Figure 6** shows 2 approaches to presenting such information, on the basis of a comparison of adjuvant interventions for resected pancreatic adenocarcinoma.

Robust reporting of rankings also includes specifying median ranks with uncertainty intervals, cumulative probability curves, and the surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA) curve.

Rankings can be reported along with corresponding estimates of pairwise comparisons between interventions. Rankings should be reported with probability estimates to minimize misinterpretation from focusing too much on the most likely rank.

Rankings may exaggerate small differences in relative effects, especially if they are based on limited information. An objective assessment of the strength of information in the network and the magnitude of absolute benefits should accompany rankings to minimize potential biases.

**BMJ** Open





#### Appendix Figure 6

Ranking
1
2
3
4
1- 0.9- 0.8- 0.7- 0.6- 0.5- 0.4- 0.3- 0.2- 0.1- 0

Appendix E Systematic review protocol

tore tories only

main (non-transfusions)

#### 

#### 

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

## Contents

Tables2				
Abbreviations3				
1 Introduction4				
2 Objective				
3 Methodology6				
3.1 Eligibility criteria6				
3.2 Study identification				
3.3 Study selection				
3.4 Data extraction				
3.4.1 Study characteristics				
3.4.2 Intervention characteristics				
3.4.3 Patient characteristics				
3.4.4 Outcomes				
3.4.5 Study quality10				
4 Discussion11				
Appendix A: Literature search strategies12				
Appendix B: ClinicalTrials.gov search17				
Appendix C: Risk of bias and quality assessment				
References				

## Tables

Table 1: Eligibility criteria	6
Table 3: Search strategy for MEDLINE	12
Table 4: Search strategy for EMBASE	14
Table 5: Search strategy for Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials	16
Table 6: Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool <sup>6</sup>	18
Table 9: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale – cohort studies <sup>7</sup>	19

quany assessment scale – cohort studies<sup>7</sup>.....

## Abbreviations

CENTRAL	Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
EMBASE	Excerpta Medica dataBASE
MEDLINE	Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online
PICOS	Population, Interventions, Comparisons, Outcomes, and Study Design
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
RBC	Red blood cells
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
SCD	Sickle cell disease
SLR	Systematic literature review
VOC	Vaso-occlusive crisis

## **1** Introduction

Sickle cell disease (SCD) is a genetic blood disorder characterized by abnormality in the oxygen-carrying protein hemoglobin found in red blood cells (RBCs), depicted by RBCs having a rigid sickle-like shape.<sup>1</sup> Vaso-occlusive crises (VOCs) are the hallmark of SCD, with the disease being associated with serious complications, multi-organ failure, and an increased risk of death.<sup>2</sup> Quality of life is severely impaired for these patients due to recurrent chronic pain crises, regular use of analgesics, repeated hospitalization due to VOCs, and multiple organ failure.<sup>3</sup> The ability to modify the disease and prevent VOC episodes can decrease the risk of complications, organ damage, and the subsequent risk of death in SCD patients, as well as reduce health-resource utilization episodes.

There are limited treatment options are for SCD patients.<sup>2</sup> Hydroxyurea (HU) is the mainstay of treatment; however, majority of patients do not persist on HU, or will not take or cannot take HU, and among the HUtreated patients, some still continue to experience VOCs, fatal organ damage, and a shortened life span.<sup>2</sup> Novartis has developed crizanlizumab for the prevention of VOCs in SCD patients. In a recent randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Phase 2 trial, the safety and efficacy of crizanlizumab with or without hydroxyurea was assessed in SCD patients still experiencing  $\geq$ 2VOCs/ year at time of enrollment.<sup>2</sup> Treatment with high-dose crizanlizumab resulted in a 45.3% reduction in annual rate of VOCs compared to placebo;<sup>2</sup> in addition, the median times to first and second VOC were 2-3 times as long for patients receiving crizanlizumab compared to those receiving placebo.<sup>2</sup>

## 2 Objective

The key parameters for the economic model relate to the treatment effects of the interventions used for the treatment of SCD. Treatment effects of the relevant alternative interventions of interest will be based on currently available published clinical trial evidence identified by means of a systematic literature review and synthesized with meta-analysis techniques. The current document defines the scope and process of the systematic literature review (SLR).

. model retar.
. at rate avidance idea.
. at

# 3 Methodology

#### 3.1 **Eligibility criteria**

The SLR will focus on identifying clinical trials evaluating the treatment effects of relevant competing interventions for the treatment of SCD and will be an update of the recent review by Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> The scope will be expanded by incorporating recently published studies and including single arm trials when RCTs are not available for the relevant interventions of interest. Study eligibility criteria are defined in terms of the population, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) outlined in Table 1, which will guide the identification and selection of studies considered relevant.

Table 1: Eligibility cri	teria
Criteria	Description
Population	Inclusion criteria: x Adult patients with sickle cell disease
Interventions	<ul> <li>x Crizanlizumab</li> <li>x Hydroxyurea</li> <li>x Endari</li> <li>x Voxelotor (GBT440)</li> <li>x Any pharmacological interventions for preventing vaso-occlusive crisis (VOC)*</li> </ul>
Comparators	<ul> <li>x Placebo or best supportive care</li> <li>x Any of the listed interventions of interest</li> <li>x Any treatment that facilitates an anchored indirect comparison</li> </ul>
Outcomes	x Any efficacy related outcome**
Study design	<ul> <li>x RCTs</li> <li>x Single-arm trials when RCTs are not available for the interventions of interest</li> </ul>
Language	x Only studies published in English

\*We exclude interventions such as gene therapy, stem cell therapy and bone marrow transplantation, as these interventions aim to cure sickle cell disease in severe sickle cell disease patients

\*\*In addition to efficacy outcomes, adverse events are of interest for the review, but will not be used as study selection criteria.

#### 3.2 Study identification

Relevant studies will be identified by searching the following databases using predefined search strategies: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE); and Excerpta Medica database (Embase). It should be noted that CENTRAL database does not contain any single-arm (uncontrolled) trials. Therefore, resources for identifying singlearm trials will be MEDLINE and Embase only. This search strategy is based on Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> and constructed

#### **BMJ** Open

according to the criteria of interest (e.g. outcomes, population, intervention and study design) using MeSH or Emtree terms (thesaurus terms, headings and subheadings) and text words to retrieve potential references. Search strategies have been developed individually for CENTRAL, MEDLINE and Embase and are listed in Appendix A. Please note that the MEDLINE search strategy also aims to identify previously published SLRs and meta-analyses as an additional source to identify relevant primary studies of interest.

Considering the limited searches in Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> due to lack of a clinical trial registry search, a clinical trial registry search on ClinicalTrials.gov will be conducted to identify relevant primary studies of interest, especially unpublished and ongoing studies. This search is based on the search strategy of MEDLINE (**Appendix B**).

Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> completed their literature searches on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2017. Therefore, all searches on databases will be limited from the date 30<sup>th</sup> January 2017 onwards, except CENTRAL database. CENTRAL database lacks limit options by date and indexes for identifying date of reference created. Thus, the limit on CENTRAL database will be performed by restricting the publication year from 2017 onwards.

Although it is possible to restrict searches by language (English), it is highly advisable that the search strategy retains high sensitivity (the proportion of references for the desired topic that are retrieved), especially as the estimated number of recalls is small. Therefore, there is no restriction on language at the search stage.

### 3.3 Study selection

Two reviewers, working independently, will review all abstracts and proceedings identified by the search according to the selection criteria, with the exception of outcome criteria, which will only be applied during the screening of full-text publications. All studies identified as eligible studies during abstract screening will then be screened at a full-text stage by the same two reviewers. Reasons for exclusion will be recorded. The full-text studies identified at this stage will be included for the data extraction. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third reviewer will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies. The process of study identification and selection will be summarized with a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram.<sup>5</sup>

### 3.4 Data extraction

Two reviewers, working independently, will extract data on study characteristics, interventions, patient characteristics, and outcomes for the final list of included studies. Following reconciliation between the two reviewers, a third reviewer will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies. Data will be stored and managed in a Microsoft Excel workbook.

### 3.4.1 Study characteristics

1

The following study characteristics will be extracted:

- x Study name
- Study year х
- Study authors х
- Study design х
- Study inclusion criteria Х
- Study exclusion criteria х
- Location of study (countries) х
- Year of study initiation and study close х
- Follow-up period Х
- Outcomes х
- Patient flow х
- Study- and analyses populations (e.g. ITT, mITT, etc.) х

#### 3.4.2 Intervention characteristics

The following intervention characteristics will be extracted:

- x Treatment regimen
- Treatment dose х
- Method of administration х
- Frequency of administration х
- Duration of treatment х
- Concomitant/background therapies х
- Compliance/Adherence х

#### 3.4.3 Patient characteristics

The following patient characteristics at baseline will be extracted:

- x Age
- x Gender
- x Race and ethnicity
- Other relevant socio-demographics х
- Concomitant hydroxycarbamide/hydroxyurea х
- Fetal hemoglobin х
- Genetic status (HbSS, HbSßo, HbSC, Hbsß+, other) х
- х Painful crisis

1			
2 3			
4	Х	Hospital admission frequency	
5	Х	Painful crisis including home crisis	
6	х	Transfusions	
/ 8	х	Previous SCD related complications	
9	v	Acute chest syndrome	
10	^		
11	Х	Avascular osteonecrosis	
12	х	Stroke	
13	х	Other comorbidities	
15			
16	3.4.4	Outcomes	
1/ 18			
10	The fol	lowing outcomes will be extracted:	
20			
21	Х	Number of VOCs	
22	х	Time to the first VOC	
23	х	Duration of VOCs	
25	x	% of patients with 0 VOCs/ year	
26	~	Number of SCD related pain days	
27 29	Х	Number of SCD-related pain days	
28	Х	Duration of SCD-related pain days	
30	х	Number of Hospital Admissions for VOC	
31	х	time to first hospital admission for a VOC	
32	x	Intensity of pain	
33	×		
35	X	Sendus complications	
36	Х	Organ damage	
3/ 38	х	Survival	
39	х	Quality of life	
40	х	Adverse events	
41			
42 43	For eac	ch outcome of interest, the upper & Lower limits of scales along with definition will be reported. F	-or
44	dichoto	pmous outcomes, the number of patients with the event and the number of patients in each treatme	ent
45	arm wil	Il be extracted. For continuous outcomes, the change from baseline in all intervention groups will	he
46	ovtroct	ad If the change from baseline is not provided, the score at and of follow up and the baseline or	
47 48	exilacio	ed. If the change from baseline is not provided, the score at end of follow-up and the baseline sco	ле
49		extracted. For event rates, the number of events, the number of patients in each treatment arm a	ina
50	follow-u	up or exposure time will be extracted. For time-to-event outcomes, hazard ratios and associat	ed
51 52	informa	ation regarding uncertainty will be extraction. Kaplan Meir curves will be extracted in terms of t	he
52 53	proport	tion of patients who had an event over time using Digitizelt® in addition to the number of patients	at
54	risk ove	er time.	
55			
56 57			
57 58			
59			9

### 3.4.5 Study quality

Two independent reviewers will assess study quality. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third investigator will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies.

The Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool will be used to assess risk of bias in included RCTs (**Appendix C**).<sup>6</sup> This instrument is used to evaluate six key domains: sequence generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants, personnel and outcome assessors; incomplete outcome data; selective outcome reporting; and other sources of bias. The risk of bias instrument can be used to assign summary assessments of within-study bias, low risk of bias (low risk of bias for all key domains), unclear risk of bias (unclear risk of bias for one or more key domains), or high risk of bias (high risk of bias for one or more domains).

The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale will be used to assess the quality of single arm studies (**Appendix C**).<sup>7</sup> This instrument is used to evaluate the quality of observational studies based on 1) study group and selection, 2) comparability of the groups within studies, and 3) the ascertainment of either the exposure or outcomes of interest for case-control or cohort studies. Ranking of the study quality will be done by using a 'star system' in which a study can be given a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the "Selection" and "Exposure" categories and a maximum of two stars for "Comparability" category. Two independent reviewers will assess study quality. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third investigator will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies.

## 4 Discussion

This SLR will involve highly sensitive searches in the peer-reviewed literature as well as searches of recent conferences and clinical trial registrations to identify unpublished completed trials with results available. The review processes will be guided by the pre-defined eligibility criteria established in the review protocol. Data quality will be ensured through the involvement of two independent researchers in the study selection and data extraction phases of the project. The primary outcomes will include median time to the first VOC, median time to the second VOC, median rate of VOCs per year, and overall survival (OS), which reflect the primary outcomes as assessed in the Sins, et al. review as well as many clinical trials for this population. Results of the SLR will help to inform clinicians and decision makers and will provide the foundation to assess the feasibility of performing an NMA.

Despite the strengths of the proposed SLR, some limitations are applicable to all SLRs that should be acknowledged. While there is a clear justification to limit the search and selection to June 20, 2018 based on the scope to update the Sins review, there is always a risk select trials will not be identified that align with the selection criteria. Additionally, as the evidence base is continually growing, any trials published after the search date will not be captured. Further, any trials that are published close to the search date but are not yet indexed in the databases at the time of the search will not be captured by the search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials. Hand searches of other published reviews may help overcome these potential limitations.

As always, the SLR is also limited by the use of published data. There is a risk of publication bias as some clinical trials fail to be published while others are published only in abstract form, which presents limited information. However, an extensive search of conference abstracts will be performed, which may mitigate the impact on the results of the SLR. Posters or slides corresponding to the conference abstracts will be identified where available; however, often conferences do not provide complete information. Moreover, conference results should be interpreted with caution, as they do not undergo the same peer review process as fully published results. Finally, the search and selection will be restricted to trials published in English. Therefore, there is a risk that non-English publications will not be identified.

## Appendix A: Literature search strategies

### Table 2: Search strategy for MEDLINE

#	Searches	Concept
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
3	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp length of stay/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
7	or/1-6	
8	anemia, sickle cell/	Population
9	hemoglobin, sickle/	
10	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	exp antisickling agents/	Interventions
13	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or endari or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	meta analysis.pt.	Systematic review
18	((meta adj analys*) or metaanalys or meta-analys*).ti,ab,sh.	and meta-analysis
19	(systematic adj5 (review or overview*)).ti,ab,sh.	studies
20	or/17-19	
21	16 and 20	
22	clinical trial/	RCTs
23	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2J 24
24
25
26
2/
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
<del>л</del> о //1
40 1
+∠ 12
43 44
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
59
00

24	single blind method/	
25	double blind method/	
26	random allocation/	
27	placebos/	
28	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	
29	randomized controlled trial/	
30	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	
31	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	
32	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	
33	or/22-32	
34	16 and 33	
35	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/	Single arm trials
- 35	or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	
36	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case	
	control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	
37	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or	
	prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
38	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or	
	data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	
39	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	
40	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	
41	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	
42	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	
43	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no	
	control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	
44	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or	
45	Studies)).ti,ab,kt.	
45	(nonrandom" or non-random").ti,ab,kt.	
46	((control <sup>®</sup> adj2 before adj2 after) or UBA study).ti,ab,kt.	
47	(all adj3 received).ab.	
48	07/35-4/	
49	16 and 48	

50	limit 21 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on rSLF and meta-analysis studies
51	limit 34 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on RCTs
52	limit 49 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on single arm trials

### Table 3: Search strategy for EMBASE

#	Searches	-
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
3	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp "length of stay"/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
7	or/1-6	
8	sickle cell anemia/	Population
9	hemoglobin S/	
10	(sickle cell or sickle h\$emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
	h\$emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an\$emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	antisickling agent/	Intervention
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or	
13	desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or	
	tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or endari or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	randomized controlled trial/	RCTs

18	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	
	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide*	
19	or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or	
	treat*)).ab,kw.	
20	trial.ti.	
21	crossover procedure/	
22	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
23	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	
24	or/17-23	
25	16 and 24	
26	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross-sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/	Single-arm trials
27	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	
28	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
29	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	
30	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
31	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	
32	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	
33	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	
	(all adi2 received) ab	
34	(all aujs received).ab.	
34 35	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	
34 35 36	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/ ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw.	
34 35 36 37	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/ ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw. or/26-36	
34 35 36 37 38	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/ ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw. or/26-36 16 and 37	
34 35 36 37 38 39	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/ ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw. or/26-36 16 and 37 limit 25 to em=201705-201825	Date limit on RC

### Table 4: Search strategy for Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials

#	Searches	
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	Outcomes
#2	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	
#3	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	
#4	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	
#5	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#6	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#7	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6	
#8	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	Population
#9	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	
#10	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	
#11	#8 or #9 or #10	
#12	MeSH descriptor: [Antisickling Agents] explode all trees	Interventions
#13	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or endari or voxelotor or GBT440):ti,ab,kw	
#14	(#8 or #9 or #10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*	
#15	#11 or #12 or #13	
#16	#7 and #11 and #14	

## Appendix B: ClinicalTrials.gov search

#### Table 6: Search strategy for ClinicalTrials.gov\*

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Drug OR Placebo OR Crizanlizumab OR Hydroxyurea OR Endari OR Voxelotor OR GBT440 OR hydroxycarbamide	Intervention/treatment
#4	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	Outcome Measures
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# Appendix C: Risk of bias and quality assessment

### Table 5: Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool<sup>6</sup>

Domain	Support for judgment	5 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	Describe the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups.	Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate generation of a randomized sequence.
Allocation concealment	Describe the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to determine whether intervention allocations could have been foreseen in advance of, or during, enrolment.	Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate concealment of allocations prior to assignment.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes)	Describe all measures used, if any, to blind study participants and personnel from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	Performance bias due to the knowledge of the allocated interventions by participants and personnel during the study.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes)	Describe all measures used, if any, to blind outcome assessors from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	Detection bias due to the knowledge of the allocated interventions by outcome assessors.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes)	Describe the completeness of outcome data for each main outcome, including attrition and exclusions from the analysis. State whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers in each intervention group (compared with total randomized participants), reasons for attrition/exclusions where reported, and any re-inclusions in analyses performed by the review authors.	Attrition bias due to amount, nature or handling of incomplete outcome data.
Reporting bias	T	
Selective reporting	State how the possibility of selective outcome reporting was examined by the review authors, and what was found.	Reporting bias due to selective outcome reporting.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	State any important concerns about bias not addressed in the other domains in the tool. If particular questions/entries were pre-specified in the review's protocol, responses should be provided for each question/entry.	Bias due to problems not covered elsewhere in the table.

#### Table 6: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale Cohort studies<sup>7</sup>

Domain	Response
Selection	
1. Representativeness of the exposed cohort	<ul> <li>a. Truly representative of the average</li></ul>
2. Selection of the non-exposed cohort	<ul> <li>a. Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort*</li> <li>b. Drawn from a different source</li> <li>c. No description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort</li> </ul>
3. Ascertainment of exposure	<ul> <li>a. Secure record (e.g. surgical records)*</li> <li>b. Structured interview*</li> <li>c. Written self-report</li> <li>d. No description</li> </ul>
4. Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	a. Yes* b. No
Comparability	0
1. Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	<ul> <li>a. Study controls for (select the most important factor)*</li> <li>b. Study controls for any additional factor (this criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor)*</li> </ul>
Outcomes	
1. Assessment of outcome	<ul> <li>a. Independent blind assessment*</li> <li>b. Record linkage*</li> <li>c. Self-report</li> <li>d. No description</li> </ul>
2. Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	<ul> <li>a. Yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest)*</li> <li>b. No</li> </ul>
3. Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	<ul> <li>a. Complete follow up - all subjects accounted for*</li> <li>b. Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - &gt;% (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost)*</li> <li>c. Follow up rate &lt;% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost</li> <li>d. No statement</li> </ul>

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the selection and outcomes categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for comparability.

## References

- 1. National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. Sickle Cell Disease. 2018; https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/sickle-cell-disease.
- 2. Ataga KI, Kutlar A, Kanter J, et al. Crizanlizumab for the Prevention of Pain Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;376(5):429-439.
- 3. McClish DK, Penberthy LT, Bovbjerg VE, et al. Health related quality of life in sickle cell patients: the PiSCES project. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2005;3:50.
- 4. Sins JWR, Mager DJ, Davis S, Biemond BJ, Fijnvandraat K. Pharmacotherapeutical strategies in the prevention of acute, vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell disease: a systematic review. *Blood Adv.* 2017;1(19):1598-1616.
- 5. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2009;62(10):1006-1012.
- 6. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2011;343:d5928.
- 7. Wells GS, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2013; <u>http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp</u>. Accessed October 1, 2016.

### Appendix F. Systematic literature review protocol for transfusions.

### **Search protocol**

### **Objective**

This search protocol aims to supplement new evidence on the treatment effects of transfusion used for preventing crises in sickle cell disease (SCD) patients in adults and adolescents for previous systematic literature review (led by Thomas Statistical Consultants). The search strategy and concept are modified from a recent systematic review by Sins et al.<sup>1</sup> and Fortin et al<sup>2</sup>. The strategy has been developed to fulfil updated eligibility criteria (Table 1) and retrieve single-arm trials.

Table 1. Eligibility criteria

Criteria	Description
Population	Trials that included SCD patients aged 16 and above
Interventions	x Red blood cell transfusions
	x Other types of transfusions
Comparators	x Placebo or best medical care
	x Interventions included in previous systematic review
Outcomes	x Pain, crisis and VOC (frequency, intensity and duration in one event)
	x Hospital admission, including emergency department (ED) and nurse visits
	<ul> <li>SCD complications, including acute chest syndromes</li> </ul>
	x Analgesic use
	x Adverse events*
Study design	x Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)
	x Single-arm studies
Language	x Only studies published in English

\*In addition to efficacy outcomes, adverse events are of interest for the review, but will not be used as study selection criteria

### Resources

### Electronic databases

Studies will be identified by searching the following electronic databases:

- x Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
- x Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE)
- x Excerpta Medica database (Embase)

Hand-searches

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Sins JWR, Mager DJ, Davis S, Biemond BJ, Fijnvandraat K: **Pharmacotherapeutical strategies in the prevention of acute, vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell disease: a systematic review**. *Blood advances* 2017, **1**(19):1598-1616.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Fortin PM, Hopewell S, Estcourt LJ. Red blood cell transfusion to treat or prevent complications in sickle cell disease: an overview of Cochrane reviews. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 8. Art. No.: CD012082. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD012082.pub2.

### x ClinicalTrial.gov

### Search strategy

Search strategies have been developed individually for CENTRAL, MEDLINE, Embase and ClinicalTrial.gov and their results are listed in Appendix 1-4. The concept of a search strategy is elaborated using MEDLINE as an example (Table 2). The search strategy was constructed according to the criteria (e.g. outcomes, population, intervention and study design) using MeSH or Emtree terms (thesaurus terms, headings and subheadings) and text words to retrieve potential references.

Table 2. Search strings and concepts

No	Searches	Results	
1	anemia, sickle cell/	19329	
2	hemoglobin, sickle/	3011	Denvilation
3	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	27120	Population
4	1 or 2 or 3	27602	
5	Blood Transfusion/	48056	
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	8033	
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	90906	
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	47785	
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	35184	Intervention
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	26829	
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1217	
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	24060	
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	183648	
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	3477	
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	16726	

1	
1	
2	
3	
-	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
10	
11	
12	
12	
15	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
27	
32	
33	
34	
25	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
11	
41	
42	
43	
11	
44	
45	
46	
17	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
52	
-	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	
~	

16	14 not 15	3229	
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	128578	
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	216650	
19	17 or 18	258199	
20	16 and 19	834	
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	13177	
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	3326	
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	188025	
24	exp pain/	362648	
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	547392	
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	66169	Outcome
27	exp length of stay/	77857	
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	104873	
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	6507	
30	or/24-29	901074	
31	4 and 23 and 30	848	
32	clinical trial/	512148	
33	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	1010	
34	single blind method/	25632	
35	double blind method/	147368	
36	random allocation/	95709	
37	placebos/	34063	RCT filter
38	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	1263924	
39	randomized controlled trial/	467730	
40	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	786522	
41	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	145215	
42	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	6481	
43	or/32-42	1565168	

BMJ Open

2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
 วา	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
22	
32	
33	
34	
25	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
<u>/1</u>	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
45	
46	
47	
10	
40	
49	
50	
51	
51	
52	
53	
54	
54	
55	
56	
57	
50	
Σŏ	
59	
60	

1

44	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or	2187051	
	retrospective studies/		
45	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	1071161	Single-arm studies filter
46	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	615678	
	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2		
47	(based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or	340559	
	surveillance))).ab.		
48	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	18409	
49	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	29604	
50	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	14110	
51	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	139501	
52	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	53439	
53	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	114108	
54	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	34084	
55	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	2644	
56	(all adj3 received).ab.	41192	
57	or/44-56	3114626	
58	31 and 43	120	
59	31 and 57	278	

### **Search results**

The numbers of references retrieved by search strategies from three databases are listed below. The search date was from the earliest date to 29<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018 in all databases. In total, there were 1,631 references retrieved.

### CENTRAL

x Number of references related to controlled trials: 332

### MEDLINE

- x Number of references related to randomised controlled trials: 120
- x Number of references related to single-arm studies: 279
# Embase

- x Number of references related to randomised controlled trials: 245
- x Number of references related to single-arm studies: 599

#### ClinicalTrial.gov

x Number of references: 56

#### **Deduplication**

Duplicates were identified firstly by 'find duplicates' function in Endnote X8 and then doublechecked manually by sorting author, title, volume and issue. After that, all references were de-duplicate against references retrieved from previous systematic review. This left 825 references from the electronic databases to be screened.

In terms of references from ClinicalTrial.gov, there were only 16 references left to be screened after deduplication.

In total, there are 841 references to go through during the title and abstract screening stage.

# Appendix 1. Search strategy and results for CENTRAL database

Search	Strategy:
Search	Silalegy.

#	Searches	Results
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	583
#2	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	19
#3	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	4790
#4	#1 or #2 or #3	4790
#5	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Transfusion] this term only	1766
#6	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocyte Transfusion] explode all trees	564
#7	((blood or erythrocyte* or "red cell*" or "red blood cell*" or RBC*) near/5 (transfus* or infus* or unit*))	14775
#8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) near/5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program* or therapy)):ab	30189
#9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)):ti	3612
#10	("allogeneic blood" or (unit* near/2 blood) or "allogenic blood" or (blood near/2 exposure) or "donor blood" or "blood product*" or "blood component*" or "blood support")	3365
#11	hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*	107
#12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*) and transfus*:ti	2434
#13	#5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12	41927
#14	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Component Transfusion] this term only	115
#15	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocytes] this term only	1478
#16	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*)	12756
#17	#14 and (#15 or #16)	39
#18	#13 or #17	41927
#19	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	42323
#20	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	124349

#21	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso- occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	4404
#22	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	6488
#23	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	20854
#24	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	1779
#25	#19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24	153780
#26	#4 and #18 and #25	332

Of 332 results:

- eetteriewony x Cochrane reviews: 35
- x Cochrane Protocol: 1
- x Trials: 296
- x Editorials: 0
- x Special collections: 0
- x Clinical Answers: 0

### Appendix 2. Search strategy and results for MEDLINE

Database(s): Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Daily 1946 to August 29, 2018 Search Strategy:

#	Searches	Results
1	anemia, sickle cell/	19329
2	hemoalobin. sickle/	3011
3	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	27120
4	1 or 2 or 3	27602
5	Blood Transfusion/	48056
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	8033
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	90906
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	47785
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	35184
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	26829
11	emotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	
12	ed cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	183648
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	3477
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	16726
16	14 not 15	3229
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	128578
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	216650

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
27
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
д6
40 17
4/ 10
40 40
49 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

19	17 or 18	258199	
20	16 and 19	834	
	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or		
21	restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy	13177	
	or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.		
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or	3326	
	intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	5520	
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	188025	
24	exp pain/	362648	
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	547392	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion"		
26	or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-	66169	
	occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.		
27	exp length of stay/	77857	
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	104873	
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	6507	
30	or/24-29	901074	
31	4 and 23 and 30	848	
32	clinical trial/	512148	
33	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	1010	
34	single blind method/	25632	
35	double blind method/	147368	
36	random allocation/	95709	
37	placebos/	34063	
38	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	1263924	
39	randomized controlled trial/	467730	
40	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	786522	
41	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	145215	
42	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	6481	
43	or/32-42	1565168	
	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or		
44	follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	2187051	
	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case	1074464	
45	control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	1071161	

46       (case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.       6156         47       ((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or registr? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.       3402         48       Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.       1840         49       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       2960         50       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       1411         51       (registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.       1395         52       ((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.       5343         53       ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.       1141         54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       31144         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	
47       ((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.       3405         48       Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.       1840         49       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       2960         50       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       1411         51       (registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.       1395         52       ((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.       5343         53       ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.       1141         54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	678
48       Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.       1840         49       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       2960         50       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       1411         51       (registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.       1395         52       ((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control"").ti,ab,kf,hw.       5343         53       ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.       1141         54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	559
40       Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.       2960         50       Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.       1411         51       (registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.       1395         52       ((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.       5343         53       ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.       1141         54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       31144         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	
50       Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.       1411         51       (registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.       1395         52       ((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.       5343         53       ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iiii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.       1141         54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	04
51       (registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.       1395         52       ((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.       5343         53       ((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.       1141         54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	10
52((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.534353((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.114154(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.340855((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.264456(all adj3 received).ab.411957or/44-5631145831 and 431205931 and 57278	501
53((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.114154(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.340855((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.264456(all adj3 received).ab.411957or/44-5631145831 and 431205931 and 57278	39
54       (nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.       3408         55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	108
55       ((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.       2644         56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	84
56       (all adj3 received).ab.       4119         57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	4
57       or/44-56       3114         58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	92
58       31 and 43       120         59       31 and 57       278	4626
59       31 and 57       278	

# Appendix 3. Search strategy and results for Embase database

Database(s): **Embase** 1974 to 2018 Week 35 Search Strategy:

#	Searches	Results
1	exp Anemia, Sickle Cell/	
2	(h?emoglobin s or h?emoglobin sc or h?emoglobin se or h?emoglobin ss or h?emoglobin c or h?emoglobin d or Hb s or Hb sc or Hb se or Hb ss or Hb c or Hb d or sc disease*).tw.	5794
3	(sickle cell or sicklemia or sickled or sickling or meniscocyt* or drepanocyt*).tw.	29569
4	1 or 2 or 3	38361
5	Blood Transfusion/	108332
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	23021
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	135137
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	38387
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	43111
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1555
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	28985
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	273982
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	2629
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	19765
16	14 not 15	2279
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	112741
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	256379

2
2
1
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
22
22
34
35
36
37
38
39
10
-т-О // 1
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
18
40 70
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
5/
58
59
60

19	17 or 18	278120	
20	16 and 19	523	
	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or		
21	restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy	22304	
	or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.		
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or	4095	
	intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.		
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	279695	
24	exp pain/	1146280	
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	789805	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion"		
26	or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-	82887	
	occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.		
27	exp length of stay/	150699	
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	169748	
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	12514	
30	or/24-29	1690290	
31	4 and 23 and 30	2325	
32	randomized controlled trial/	508600	
33	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	1062285	
	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide* or	560662	
34	distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw.		
35	trial.ti.	248694	
36	crossover procedure/	56042	
37	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	276112	
38	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	99658	
39	or/32-38	1386841	
	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross-	4774050	
40	sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/	1771952	
41	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case	1292224	
	control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	1202224	
42	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or	700040	
	prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	190240	
12	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or	500622	
43	data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	500033	

44	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	183687
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	42777
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	3333
47	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	80316
48	(all adj3 received).ab.	75969
49	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	126474
50	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw.	205403
51	or/40-50	3180246
52	31 and 39	245
53	31 and 51	599

# Appendix 4. Search strategy and results for ClinicalTrial.gov

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Transfusion OR blood OR RBC OR hematocr@R erythrocyte	Intervention/treatment
	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisi	Outcome Measures
#4	OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR	
	interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival ORuqlity of life	
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

Ny resurc.

BMJ Open

# **BMJ Open**

# Crizanlizumab and comparators for adults with sickle-cell disease: a systematic review and network meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-034147.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Apr-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Thom, H; University of Bristol , Bristol Medical School Jansen, Jeroen; Precision Xtract Shafrin, Jason; Precision Health Economics Inc, HEOR Zhao, Lauren; Precision Health Economics Inc, HEOR Joseph, George; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp Cheng, Hung-Yuan; University of Bristol , Bristol Medical School Gupta, Subhajit; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp Shah, Nirmish; Duke University
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Haematology (incl blood transfusion)
Secondary Subject Heading:	Haematology (incl blood transfusion)
Keywords:	sickle cell disease, crizanlizumab, network meta-analysis, systematic literature review, vasoocclusive crisis, hematology





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

Title: Crizanlizumab and comparators for adults with sickle-cell disease: a systematic review and network meta-analysis

Running title: Crizanlizumab for adults with sickle-cell disease

Authors: Thom HZ<sup>1\*</sup>, Jansen JP<sup>2</sup>, Shafrin J<sup>3</sup>, Zhao LM<sup>3</sup>, Joseph G<sup>4</sup>, Cheng HY<sup>1</sup>, Gupta, S<sup>4</sup>, Shah N<sup>5</sup>

Affiliations: <sup>1</sup>University of Bristol, Bristol, UK, <sup>2</sup>Precision Health Economics & Outcomes Research, Oakland, CA,<sup>3</sup>Precision Health Economics & Outcomes Research, Los Angeles, CA, <sup>4</sup>Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, East Hanover, NJ, <sup>5</sup>Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC

#### **Corresponding Author\*:**

Howard Z. Thom University of Bristol Canynge Hall 39 Whatley Road BS8 2PS howard.thom@bristol.ac.uk

# ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** Treatment options for preventing vaso-occlusive crises (VOC) among patients with sickle cell disease (SCD) are limited, especially if hydroxyurea treatment has failed or is contraindicated. A systematic literature review (SLR) and network meta-analysis (NMA) were conducted to evaluate the efficacy and safety of crizanlizumab for older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients.

**Methods:** The SLR included randomized controlled trials (RCT) and uncontrolled studies. Bayesian NMA of VOC, all-cause hospitalization days, and adverse events were conducted.

**Results:** The SLR identified 51 studies and 9 RCTs on 14 treatments that met the NMA inclusion criteria. The NMA found crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg was associated with a reduction in VOC (hazard ratio 0.55, 95% credible interval (0.43, 0.69); Bayesian probability of superiority >0.99), all-cause hospitalization days (0.58 (0.50, 0.68); >0.99), and no evidence of difference on adverse events (0.91 (0.59, 1.43); 0.66) or serious adverse events (0.93 (0.47, 1.87); 0.59) compared with placebo. The hazard ratio for reduction in VOC for crizanlizumab relative to L-glutamine was 0.67 (0.50, 0.88); >0.99). These results were sensitive to assumptions regarding whether patient age is an effect modifier.

**Conclusions:** This NMA provides preliminary evidence comparing the efficacy of crizanlizumab with other treatments for VOC prevention.

# PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

• No patient or public involvement in this study.

# STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This SLR was comprehensive in terms of outcomes and interventions and was focused on the target population of crizanlizumab.
- To include a diverse range of outcome summaries, a shared parameter Bayesian NMA was employed, as recommended by NICE.
- Risk of bias was assessed using the best practice Cochrane collaboration tool.
- It was not possible to adjust for differences in statistical analysis across RCTs.
- The strength of comparisons on outcomes other than vaso-occlusive crises (VOC) were weak, and VOC may not be the key outcome for patients.

# **INTRODUCTION**

Sickle Cell Disease (SCD) affects approximately 100,000 people in the US.<sup>1</sup> The disease is caused by an autosomal-recessive single gene defect in the beta chain of hemoglobin (HbA), which results in sickle cell hemoglobin (HbS). Sickled cells break down prematurely, and are associated with varying degrees of anemia. Interactions of red blood cells, white blood cells, platelets and endothelial cells are an important contributor to the pathophysiology of sickle cell disease.<sup>2-7</sup> For instance, endothelial cells lining the vasculature are activated and have increased expression of adhesion molecules in SCD patients; this plays a central role in the development of vaso-occlusion.<sup>3 8 9</sup> Ultimately, obstruction of small blood capillaries cause painful crises, damage to major organs, and increased vulnerability to severe infections. Over the past several decades, life expectancy has improved, however, the disease continues to be associated with early mortality and high morbidity.<sup>10</sup> The aim of treatment is to aid disease and chronic pain management, reduce severity and/or prevent complications, and manage acute pain during crises.<sup>11</sup>

There is no widely available cure for SCD and few effective treatments. Hydroxyurea and L-glutamine (Endari), the only two FDA-approved drugs for SCD, are indicated for the prevention of vasoocclusive crises (VOC).<sup>12</sup> In a two-year pediatric study, per patient health care costs for children on hydroxyurea were \$9450, compared with \$13716 for those who did not receive this treatment.<sup>13</sup> Despite the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute's (NHLBI) recommendations, hydroxyurea is not regularly prescribed and adherence to the therapy is poor.<sup>14</sup> Further, there are no current clinical guidelines outlining when to integrate L-glutamine into care. Regular blood transfusions can also be used as a preventive measure, but they may also lead to abnormally high levels of iron in the blood, which can cause long-term organ damage and reactions due to a mismatch between the donors and recipients.<sup>14</sup> Voxelotor has shown an ability to increase haemoglobin levels in patients with SCD<sup>15</sup> and in November 2019 was FDA-approved.<sup>16</sup>

Crizanlizumab is a new, FDA-approved<sup>17</sup> drug for the prevention of vaso-occlusive crises. A phase II multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, 12-month study was completed to evaluate crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and 2.5 mg/kg versus placebo.<sup>18</sup> This study found that the median rate of crises per year was 1.63 with crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg versus 2.98 with placebo (indicating a 45.3% lower rate with high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg, *P*=0.01). The median time to the first VOC was also significantly longer with high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg than with placebo (4.07 vs. 1.38 months, *P*=0.001), as was the median time to the second VOC (10.32 vs. 5.09 months, *P*=0.02). In addition, the median rate of uncomplicated crises per year was 1.08 with crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg, *P*=0.02).

The comparative efficacy and safety of crizanlizumab has been evaluated against placebo, however head-to-head randomized controlled trial (RCT) evidence is lacking for comparisons to treatments of interest. Network meta-analysis (NMA) is a statistical method that allows for the simultaneous evaluation of all treatments within a therapeutic area and allows for indirect comparisons between treatments where head-to-head evidence may not be available. Specifically, NMA can be used to combine direct and indirect evidence regarding any interventions that form a network of RCTs where each trial has at least one intervention (active or placebo) in common with another trial and all RCTs are sufficiently similar.<sup>19 20</sup> To minimize risk of bias, RCTs should be identified through a comprehensive systematic literature review (SLR) using pre-defined criteria.<sup>21</sup>

This study conducts a SLR and NMA to assess the comparative efficacy and safety of crizanlizumab against relevant competing interventions for older adolescent and adult ( $\geq$ 16 years old) patients with SCD.

# **METHODS**

#### Systematic literature reviews

The SLR protocol was finalised on 25 June 2018 and the SLR was conducted according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.<sup>22</sup> A PRISMA NMA checklist can be found in Appendix A. The SLR approach updated and expanded an earlier published SLR by Sins et al.<sup>23</sup> by including non-controlled studies and included additional interventions. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for studies are summarised in Table 1 below. Relevant studies were identified by searching the following databases: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE); and Excerpta Medica database (Embase). We also searched a trial registry, *ClinicalTrials.gov*. The search strategies were derived from Sins et al.<sup>23</sup> and can be found in Appendix B along with the complete search protocols in Appendices C and D. As blood transfusion was not included by Sins et al.,<sup>23</sup> we conducted a separate search for blood transfusion from inception of databases to 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018. For non-transfusion studies, the search date was from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017 to 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 to bridge the findings of Sins et al.<sup>23</sup>

Criteria	Description
Population	Studies included adult patients with sickle cell disease
Interventions	<ul> <li>Crizanlizumab</li> <li>L-glutamine</li> <li>Voxelotor (GBT440)</li> <li>Red blood cell transfusions</li> <li>Other types of transfusions</li> <li>Any pharmacological interventions for preventing crisis, pain and/or vaso-occlusive crisis (VOC)</li> </ul>
Comparators	<ul> <li>Placebo or best supportive care</li> <li>Any of the listed interventions of interest</li> <li>Any treatment that facilitates an anchored indirect comparison</li> </ul>
Outcomes	<ul> <li>Primary outcomes: <ul> <li>Pain, crisis and VOC (frequency, intensity and duration in one event)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Secondary outcome: <ul> <li>Hospital admission, including emergency department (ED) and nurse visits</li> <li>SCD complications, including acute chest syndromes (ACS)</li> <li>Analgesic use</li> <li>Adverse events*</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

#### Table 1: Study selection criteria to identify trials for the systematic literature review

Study design	<ul> <li>Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)</li> <li>Single-arm trials when RCTs are not available for the interventions of interest</li> </ul>
Language	English

\*In addition to efficacy outcomes, adverse events are of interest for the review, but will not be used as study selection criteria.

Results of searches were managed using Endnote and a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Two reviewers screened and selected records independently against inclusion and exclusion criteria using titles and abstracts. Full-texts of potential eligible records were retrieved and screened to assess the eligibility for data extraction. Disagreements were resolved by discussion and consensus. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third investigator was included to reach consensus for any remaining discrepancies. The Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool was used to assess risk of bias in included RCTs. <sup>24</sup> The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to assess the quality of non-controlled studies.<sup>25</sup>

The primary outcome of this review was sickle cell pain crisis (SCPC), also known as a VOC leading to a healthcare visit. A variety of definitions for VOC was observed in the included studies. We consulted several medical experts and chose the definition of VOC used in the pivotal Phase II RCT of crizanlizumab.<sup>18</sup> In this trial, a VOC was defined as an acute episode of pain, with no medically determined cause other than a vaso-occlusive event that resulted in a medical facility visit and treatment with oral or parenteral opioids or with a parenteral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug. In addition to outcomes specifically named as VOC, the outcomes of pain crisis and Sickle Cell Disease Crisis (SCDC) were extracted and included with the VOC set if found to use a comparable definition.

Other outcomes identified as of interest and/or extracted included pain-related outcomes, acute chest syndrome (ACS), all-cause hospitalizations, transfusions, analgesic use, death, adverse events, and serious adverse events. In addition to study and intervention characteristics, the patient characteristics were extracted to qualitatively assess comparability of different study populations.

#### Network meta-analysis

This paper adopts the Bayesian statistical framework to conduct the NMA. This is different to the frequentist framework as the data, represented as a likelihood, are used to update a prior distribution on uncertain parameters to provide a posterior distribution<sup>26</sup>. Bayesian NMA is conducted using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) estimation which is a technique to sample from the posterior distribution of a specified likelihood and prior. The Bayesian framework is recommended by NICE and published textbooks for NMA due to its flexibility and in this study it allows the synthesis of different data types, which would be difficult in the frequentist setting<sup>27 28</sup>. The key outputs of a Bayesian analysis are 95% credible intervals (CrI) and Bayesian probabilities. The 95% CrI is the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of the MCMC samples from the posterior distribution and represents a region where there is 95% probability of containing the true value of some parameter, for example a hazard ratio. The Bayesian probability for a parameter is the proportion of the MCMC distribution that lies above or below a certain threshold; in this analysis the interest lies in Bayesian probabilities of superiority which are the probability that the hazard ratios are greater than 1.

Quantitative synthesis through this Bayesian NMA approach was planned for reported or derived time-to-event outcomes of VOC, all-cause hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse

events, in line with those reported by the Phase II RCT on crizanlizumab.<sup>18</sup> International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR), Society for Medical Decision (MDM), and UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines were followed in design of the NMA model.<sup>27 29-31</sup> As the pivotal study on crizanlizumab was conducted within an older adolescent and adult (>16 years old) population, the NMA was conducted only on studies that included patients >16 years old with SCD. Whilst the pivotal study for L-glutamine (Niihara 2018) included patients aged <16 years old, a decision was made to include the study to enable a comparison with crizanlizumab. The primary comparison examines the outcomes in the whole population. A sensitivity analysis, was subsequently run using the results with Endari in a subgroup of patients aged >18 years old (reported in Niihara 2018).. Evidence networks were generated with nodes corresponding to treatments and edges connecting nodes if at least one RCT comparing corresponding treatments was identified.<sup>32</sup> An extended network including RCTs with a mixture of child, adolescent and adult populations was investigated for additional direct or indirect evidence on any comparison with crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg.

Following NICE guidelines, we employed a shared parameter model for hazard ratios to synthesise studies summarising outcomes in different formats and accounting for differences in trial duration.<sup>27</sup> Summaries that could be included were total number of events, percentage of patients with events, mean numbers of events, mean or median rates, numbers of patients with at least one event, and risk or hazard ratio of event. Likelihood and link function for each summary followed MDM and NICE guidelines.<sup>27 31</sup> Total number of events are modelled with a Poisson likelihood and log link, numbers of patients with at least one event are modelled using a Binomial likelihood and complementary log log link, while risk and hazard ratios are modelled on a log scale with a Normal likelihood and identify link. In line with NICE recommendations, a Bayesian perspective with vague priors was adopted.<sup>27 31</sup> Sensitivity to priors was explored with details in Appendix B; the base case prior has a standard deviation of 100 while the precise prior sensitivity has a standard deviation of 3.16 on log scale of baseline and treatment effects. Fixed and random effect were considered with choice being made on basis of model fit; meta-regressions were also explored to assess heterogeneity due to trial duration, proportion female, mean age, proportion homozygous hemoglobin S (HbSS) genotype, proportion hydroxyurea use, and proportion black or African-American.<sup>33</sup> Different doses of the same drug were analysed independently. If a connected evidence network could be formed using only RCTs, single-arm study evidence was discarded. The reference treatment in all analyses was placebo. If feasible, inconsistency between direct and indirect evidence was planned to be tested by node-splitting and an independent means inconsistency model.<sup>19</sup> All analyses were conducted using the MCMC software of OpenBUGS version 3.2.3.<sup>34</sup> Two MCMC chains with 400,000 iterations for burn-in and 30,000 iterations for posterior sampling were used. Convergence was assessed by visual inspection and the Gelman-Rubin statistic.<sup>34 35</sup> Further details of the modelling methods are provided in Appendix E.

We generated hazard ratios with 95% Crl of high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg relative to each comparator. We estimated the Bayesian probability that crizanlizumab was superior (lower hazard of event) or inferior (higher hazard of event). These probabilities are the Bayesian equivalent of one-sided p-values. In line with the recommendations of the American Statistical Association, we did not adopt a strict threshold for interpreting these Bayesian probabilities,<sup>36</sup> but instead reported the probability itself. Probabilities are interpreted to suggest evidence in favour of a hypothesis if it lay lower than 5% or above 95%, and weak evidence if the probability was between 5-10% or 90-95%.<sup>37</sup>

60

# RESULTS

## Systematic literature review results

We retrieved 3388 records from electronic databases, *ClinicalTrials.gov* and Sins 2017. After removing duplicates and irrelevant records, we screened 250 full-text articles. Fifty one studies (67 references) were included to perform evidence evaluation for the NMA (Figure 1). Full details and references for the 51 studies are included in Appendix B. We also identified fourteen additional ongoing clinical RCTs or completed RCTs without publication, which investigated effects of non-hydroxyurea treatments on SCD patients.<sup>38-51</sup>

Of 51 studies, duration of follow-up was reported in 41 studies and, among RCTs in the ≥16 years old population, duration ranged from 30 days in Wun 2013<sup>52</sup> to 52 weeks in Ataga 2017.<sup>18</sup> This range represents substantial variation in follow-up, but the methods used for NMA model trial follow-up compare annualized hazards in order to adjust for this difference.

The proportion of female patients varied across RCTs, ranging from 0.44 in Glassberg 2017<sup>53</sup> to 0.60 in Sins 2017,<sup>54</sup> so qualitatively similar proportions. Across all 51 studies, the proportion of females varied from 0.23 in Gupta 1995<sup>55</sup> to 1.00 in de Abood 1997,<sup>56</sup> representing a more substantial difference. In the  $\geq$ 16 years old population RCTs, age ranged from 20.5 years in Pace 2003<sup>57</sup> to 35.5 years in Ataga 2008.<sup>58</sup> Across all 51 studies, the mean age ranged from 4.8 years in Adegoke 2013<sup>59</sup> to 48.8 years in Bridges 2017.<sup>60</sup> The proportion with HbSS genotype ranged from 0.60 in Wun 2013<sup>52</sup> to 1.00 in several studies that restricted enrolment to patients with HbSS disease alone, including Ataga 2008<sup>58</sup> in the  $\geq$ 16 years old population. Although HbSS is indicative of absolute outcomes (prognostic factor), there is no known evidence that it is an effect modifier, so the NMA remains feasible.<sup>33</sup> Proportion of patients reported as black or African American ranged from 0.53 in NCT02482298<sup>61</sup> to 1.00 in Styles 2010.<sup>62</sup> Several studies excluded patients with history of hydroxyurea usage, including Bao 2008<sup>63</sup> in the  $\geq$ 16 years old population. In the  $\geq$ 16 years old population, this otherwise varied from 0.42 in Sins 2017<sup>54</sup> to 0.67 in Niihara 2018,<sup>12</sup> making it somewhat comparable.

# Construction of evidence networks

Of the 51 studies identified, there were 17 non-controlled studies that were excluded from the NMA due to lack of common comparators and potential bias. Of the 34 remaining RCTs , only 8 were conducted solely in older adolescent and adult ( $\geq$ 16 years old) patients.<sup>18 52-54 57 58 61 62</sup>. As the only RCT identified on L-glutamine, Niihara 2018<sup>12</sup> was included in the network. This gave 9 RCTs in the  $\geq$ 16 years old population evidence networks. Five of these studies used a VOC definition comparable to that in Ataga 2017<sup>12 18 57 58 62</sup> (details in Appendix E). The only study that examined transfusions was a conference abstract by Vichinsky. As the authors did not specify the definition of VOC or a placebo control, this study was excluded from the NMA<sup>64</sup> Appendix F shows the characteristics of included studies in the NMA. Analysed evidence networks are provided in Figure 2.

In addition to crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and 2.5 mg/kg, multiple doses of other drugs were included in the networks. Ticagrelor was studied as both twice daily 45mg (high-dose) and 10mg (low-dose);<sup>61</sup> N-acetylcysteine (NAC) as 600mg (low-dose), 1200mg (mid-dose), and 2400mg (high-dose);<sup>57</sup> Senicapoc with a loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance,<sup>62</sup> and as a low-dose and high-dose formulation corresponding to single loading doses of 100mg and 150mg, respectively, and maintenance 6mg and 10mg daily, respectively.<sup>58</sup>

Cochrane risk of bias assessment for the 9 RCTs included in NMA is reported in full in Appendix E. Risk of bias was low in all categories for three of these studies (two studying senicapoc and one mometasome), and was low in all except incomplete outcome data in Ataga 2017.<sup>18</sup> Three studies were at unclear risk of bias due to random sequence generation and allocation concealment (studying ticagrelor, L-glutamine, and NAC doses).<sup>12 57 61</sup> Sins 2017 (studying NAC) was at low risk of bias for all categories except incomplete outcome data, on which it was at high risk of bias.<sup>54</sup>. Wun 2013 (studying prasugrel) was at unclear risk of bias on random sequence generation, allocation concealment, and blinding but low risk of bias on remaining categories.<sup>52</sup>

#### Network meta-analysis results

A fixed effects NMA approach was used for the primary analyses. The NMA models converged well and fit, assessed by comparing residual deviance to total number of data points, was good for all fixed effects analyses. Random effects analyses did not converge as only one RCT was available on each treatment contrast. Meta-regression to explore covariate effects did not reveal evidence of effect medication but convergence was poor for these models. Fit statistics and model assessment details are provided in Appendix E. Inconsistency could not be tested as there were no treatment contrasts on which both direct and indirect evidence were available.<sup>19</sup>

We discuss in turn the results of the NMA on VOC, all-cause hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events. Forest plots of hazard ratios with 95% CI of crizanlizumab vs all comparators are provided in Figure 3. Bayesian probabilities that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg is superior or inferior are also provided in this figure. Pairwise results for all treatment comparisons are provided in Appendix E.

We found evidence that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard of VOC than placebo Lglutamine (hazard ratio 0.55, 95% CrI (0.43, 0.69); Bayesian probability crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg superior 0.9999), L-glutamine (0.67 (0.51, 0.88); 0.9982), and senicapoc (0.46 (0.32, 0.67); >0.9999). We found only weak evidence that hazard of VOC was lower on crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg than crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.81 (0.63, 1.05); 0.9452) or low-dose NAC (0.48 (0.18, 1.21); 0.9396). We found no evidence of a difference between crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and mid-dose NAC (0.81 (0.29, 2.18); 0.6619), high-dose NAC (1.91 (0.57, 7.58); 0.1507), high-dose senicapoc (0.57 (0.15, 2.17); 0.8010), or low-dose senicapoc (0.53 (0.14, 1.95); 0.8334). Results are summarized in Table 2 below. Cumulative ranking plots ('rankograms') are provided in Appendix B for the interested reader for each of the outcomes of interest. These are plots of the cumulative probability that each treatment is ranked in the top 1, 2, 3, etc. treatments.

		All-cause	Adverse	Serious adverse
	VOC	hospitalization	events	events
Placebo	>0.9999	>0.9999	0.6558	0.5857
L-glutamine	0.9982	0.0731	0.2480	0.2854
Crizanlizumab				
2.5mg/kg	0.9452	>0.9999	0.5743	0.8134
Mometasome	-	0.7496	0.9399	-
Low-Dose NAC	0.9396	0.0166	0.6996	0.9744
Mid-Dose NAC	0.6619	-	-	-
High-Dose NAC	0.1507	-	-	-
Prasugrel	-	-	-	0.5242
Senicapoc	>0.9999	-	0.7176	-

Tahlo 2 Ba	vesian nro	hahilitios t	hat cri	zanlizumah	ie ei	inerior c	n oa	ch o	utcome	analv	hazı
I able Z. Da	yesian pro	babilities t	παι σπ	zamizuman	15 50	ipenor c	лі еа		ucome	analy	/zeu

2	
3 ⊿	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30 21	
27	
22	
32	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

High-Dose				
Senicapoc	0.8010	-	-	-
Low-Dose				
Senicapoc	0.8334	-	-	-
High-dose				
Ticagrelor	-	-	-	0.4247
Low-dose				
Ticagrelor	-	-	-	0.6181
*** ·· · · · ·	c			

\*Proportion of MCMC samples for which crizanlizumab vs comparator hazard ratio is above (inferior) or below (superior) 1. Entry '-' indicates comparator not included in outcome specific evidence network.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg daily.

In a sensitivity analysis using a rate ratio of 0.64 with 95% confidence interval (0.45, 0.89) in a subgroup of patients aged >18 years old reported on page 231 of the publication Niihara 2018<sup>12</sup>, we found no evidence that crizanlizumab had a lower hazard of VOC than L-glutamine (0.86 (0.57, 1.29); 0.7707). Full results of this analysis are provided in Appendix E.

We found evidence that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard of all-cause hospitalization days than placebo (0.58 (0.50, 0.68); >0.9999), and crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.58 (0.50, 0.68); >0.9999), but found evidence that hazard was higher than on low-dose NAC (2.08 (1.06, 4.66); 0.0166). We found weak evidence that hazard of all-cause hospitalization days was higher on crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg than on L-glutamine (1.73 (0.82, 3.76); 0.0731) and no evidence of a difference with mometasome (0.89 (0.63, 1.26); 0.7496). Note that all-cause hospitalization includes admission for VOC but also for adverse events and non-SCD related causes.

The hazard of adverse events—both serious and overall—for crizanlizumab was generally similar or weakly better than other treatments. The exception is that there was weak evidence that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard than mometasome (0.51 (0.21, 1.19); 0.9399). We found no evidence of a difference in hazard of adverse events between crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and placebo (0.91 (0.59, 1.43); 0.6558), L-glutamine (1.31 (0.62, 3.08); 0.2480), crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.96 (0.61, 1.48); 0.5743), low-dose NAC (0.84 (0.45, 1.60); 0.6996), or senicapoc (0.86 (0.52, 1.44); 0.7176). Similarly, the hazard of serious adverse events on crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg were lower than on low-dose NAC (0.20 (0.02, 1.00); 0.9744). There was no evidence of a difference on adverse event rates between crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and placebo (0.93 (0.47, 1.87); 0.5857), L-glutamine (1.24 (0.58, 2.70); 0.2854), crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg (0.75 (0.39, 1.43); 0.8134), high-dose ticagrelor (1.14 (0.27, 4.81); 0.4247), or low-dose ticagrelor (0.81 (0.21, 3.17); 0.6181).

Cumulative ranking plots ('rankograms') are provided in Appendix B for the interested reader. These are plots of the cumulative probability that each treatment is ranked in the top 1, 2, 3, etc. treatments. For Crisis, qualitatively, high-dose NAC was most likely to have the top rank (i.e., fewest events) rank but was closely followed by crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg. For adverse events, L-glutamine had the best (fewest events) rank followed crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg and for serious adverse events L-glutamine was again best ranked while crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg was middle ranking. For all-cause hospitalization days, NAC had the best rank (fewest hospitalizations) and was followed by L-glutamine and crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg.

A sensitivity analysis assuming more precise priors was conducted and details are provided in Appendix B. There was little or no impact on results. For example, the hazard ratio of VOC for

crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg compared with L-glutamine was (0.67 (0.51, 0.88); 0.9982) with precise priors and (0.67 (0.51, 0.88); 0.9982) in the base case with vague priors. Similarly, the hazard ratio of AE for crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg compared with L-glutamine was (1.29 (0.62, 2.93); 0.2480) with precise priors and (1.31 (0.62, 3.08); 0.2480) in the base case.

## DISCUSSION

Previous SLRs and meta-analyses of treatments for SCD have demonstrated hydroxyurea to be effective in reducing VOC rates.<sup>65 66</sup> However, patients receiving hydroxyurea therapy can continue to have crises, end-organ damage, and a decreased life expectancy.<sup>67</sup> Crizanlizumab and L-glutamine are promising treatment options for SCD patients not well managed on hydroxyurea, but no direct comparison across these treatments has been conducted.<sup>14 18 68</sup> Our SLR and NMA is the first looking at the comparative efficacy of new treatments for older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients not well managed on hydroxyurea and is therefore of vital importance to this patient population.

Our baseline analysis found that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg reduced VOC compared to L-glutamine, placebo, and senicapoc, and weak evidence of reduction compared to crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg and low-dose NAC. These results, however, were sensitive to whether the L-glutamine efficacy was measured for all patients or only those aged >18 years.

We found that crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg reduced all-cause hospitalization days compared to placebo and crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg. Conversely, we found evidence that low-dose NAC reduced hospitalization compared to crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg, and weak evidence that L-glutamine reduced hospitalization compared to crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg.

Our analysis found high-dose crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg had a lower hazard of adverse events compared to mometasome and of serious adverse events compared to low-dose NAC. There was no evidence of a difference between 5 mg/kg crizanlizumab on safety with other treatments.

#### Strengths

This SLR was comprehensive in terms of outcomes and interventions and was focused on the target population of crizanlizumab, that of older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients not well managed, or having failed previous treatment, with hydroxyurea. Our review followed the PRISMA guidelines and checklist.<sup>22</sup> Risk of bias was assessed using the best practice Cochrane collaboration tool.<sup>24</sup> To be comprehensive, we searched for both RCT and single-arm evidence but used only RCT evidence in the NMA. Our NMA combines direct head-to-head RCT evidence to enable indirect comparisons of interventions (e.g. crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg versus L-glutamine) that have not been compared directly; it thus goes beyond the published results of individual studies. Our analysis followed published and international guidelines on indirect comparisons and network meta-analysis.<sup>27 29-31</sup> On the outcome of VOC, we ensured only studies with a definition compatible with that of the principal crizanlizumab study were analysed. <sup>18</sup> To include a diverse range of outcome summaries, such as total number of events and numbers of patients with at least one event, a shared parameter Bayesian NMA was employed, as recommended by NICE.<sup>27</sup>

#### Limitations

There were several limitations to this SLR and NMA. There was at most only one RCT on each of the treatment contrasts. A similar definition of VOC was used across RCTs but the shared parameter NMA combined RCTs without adjusting for differences in statistical analyses, such as methods for managing drop-outs, used. Differences in RCT follow-up (e.g. 30 days in Wun 2013<sup>52</sup> and 52 weeks in

**BMJ** Open

Ataga 2017)<sup>18</sup> limit comparability of annualized hazard rates across treatments. The strength of evidence for comparisons on hospitalization, adverse events, and serious adverse events was weak. Furthermore, we could not include transfusions in the NMA as the only available RCT in an adult population —Vichinsky 2010<sup>64</sup>— used an unspecified standard of care rather than a placebo control, did not describe the definition of VOC that was used, and was published only as an abstract.

Our NMA model generated results on a hazard ratio scale and thus used a complementary log-log link for the binomial likelihood when analyzing numbers of patients with at least one event. Although such data could have been modelled using a logit link, and thus generated odds ratios, this would have made it difficult to link to hazard ratio data, or total event data, reported by other studies. However, recent research has found hazards and odds ratios to be similar in NMA if the numbers of events are low, as they are in our study.<sup>69</sup>

Due to a lack of evidence, the NMA was not able to estimate the relative impact of crizanlizumab treatment on the rate of complicated VOC or organ damage, both of which are important health outcomes for patients and physicians. The heterogeneity variance of random effects models was not identifiable as only one study was available on each contrast. Published informative priors could be considered.<sup>70</sup> However, the heterogeneity variance would be entirely defined by this prior and its validity would depend on the relevance of a non-SCD clinical area as no NMA has been published previously in SCD. Inconsistency in the network could not be assessed as there were no loops in the evidence networks; it was necessary to assume consistency to enable comparisons with crizanlizumab. As there was no additional indirect evidence to be synthesized with the direct evidence, the NMA does not go beyond individual study results on pairwise comparisons for which there is direct head-to-head evidence (e.g. crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg versus placebo). In such cases, individual study results should remain the primary source of comparative data.

A previous SLR in non-hydroxyurea SCD treatments did not conduct quantitative synthesis due to concerns regarding heterogeneity.<sup>23</sup> Although we considered meta-regression on trial duration, proportion female, mean age, proportion HbSS genotype, proportion hydroxyurea use, and proportion black or African-American there was insufficient evidence as there was only one RCT on each treatment contrast. We were also lacking information on the amount of VOCs in the year preceding randomization/treatment start for several of the treatments included in the analysis, a factor known to be prognostic. We therefore had to assume differences in characteristics would not modify treatment effects, even in parameters expected to influence the frequency of VOCs. Although we conducted a sensitivity analysis using results among >18 year olds from Niihara 2018, that study itself concluded that there was "no significant interaction between trial group assignment and age".<sup>71</sup> On the other hand, if age is an effect modifier, the baseline results should be interpreted cautiously. Future real-world evidence studies may be useful to explore effect modifiers and identify patient types that benefit most from crizanlizumab and other treatments.

Further, caution should be taken when interpreting these results in relation to switching patients from hydroxyurea to crizanlizumab or L-glutamine. Our analysis does not purport to compare crizanlizumab, or indeed L-glutamine or blood transfusions, with hydroxyurea but is instead focused solely on patients who are not well managed on hydroxyurea. Before more evidence is available, physicians should consider treatment with hydroxyurea before consideration of second line treatments.<sup>72</sup>

#### Conclusion

Our baseline analysis showed from an SLR and NMA that crizanlizumab reduced crises and hospital days compared with placebo and other treatments with an acceptable adverse event profile in older adolescent and adult (≥16 years old) SCD patients when compared to other non-hydroxyurea treatments. The VOC results, however, were sensitive to assumptions regarding whether patient age is an effect modifier.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Systematic literature review was assisted by Luke McGuinness of University of Bristol, Rohan Shirali of Precision Xtract, and Emily Glowienka of Precision Xtract. Clifton Chow provided early review of the systematic literature review protocols. We would like to thank Miranda Bailey, Andrew Cavey, Pascal Edrich, Thu Thuy Nguyen, and Patrick Urban for their comments and feedback on this manuscript.

# DATA SHARING STATEMENT

All necessary data, coda, and initial values for our OpenBUGS models are provided in the network meta-analysis.

# **AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS**

HT drafted the manuscript and designed and conducted the network meta-analysis. NS ensured medical relevance for the review and analysis and provided context for the results. JJ advised on statistical aspects of the analysis. GJ and JS provided oversight to the whole project. LZ provided project management and administrative support. MB provided subject-matter expertise on the review and analysis. HYC led the systematic review. SG validated the network meta-analysis. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

# DISCLOSURES OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

This work was funded by Novartis Pharma AG, manufacturer of crizanlizumab. Novartis reviewed the manuscript prior to submission. JS and JP disclose employment by and equity in by precisionHEOR, a consulting firm to the life sciences and broader health care industry. HT discloses personal consulting fees from Novartis Pharma AG, Hoffman La-Roche, Pfizer Inc., and Eli Lilly. LZ discloses employment by precisionHEOR, a consulting firm to the life sciences and broader health care industry. NS discloses research funding and speaker fees from Novartis Pharmaceutical Company.

# **FUNDING**

This work was funded by Novartis Pharma AG, manufacturer of crizanlizumab.

# REFERENCES

- 1. Hassell KL. Population Estimates of Sickle Cell Disease in the U.S. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 2010;38(4, Supplement):S512-S21. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.12.022
- 2. Manwani D, Frenette PS. Vaso-occlusion in sickle cell disease: pathophysiology and novel targeted therapies. *Blood* 2013;122(24):3892-98.
- 3. Zhang D, Xu C, Manwani D, et al. Neutrophils, platelets, and inflammatory pathways at the nexus of sickle cell disease pathophysiology. *Blood* 2016;127(7):801-09.
- 4. Polanowska-Grabowska R, Wallace K, Field JJ, et al. P-selectin–mediated platelet-neutrophil aggregate formation activates neutrophils in mouse and human sickle cell disease. *Arteriosclerosis, thrombosis, and vascular biology* 2010;30(12):2392-99.
- 5. Frelinger III AL, Jakubowski JA, Brooks JK, et al. Platelet activation and inhibition in sickle cell disease (pains) study. *Platelets* 2014;25(1):27-35.
- 6. Sreeramkumar V, Adrover JM, Ballesteros I, et al. Neutrophils scan for activated platelets to initiate inflammation. *Science* 2014;346(6214):1234-38.
- 7. Matsui NM, Varki A, Embury SH. Heparin inhibits the flow adhesion of sickle red blood cells to Pselectin. *Blood* 2002;100(10):3790-96.
- 8. Matsui NM, Borsig L, Rosen SD, et al. P-selectin mediates the adhesion of sickle erythrocytes to the endothelium. *Blood* 2001;98(6):1955-62.
- 9. Wagner DD, Frenette PS. The vessel wall and its interactions. *Blood* 2008;111(11):5271-81.
- 10. Novelli EM, Gladwin MT. Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. Chest 2016;149(4):1082-93. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2015.12.016
- 11. Lanzkron S. Sickle cell anemia BMJ Best Practice, 2018.
- 12. Niihara Y, Miller ST, Kanter J, et al. A Phase 3 Trial of I-Glutamine in Sickle Cell Disease. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379(3):226-35. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1715971 [published Online First: 2018/07/19]
- Wang WC, Oyeku SO, Luo Z, et al. Hydroxyurea Is Associated With Lower Costs of Care of Young Children With Sickle Cell Anemia. *Pediatrics* 2013;132(4):677-83. doi: 10.1542/peds.2013-
- 14. Hematology ASo. State of Sickle Cell Disease: 2016 Report, 2016.
- 15. Vichinsky E, Hoppe CC, Ataga KI, et al. A Phase 3 Randomized Trial of Voxelotor in Sickle Cell Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2019
- 16. Prescribing information for Oxbryta (voxelotor) US Food and Drug Administration; 2019 [Available from:

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\_docs/label/2019/213137s000lbl.pdf accessed March 11, 2020.

17. Prescribing Information for Adakveo (crizanlizumab): US Food and Drug Administration; 2019 [Available from:

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\_docs/label/2019/761128s000lbl.pdf accessed March 11, 2020.

- Ataga KI, Kutlar A, Kanter J, et al. Crizanlizumab for the Prevention of Pain Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2017;376(5):429-39. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1611770
- Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, et al. Evidence synthesis for decision making 4: inconsistency in networks of evidence based on randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 2013;33(5):641-56. doi: 10.1177/0272989X12455847
- 20. Jansen JP, Naci H. Is network meta-analysis as valid as standard pairwise meta-analysis? It all depends on the distribution of effect modifiers. *BMC Med* 2013;11:159. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-11-159 [published Online First: 2013/07/06]

- 21. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009;62(10):1006-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005
- 22. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2700. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700
- 23. Sins JWR, Mager DJ, Davis S, et al. Pharmacotherapeutical strategies in the prevention of acute, vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell disease: a systematic review. *Blood advances* 2017;1(19):1598-616. doi: 10.1182/bloodadvances.2017007211 [published Online First: 2018/01/04]
- 24. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 25. Wells GS, O'Connell D, Peterson J, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses 2013 [Available from: <a href="http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp">http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp</a> accessed October 1 2016.
- 26. Sivia D, Skilling J. Data Analysis: A Bayesian Tutorial. United States: Oxford University Press 2006.
- 27. Dias S, Welton N, Sutton A, et al. NICE DSU Technical Support Document 2: A Generalised Linear Modelling Framework for Pairwise and Network Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials. *Report by the Decision Support Unit* 2011 (last updated September 2016)
- 28. Dias S, Ades A, Welton N, et al. Network Meta-Analysis for Decision-Making: Wiley 2018.
- 29. Jansen JP, Fleurence R, Devine B, et al. Interpreting indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis for health-care decision making: report of the ISPOR Task Force on Indirect Treatment Comparisons Good Research Practices: part 1. *Value Health* 2011;14(4):417-28. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2011.04.002
- 30. Hoaglin DC, Hawkins N, Jansen JP, et al. Conducting indirect-treatment-comparison and networkmeta-analysis studies: report of the ISPOR Task Force on Indirect Treatment Comparisons Good Research Practices: part 2. Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research 2011;14(4):429-37. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2011.01.011
- 31. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, et al. Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 2013;33(5):607-17. doi: 10.1177/0272989X12458724
- 32. Salanti G, Del Giovane C, Chaimani A, et al. Evaluating the quality of evidence from a network meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2014;9(7):e99682. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0099682
- 33. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Welton NJ, et al. Evidence synthesis for decision making 3: heterogeneity---subgroups, meta-regression, bias, and bias-adjustment. *Med Decis Making* 2013;33(5):618-40. doi: 10.1177/0272989X13485157
- 34. Lunn D, Jackson C, Best N, et al. The BUGS book : a practical introduction to Bayesian analysis. Boca Raton ; London: CRC Press 2013.
- 35. Gelman A, Rubin D. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences (with discussion). *Statistical Science* 1992;7:457-511.
- 36. American Statistical Association. AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION RELEASES STATEMENT ON STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND P-VALUES. Provides Principles to Improve the Conduct and Interpretation of Quantitative Science March 7, 2016 2016
- 37. Sterne JA, Davey Smith G. Sifting the evidence-what's wrong with significance tests? *BMJ* 2001;322(7280):226-31.
- 38. NCT02179177. Apixaban in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2017
- 39. NCT02615847. Clinical Trial to Study the Safety and Tolerability of Memantin Mepha<sup>®</sup> in Sickle Cell Disease Patients. 2017
- 40. NCT02594462. Contraception in Women With Sickle Cell Disease. 2018
- 41. NCT02380079. Dose-Escalation Study of SCD-101 in Sickle Cell Disease. 2018

Δ	
5	
6	
7	
/ 0	
ð	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
2/	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
_10 ⊿7	
47	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

- 42. NCT01702246. Effect of Simvastatin Treatment on Vaso-occlusive Pain in Sickle Cell Disease. 2015
  - 43. NCT01737814. Evaluation of Purified Poloxamer 188 in Vaso-Occlusive Crisis of Sickle Cell Disease (EPIC). 2016
  - 44. NCT02449616. Evaluation of Repeat Administration of Purified Poloxamer 188. 2016
  - 45. NCT02061202. Inhaled Mometasone to Reduce Painful Episodes in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2017
  - 46. NCT02633397. A Multi-Center Study of Riociguat in Patients With Sickle Cell Diseases. 2018
  - 47. NCT03247218. A Phase IIa IIb, Trial to Study the Safety, Tolerability and Efficacy of Memantine as a Long-term Treatment of SCD. 2019
  - 48. NCT02525107. Prevention of Vaso-occlusive Painful Crisis by Using Omega-3 Fatty Acid Supplements. 2019
  - 49. NCT01704794. Quality of Life Study for Sickle Cell Patients Treated With Jobelyn (Sorghum Bicolor Extract). 2014
  - 50. NCT01202812. A Randomized Trial of LOVAZA in Pediatric Sickle Cell Disease (SCD). 2012
  - 51. NCT02604368. Sickle Cell Omega-3 Treatment Trial (SCOT Trial). 2020
  - 52. Wun TS, Denis; Frelinger, Andrew L.; Krishnamurti, Lakshmanan; Novelli, Enrico M.; Kutlar, Abdullah; Ataga, Kenneth I.; Knupp, Charles L.; McMahon, Lillian E.; Strouse, John J.; Zhou, Chunmei; Heath, Lori E.; Nwachuku, Chuke E.; Jakubowski, Joseph A.; Riesmeyer, Jeffrey S.; Winters, Kenneth J. A double-blind, randomized, multicenter phase 2 study of prasugrel versus placebo in adult patients with sickle cell disease. *Journal of Hematology & Oncology* 2013;6 doi: 10.1186/1756-8722-6-17
  - 53. Glassberg JM, Caterina; Cromwell, Caroline; Cytryn, Lawrence; Kraus, Thomas; Skloot, Gwen S.; Connor, Jason T.; Rahman, Adeeb H.; Meurer, William J. Inhaled steroids reduce pain and sVCAM levels in individuals with sickle cell disease: A triple-blind, randomized trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2017;92(7):622-31. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ajh.24742</u>
  - 54. Sins JF, X; Fijnvandraat, K; Dominguez, M; Rijneveld, Aw; Kerkhoffs, J-L; Meurs, A; Groot, Mr; Heijboer, H; Nur, E; Luken, Bm; Zeerleder, Ss; Dresse, M-F; Le, P-Q; Hermans, P; Vanderfaeillie, A; Neste, E; Benghiat, Fs; Kesse-Adu, R; Delannoy, A; Efira, A; Azerad, M-A; Borgie, Ca; Chen, J; Lopez, Ja; Biemond, Bj. Effects of oral N-acetylcysteine on oxidative stress in patients with sickle cell disease. *Blood Conference: 59th annual meeting of the american society of hematology, ASH 2017 United states* 2017;130(Supplement 1) (no pagination)
  - 55. Gupta VLC, B. S. Efficacy of zinc therapy in prevention of crisis in sickle cell anemia: a double blind, randomized controlled clinical trial. *The Journal of the Association of Physicians of India* 1995;43(7):467-9.
  - 56. de Abood MdC, Z.; Guerrero, F.; Espino, M.; Austin, K. L. Effect of Depo-Provera (R) or Microgynon (R) on the painful crises of sickle cell anemia patients. *Contraception* 1997;56(5):313-16. doi: 10.1016/S0010-7824(97)00156-X
  - 57. Pace BSS, A.; Pack-Mabien, A.; Mulekar, M.; Ardia, A.; Goodman, S. R. Effects of N-acetylcysteine on dense cell formation in sickle cell disease. *American Journal of Hematology* 2003;73(1):26-32. doi: 10.1002/ajh.10321
  - 58. Ataga KIS, Wally R.; De Castro, Laura M.; Swerdlow, Paul; Saunthararajah, Yogen; Castro, Oswaldo; Vichinsky, Elliot; Kutlar, Abdullah; Orringer, Eugene P.; Rigdon, Greg C.; Stocker, Jonathan W. Efficacy and safety of the Gardos channel blocker, senicapoc (ICA-17043), in patients with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 2008;111(8):3991-97. doi: 10.1182/blood-2007-08-110098
  - 59. Adegoke SAS, Umar Abdullahi; Mohammed, Lasisi Oluwafemi; Sanusi, Yunusa; Oyelami, Oyeku Akibu. Influence of Lime Juice on the Severity of Sickle Cell Anemia. *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine* 2013;19(6):588-92. doi: 10.1089/acm.2012.0567

60. Bridges KRG, B.; Bronte, L. A single center experience of GBT440 treatment of severe anemia in sickle cell disease (SCD). *Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH* 2017;130(Supplement 1)

- 61. NCT02482298. A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrelor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2016
- 62. Ataga KIR, Marvin; Ballas, Samir K.; Yasin, Zahida; Bigelow, Carolyn; St James, Luther; Smith, Wally R.; Galacteros, Frederic; Kutlar, Abdullah; Hull, James H.; Stocker, Jonathan W. Improvements in haemolysis and indicators of erythrocyte survival do not correlate with acute vaso-occlusive crises in patients with sickle cell disease: a phase III randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study of the gardos channel blocker senicapoc (ICA-17043). *British Journal of Haematology* 2011;153(1):92-104. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2141.2010.08520.x
- 63. Bao BP, Ananda S.; Beck, Frances W. J.; Snell, Diane; Suneja, Anupam; Sarkar, Fazlul H.; Doshi, Nimisha; Fitzgerald, James T.; Swerdlow, Paul. Zinc supplementation decreases oxidative stress, incidence of infection, and generation of inflammatory cytokines in sickle cell disease patients. *Translational Research* 2008;152(2):67-80. doi: 10.1016/j.trsl.2008.06.001
- 64. Vichinsky EP, Neumayr LD, Gold J, et al. A Randomized Trial of the Safety and Benefit of Transfusion Vs. Standard Care In the Prevention of Sickle Cell-Related Complications In Adults: a Preliminary Report From the Phase II NHLBI Comprehensive Sickle Cell Centers (CSCC) Study of Neuropsychological Dysfunction and Neuroimaging Abnormalities In Neurologically Intact Adult Patients with Sickle Cell Disease. *Blood (abstract only)* 2010;116:3221.
- 65. Lanzkron S, Strouse JJ, Wilson R, et al. Systematic review: Hydroxyurea for the treatment of adults with sickle cell disease. *Ann Intern Med* 2008;148(12):939-55.
- 66. Nevitt SJJ, Ashley P.; Howard, Jo. Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017;4:CD002202. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD002202.pub2</u>
- 67. Steinberg MH, Barton F, Castro O, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on mortality and morbidity in adult sickle cell anemia: risks and benefits up to 9 years of treatment. *JAMA* 2003;289(13):1645-51. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.13.1645
- Niihara YM, S.; Razon, R.; Claggett, B.; Onyekwere, O. C.; Ikeda, A.; Singleton, T.; Wood, A. K.; Singh, R.; Tran, L.; Stark, C. W. Phase 3 study of I-glutamine in sickle cell disease: Analyses of time to first and second crisis and average cumulative recurrent events. *Blood Conference:* 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017;130(Supplement 1)
- 69. Thom H, Lopez-Lopez JA, Welton NJ. Shared parameter model for competing risks and different data summaries in meta-analysis: Implications for common and rare outcomes. *Res Synth Methods* 2019 doi: 10.1002/jrsm.1371
- 70. Turner RM, Dominguez-Islas CP, Jackson D, et al. Incorporating external evidence on betweentrial heterogeneity in network meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2019;38(8):1321-35. doi: 10.1002/sim.8044
- 71. Niihara Y, Miller ST, Kanter J, et al. A Phase 3 Trial of l-Glutamine in Sickle Cell Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2018;379(3):226-35. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1715971
- 72. Quinn CT. I-Glutamine for sickle cell anemia: more questions than answers. *Blood* 2018;132(7):689-93. doi: 10.1182/blood-2018-03-834440

**BMJ** Open











Figure 1. SCD Prisma Flow Chart 209x297mm (600 x 600 DPI)



Figure 2. Evidence networks

\* Each node represent a treatment and nodes are connected by an edge if at least trial has compared the relevant treatments. Any two treatments can be compared if their corresponding nodes can be connected by a path of one or more edges.

High-dose Crizanlizumab=5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. Low-Dose Crizanlizumab=2.5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

5 RCTs on crisis = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo), Ataga 2011 (senicapoc vs. placebo), Ataga 2008 (senicapoc low-dose, senicapoc high-dose vs. placebo), and Pace 2003 (NAC low, mid, and high dose vs. placebo). 4 RCTs on all-cause hospitalization days = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo), Glassberg 2017 (mometasome vs. placebo), and Sins 2017 (NAC vs. placebo). 5 RCTs on adverse events = Glassberg 2017 (mometasome vs. placebo), Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Ataga 2011 (senicapoc vs placebo), Sins 2017 (NAC vs. placebo). 5 RCTs on serious adverse events = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Sins 2017 (NAC vs placebo). 5 RCTs on serious adverse events = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Sins 2017 (NAC vs placebo). 5 RCTs on serious adverse events = Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Sins 2017 (NAC vs placebo), Sins 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo), NCT02482298 (TICAGRELOR vs placebo), and Niihara 2018 (L-glutamine vs placebo).

291x185mm (192 x 192 DPI)

#### BMJ Open



#### Figure 3. Forest plot

\*Hazard ratio less than 1 suggests lower hazard of event on the crizanlizumab. Bayesian probabilities of superiority are proportion of MCMC samples for which crizanlizumab vs comparator hazard ratio is above (inferior) or below (superior) 1.

High-dose Crizanlizumab=5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. Low-Dose Crizanlizumab=2.5mg/kg 14 times over 52 weeks. High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose

Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# Appendix A. PRISMA Checklist

# PRISMA NMA Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting A Systematic Review Involving a Network Meta-analysis

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review <i>incorporating a network meta-analysis (or related form of meta-analysis).</i>	Page 1
ABSTRACT Structured summary	2	<ul> <li>Provide a structured summary including, as applicable:</li> <li>Background: main objectives</li> <li>Methods: data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal; and synthesis methods, such as network meta-analysis.</li> <li>Results: number of studies and participants identified; summary estimates with corresponding confidence/credible intervals; treatment rankings may also be discussed. Authors may choose to summarize pairwise comparisons against a chosen treatment included in their analyses for brevity.</li> <li>Discussion/Conclusions: limitations; conclusions and implications of findings.</li> <li>Other: primary source of funding; systematic</li> </ul>	Page 2 (but used 'objectives' rather than 'background' to align with BMJ Open style guide.
INTRODUCTION		review registration number with registry name.	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known, <i>including mention of why</i> <i>a network meta-analysis has been conducted</i> .	Page 3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed, with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	Page 4 (Table 1)
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists and if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address); and, if available, provide registration information, including registration number.	Appendix D and E.
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as	Page 4 &5(Table 1&2)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. <i>Clearly</i> describe eligible treatments included in the treatment network, and note whether any have been clustered or merged into the same node (with justification).	
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	Page 4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Page 4 and Appendix A, D, and E
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	Page 4&5
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	Page 4 (Table 1, appendix)
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Page 4 (Table 1)
Geometry of the network	<b>S</b> 1	Describe methods used to explore the geometry of the treatment network under study and potential biases related to it. This should include how the evidence base has been graphically summarized for presentation, and what characteristics were compiled and used to describe the evidence base to readers.	Page 5
Risk of bias within individual studies	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), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	Page 4
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Also describe the use of additional summary measures assessed, such as treatment rankings and surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) values, as well as modified approaches used to present summary findings from meta-analyses.	Page 4&5
Planned methods of analysis	14	<ul> <li>Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies for each network meta-analysis. This should include, but not be limited to: <ul> <li>Handling of multi-arm trials;</li> <li>Selection of variance structure;</li> <li>Selection of prior distributions in Bayesian analyses; and</li> <li>Assessment of model fit.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Page 5 and Appendix B
Assessment of Inconsistency	S2	Describe the statistical methods used to evaluate the agreement of direct and indirect evidence in the treatment network(s) studied. Describe efforts taken to address its presence when found.	Page 5 and Appendix B

Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	Page 4
Additional analyses RESULTS†	16	<ul> <li>Describe methods of additional analyses if done, indicating which were pre-specified. This may include, but not be limited to, the following: <ul> <li>Sensitivity or subgroup analyses;</li> <li>Meta-regression analyses;</li> <li>Alternative formulations of the treatment network; and</li> <li>Use of alternative prior distributions for Bayesian analyses (if applicable).</li> </ul></li></ul>	Page 5, and appendix B
		<b>A</b>	
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.	Page 5 (Figure 1)
Presentation of network structure	<b>S</b> 3	Provide a network graph of the included studies to enable visualization of the geometry of the treatment network.	Figure 2
Summary of network geometry	S4	Provide a brief overview of characteristics of the treatment network. This may include commentary on the abundance of trials and randomized patients for the different interventions and pairwise comparisons in the network, gaps of evidence in the treatment network, and potential biases reflected by the network structure.	Page 6
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Table 2, Appendix
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment.	Page 6 and Appendix A
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates and confidence intervals. <i>Modified approaches may be</i> <i>needed to deal with information from larger</i> <i>networks</i> .	Table 2
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence/credible intervals. <i>In larger</i> <i>networks, authors may focus on comparisons versus</i> <i>a particular comparator (e.g. placebo or standard</i> <i>care), with full findings presented in an appendix.</i> <i>League tables and forest plots may be considered to</i> <i>summarize pairwise comparisons.</i> If additional summary measures were explored (such as treatment rankings), these should also be presented.	Figure 3 and appendix
	Risk of bias across studiesAdditional analysesAdditional analysesStudy selectionPresentation of network structureSummary of network geometryStudy characteristicsRisk of bias within studiesResults of individual studiesSynthesis of results	Risk of bias across studies15Additional analyses16Additional analyses16analyses16analyses17Study selection17Presentation of network structureS3Summary of network geometryS4Study characteristics18Risk of bias within studies19Results of individual studies20Synthesis of results21	Risk of bias across studies       15       Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).         Additional analyses       16       Describe methods of additional analyses if done, inicitating which were pre-specified. This may include, but not be limited to, the following: • Sensitivity or subgroup analyses; • Meta-regression analyses; • Use of alternative prior distributions for Bayesian analyses (if applicable).         RESULTS†       51         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.         Presentation of network structure       53         Summary of network geometry       54         Provide a brief overview of characteristics of the treatment network. This may include commentary on the abundance of trials and randomized patients for the different interventions and pairwise comparisons in the network, gaps of evidence in the treatment network, and potential biases reflected by the network structure.         Study characteristics       18         For each study; 1) simple summary data for each intervention group, and 2) effect estimates and confidence intervals. Modified approaches may be needed to deal with information from larger networks.         Synthesis of results       21       Present tresults of each meta-a
Exploration for inconsistency	S5	Describe results from investigations of inconsistency. This may include such information as measures of model fit to compare consistency and inconsistency models, <i>P</i> values from statistical tests, or summary of inconsistency estimates from different parts of the treatment network.	Page 7 (no independent loops of evidence on which to test for inconsistency)
--------------------------------	----	--	--
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies for the evidence base being studied.	Appendix A
Results of additional analyses	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression analyses, <i>alternative network geometries studied, alternative choice of prior distributions for Bayesian analyses,</i> and so forth).	Page 6, 9, and Appendix B
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings, including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy-makers).	Page 7-9
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). <i>Comment on the validity of the assumptions, such as</i> <i>transitivity and consistency. Comment on any</i> <i>concerns regarding network geometry (e.g.,</i> <i>avoidance of certain comparisons).</i>	Page 8 and 9
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	Page 9
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. This should also include information regarding whether funding has been received from manufacturers of treatments in the network and/or whether some of the authors are content experts with professional conflicts of interest that could affect use of treatments in the network.	Page 10

PICOS = population, intervention, comparators, outcomes, study design.

\* Text in italics indicateS wording specific to reporting of network meta-analyses that has been added to guidance from the PRISMA statement.

<sup>†</sup> Authors may wish to plan for use of appendices to present all relevant information in full detail for items in this section.

# Box. Terminology: Reviews With Networks of Multiple Treatments

Different terms have been used to identify systematic reviews that incorporate a network of multiple treatment comparisons. A brief overview of common terms follows.

*Indirect treatment comparison:* Comparison of 2 interventions for which studies against a common comparator, such as placebo or a standard treatment, are available (i.e., indirect information). The direct treatment effects of each intervention against the common comparator (i.e., treatment effects from a comparison of interventions made within a study) may be used to estimate an indirect treatment comparison between the 2 interventions (**Appendix Figure 1, A**). An indirect treatment comparison (ITC) may also involve multiple links. For example, in **Appendix Figure 1, B**, treatments B and D may be compared indirectly on the basis of studies encompassing comparisons of B versus C, A versus C, and A versus D.

Network meta-analysis or mixed treatment comparison: These terms, which are often used interchangeably, refer to situations involving the simultaneous comparison of 3 or more interventions. Any network of treatments consisting of strictly unclosed loops can be thought of as a series of ITCs (**Appendix Figure 1, A and B**). In mixed treatment comparisons, both direct and indirect information is available to inform the effect size estimates for at least some of the comparisons; visually, this is shown by closed loops in a network graph (**Appendix Figure 1, C**). Closed loops are not required to be present for every comparison under study. "Network meta-analysis" is

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

an inclusive term that incorporates the scenarios of both indirect and mixed treatment comparisons.

*Network geometry evaluation:* The description of characteristics of the network of interventions, which may include use of numerical summary statistics. This does not involve quantitative synthesis to compare treatments. This evaluation describes the current evidence available for the competing interventions to identify gaps and potential bias. Network geometry is described further in **Appendix Box 4**.

to beet terien only

Appendix Box 1. The Assumption of Transitivity for Network Meta-Analysis

Methods for indirect treatment comparisons and network meta-analysis enable learning about the relative treatment effects of, for example, treatments A and B through use of studies where these interventions are compared against a common therapy, C.

When planning a network meta-analysis, it is important to assess patient and study characteristics across the studies that compare pairs of treatments. These characteristics are commonly referred to as *effect modifiers* and include traits such as average patient age, gender distribution, disease severity, and a wide range of other plausible features.

For network meta-analysis to produce valid results, it is important that the distribution of effect modifiers is similar, for example, across studies of A versus B and A versus C. This balance increases the plausibility of reliable findings from an indirect comparison of B versus C through the common comparator A. When this balance is present, the assumption of transitivity can be judged to hold.

Authors of network meta-analyses should present systematic (and even tabulated) information regarding patient and study characteristics whenever available. This information helps readers to empirically evaluate the validity of the assumption of transitivity by reviewing the distribution of potential effect modifiers across trials.

# Appendix Box 2. Differences in Approach to Fitting Network Meta-Analyses

Network meta-analysis can be performed within either a frequentist or a Bayesian framework. Frequentist and Bayesian approaches to statistics differ in their definitions of probability. Thus far, the majority of published network meta-analyses have used a Bayesian approach.

Bayesian analyses return the posterior probability distribution of all the model parameters given the data and prior beliefs (e.g., from external information) about the values of the parameters. They fully encapsulate the uncertainty in the parameter of interest and thus can make direct probability statements about these parameters (e.g., the probability that one intervention is superior to another).

Frequentist analyses calculate the probability that the observed data would have occurred under their sampling distribution for hypothesized values of the parameters. This approach to parameter estimation is more indirect than the Bayesian approach.

Bayesian methods have been criticized for their perceived complexity and the potential for subjectivity to be introduced by choice of a prior distribution that may affect study findings. Others argue that explicit use of a prior distribution makes transparent how individuals can interpret the same data differently. Despite these challenges, Bayesian methods offer considerable flexibility for statistical modeling. In-depth introductions to Bayesian methods and discussion of these and other issues can be found elsewhere.

# Appendix Box 3. Network Meta-Analysis and Assessment of Consistency

Network meta-analysis often involves the combination of direct and indirect evidence. In the simplest case, we wish to compare treatments A and B and have 2 sources of information: direct evidence via studies comparing A versus B, and indirect evidence via groups of studies comparing A and B with a common intervention, C. Together, this evidence forms a closed loop, ABC.

Direct and indirect evidence for a comparison of interventions should be combined only when their findings are similar in magnitude and interpretation. For example, for a comparison of mortality rates between A and B, an odds ratio determined from studies of A versus B should be similar to the odds ratio comparing A versus B estimated indirectly based on studies of A versus C and B versus C. This assumption of comparability of direct and indirect evidence is referred to as *consistency* of treatment effects.

When a treatment network contains a closed loop of interventions, it is possible to examine statistically whether there is agreement between the direct and indirect estimates of intervention effect.

Different methods to evaluate potential differences in relative treatment effects estimated by direct and indirect comparisons are grouped as *local approaches* and *global approaches*. Local approaches (e.g., the Bucher method or the node-splitting method) assess the presence of inconsistency for a particular pairwise comparison in the network, whereas global approaches (e.g., inconsistency models, *l*<sup>2</sup> measure for inconsistency) consider the potential for inconsistency in the network as a whole.

Tests for inconsistency can have limited power to detect a true difference between direct and indirect evidence. When multiple loops are being tested for inconsistency, one or a few may show inconsistency simply by chance. Further discussions of consistency and related concepts are available elsewhere.

Inconsistency in a treatment network can indicate lack of transitivity (see **Appendix Box 1**).

# Appendix Box 4. Network Geometry and Considerations for Bias

The term *network geometry* is used to refer to the architecture of the treatment comparisons that have been made for the condition under study. This includes what treatments are involved in the comparisons in a network, in what abundance they are present, the respective numbers of patients randomly assigned to each treatment, and whether particular treatments and comparisons may have been preferred or avoided.

Networks may take on different shapes. Poorly connected networks depend extensively on indirect comparisons. Meta-analyses of such networks may be less reliable than those from networks where most treatments have been compared against each other.

Qualitative description of network geometry should be provided and accompanied by a network graph. Quantitative metrics assessing features of network geometry, such as *diversity* (related to the number of treatments assessed and the balance of evidence among them), *co-occurrence* (related to whether comparisons between certain treatments are more or less common), and *homophily* (related to the extent of comparisons between treatments in the same class versus competing classes), can also be mentioned.

Although common, established steps for reviewing network geometry do not yet exist, however examples of in-depth evaluations have been described related to treatments for tropical diseases and basal cell carcinoma and may be of interest to readers. An example based on 75 trials of treatments for pulmonary arterial hypertension (**Appendix Figure 3**) suggests that head-to-head studies of active therapies may prove useful to further strengthen confidence in interpretation of summary estimates of treatment comparisons.

Appendix Box 5. Probabilities and Rankings in Network Meta-Analysis Systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses can provide information about the hierarchy of competing interventions in terms of treatment rankings.

The term *treatment ranking probabilities* refers to the probabilities estimated for each treatment in a network of achieving a particular placement in an ordering of treatment effects from best to worst. A network of 10 treatments provides a total of 100 ranking probabilities—that is, for each intervention, the chance of being ranked first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and so forth).

Several techniques are feasible to summarize relative rankings, and include graphical tools as well as different approaches for estimating ranking probabilities. **Appendix Figure 6** shows 2 approaches to presenting such information, on the basis of a comparison of adjuvant interventions for resected pancreatic adenocarcinoma.

Robust reporting of rankings also includes specifying median ranks with uncertainty intervals, cumulative probability curves, and the surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA) curve.

Rankings can be reported along with corresponding estimates of pairwise comparisons between interventions. Rankings should be reported with probability estimates to minimize misinterpretation from focusing too much on the most likely rank.

Rankings may exaggerate small differences in relative effects, especially if they are based on limited information. An objective assessment of the strength of information in the network and the magnitude of absolute benefits should accompany rankings to minimize potential biases.

**BMJ** Open



60





BMJ Open

1					
2		Trea	itment and Co	ores onding Rankir	ng Probabilities
4 5	Ranking	5-FU	Gemcltablne	Chemoradlalton + 5-FU	Chemoradlation + gemcitablne
6	1	0.42	0.42	0.15	0.01
7 8	2	0.46	0.36	0.15	0,02
9	3	0.10	0.17	0.68	0.04
10	4	0,02	0.05	0.02	0.93
12				,	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 20		,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	<b>5-FU</b> Gemcltak Chemora ,,•,•,,•	olne dlation + 5-FU 900 +,,,,,,
0 11 2 33 34					
5					
7					
3					
) ,					
•					
I					
0	For peer review of	only - ht	ttp://bmjope	n.bmj.com/site/a	bout/guidelines.xhti

# Appendix B: Additional details of Systematic literature review

# A.1 Literature search strategies for non-transfusions SLR

Table 1: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of MEDLINE

#	Searches	Concept
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein	
3	occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp length of stay/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	_
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
7	or/1-6	
8	anemia, sickle cell/	Population
9	hemoglobin, sickle/	
	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
10	h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	exp antisickling agents/	Interventions
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling 🧹	
13	agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or	
	velaresol or crizanlizumab or L-glutamine or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	meta analysis.pt.	Systematic review
18	((meta adj analys*) or metaanalys or meta-analys*).ti,ab,sh.	and meta-analysis
19	(systematic adj5 (review or overview*)).ti,ab,sh.	studies
20	or/17-19	
21	16 and 20	
22	clinical trial/	RCTs
23	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	

4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	, 8
2	a
ב 2	ر م
2	1
2	י ר
2	2
2	ר ∧
2	4 5
2	5
2	7
с 2	/ 0
с 2	0
د ∡	9
4	1
4	וי ר
4	2
4	с л
4	4 5
4	5
4	7
4	0
4	0
4	2
2	1
2	ו ר
2	∠ 2
2	د ∧
2	+ 5
2	כ ה
2	7
2	/ Q
5	0 0
د ء	ע ר
0	υ

#	Searches	Concept
24	single blind method/	
25	double blind method/	_
26	random allocation/	_
27	placebos/	
28	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	
29	randomized controlled trial/	
30	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	
31	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	
32	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	
33	or/22-32	
34	16 and 33	
35	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	Single arm trials
36	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	
37	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
38	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or odata* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	
39	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	
40	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	
41	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	
42	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	
43	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	
44	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf	
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	
47	(all adj3 received).ab.	
48	or/35-47	
49	16 and 48	

3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
<u>4</u> 8
-10 /10
77
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
60
00

_		
#	Searches	Concept
50	limit 21 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on rSLR and meta-analysis
		studies
51	limit 34 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on RCTs
52	limit 49 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on single arm trials

## Table 2: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of EMBASE

#	Searches	
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein	
3	occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	_
4	exp "length of stay"/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	_
7	or/1-6	
8	sickle cell anemia/	Population
9	hemoglobin S/	
10	(sickle cell or sickle h $\$$ emoglobin or drepanocyt $*$ or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
10	h\$emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an\$emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	antisickling agent/	Intervention
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling	
13	agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or	
	velaresol or crizanlizumab or L-glutamine or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	randomized controlled trial/	RCTs
18	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	

~
2
2
J
4
~
5
6
7
/
8
~
9
10
10
11
12
12
13
11
14
15
10
16
17
10
18
19
~~~
20
21
<u>~</u> 1
22
25
25
24
25
25
26
27
27
28
20
29
30
50
31
32
52
33
34
54
35
36
50
37
20
50
39
10
40
41
40
42
43
11
44
45
16
46
47
40
4ð
49
50
50
51
5.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
72

Searches (random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide* or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw. trial.ti. crossover procedure/ ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. obase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ ((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide* or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw. trial.ti. crossover procedure/ ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. ohase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 orospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ ((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	- - - Single-arm trials
or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw. trial.ti. crossover procedure/ ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. obase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 orospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ ((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	- - - Single-arm trials
treat*)).ab,kw. trial.ti. crossover procedure/ ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) ad]3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. obase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ ((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
trial.ti. crossover procedure/ (singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. obase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ (epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
crossover procedure/ ((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. ohase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 orospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ (epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	- - Single-arm trials
(singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw. ohase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 orospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ (epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
ohase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/ or/17-23 16 and 24 orospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ clepidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
or/17-23 16 and 24 prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ (epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
16 and 24 prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ (epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/ (epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	Single-arm trials
(epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	
case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
(cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	
registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	
(control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	
(single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	2
all adj3 received).ab.	
ohase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	
(phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or	
studies)).ti,ab,kw.	
or/26-36	
studies)).ti,ab,kw. pr/26-36 16 and 37	
or/26-36 16 and 37 imit 25 to em=201705-201825	Date limit on RCTs
	all adj3 received).ab. hase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/ (phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or tudies)).ti,ab,kw. r/26-36 6 and 37

#### Table 3: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials

#	Searches	
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	Outcomes
#2	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein	
#3	occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	
#4	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	
#5	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#6	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#7	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6	
#8	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	Population
#9	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	
	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
#10	h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	
#11	#8 or #9 or #10	
#12	MeSH descriptor: [Antisickling Agents] explode all trees	Interventions
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling	
#13	agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or	
	velaresol or crizanlizumab or L-glutamine or voxelotor or GBT440):ti,ab,kw	
#14	(#8 or #9 or #10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*	
#15	#11 or #12 or #13	
#16	#7 and #11 and #14	

#### Table 6: Search strategy for non-transfusions search of ClinicalTrials.gov\*

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#2	Drug OR Placebo OR Crizanlizumab OR Hydroxyurea OR L-glutamine OR Voxelotor OR	Intervention/treatment
#3	GBT440 OR hydroxycarbamide	
	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis	Outcome Measures
#4	OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR	
	interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

**BMJ** Open

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

## A.2 Literature search strategies for transfusions SLR

Table 4: Search strategy for transfusions search on CENTRAL database

#	Searches	Results
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	583
#2	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	19
#3	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	4790
#4	#1 or #2 or #3	4790
#5	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Transfusion] this term only	1766
#6	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocyte Transfusion] explode all trees	564
#7	((blood or erythrocyte* or "red cell*" or "red blood cell*" or RBC*) near/5 (transfus* or infus* or unit*))	14775
#8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) near/5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program* or therapy)):ab	30189
#9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)):ti	3612
#10	("allogeneic blood" or (unit* near/2 blood) or "allogenic blood" or (blood near/2 exposure) or "donor blood" or "blood product*" or "blood component*" or "blood support")	3365
#11	hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*	107
#12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*) and transfus*:ti	2434
#13	#5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12	41927
#14	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Component Transfusion] this term only	115
#15	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocytes] this term only	1478 🔍
#16	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*)	12756
#17	#14 and (#15 or #16)	39
#18	#13 or #17	41927
#19	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	42323
#20	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	124349

#	Searches	Results
#21	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso- occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti.ab.kw	4404
#22	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	6488
#23	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	20854
#24	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	1779
#25	#19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24	153780
#26	#4 and #18 and #25	332

# Table 5: Search strategy for transfusions search on MEDLINE database

#	Searches	Results
1	anemia, sickle cell/	19329
2	hemoglobin, sickle/	3011
3	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	27120
4	1 or 2 or 3	27602
5	Blood Transfusion/	48056
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	8033
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	90906
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	47785
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	35184
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	26829
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1217
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	24060
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	183648
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	3477
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	16726

3
4
5
6
7
/ 0
ð
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
10
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
ノブ

#	Searches	Results
16	14 not 15	3229
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	128578
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	216650
19	17 or 18	258199
20	16 and 19	834
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	13177
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	3326
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	188025
24	exp pain/	362648
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	547392
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso - occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	66169
27	exp length of stay/	77857
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	104873
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	6507
30	or/24-29	901074
31	4 and 23 and 30	848
32	clinical trial/	512148
33	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	1010
34	single blind method/	25632
35	double blind method/	147368
36	random allocation/	95709
37	placebos/	34063
38	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	126392
39	randomized controlled trial/	467730
40	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	786522
41	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	145215
42	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	6481
43	or/32-42	156516

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, Q	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
2/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	

#	Searches	Results
44	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	2187051
45	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	1071161
46	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	615678
47	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	340559
48	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	18409
49	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	29604
50	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	14110
51	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	139501
52	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	53439
53	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	114108
54	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	34084
55	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	2644
56	(all adj3 received).ab.	41192
57	or/44-56	3114626
58	31 and 43	120
59	31 and 57	278

Table 6: Search strategy for transfusions search on EMBASE database
---------------------------------------------------------------------

#	Searches	Results
1	exp Anemia, Sickle Cell/	32009
2	(h?emoglobin s or h?emoglobin sc or h?emoglobin se or h?emoglobin ss or h?emoglobin c or h?emoglobin d or Hb s or Hb sc or Hb se or Hb ss or Hb c or Hb d or sc disease*).tw.	5794
3	(sickle cell or sicklemia or sickled or sickling or meniscocyt* or drepanocyt*).tw.	29569
4	1 or 2 or 3	38361
5	Blood Transfusion/	108332
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	23021
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	135137
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	77239
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	38387
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	43111
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1555
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	28985
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	273982
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	2629
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	19765
16	14 not 15	2279
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	112741
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	256379
19	17 or 18	278120
20	16 and 19	523
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	22304
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	4095

#	Searches	Results
24	exp pain/	1146280
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	789805
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "venous occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso- occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	82887
27	exp length of stay/	150699
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	169748
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	12514
30	or/24-29	1690290
31	4 and 23 and 30	2325
32	randomized controlled trial/	508600
33	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	1062285
34	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide* or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw.	560662
35	trial.ti.	248694
36	crossover procedure/	56042
37	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	276112
38	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	99658
39	or/32-38	138684
40	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/	1771952
41	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	1282224
42	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	790240
43	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	500633
44	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	183687
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	42777
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	3333
47	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	80316
48	(all adj3 received).ab.	75969

3
4
5
6
0
/
8
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
∠∪ 21
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
31
24
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
40 40
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
<u>1</u> 0
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
57
20
59
60

#	Searches	Results
49	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	126474
50	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw.	205403
51	or/40-50	3180246
52	31 and 39	245
53	31 and 51	599

#### Table 7: Search strategy for transfusions search on clinicaltrials.gov database

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Transfusion OR blood OR RBC OR hematocrit OR erythrocyte	Intervention/treatment
	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis	Outcome Measures
#4	OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR	
	interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

## A.3 Additional results from systematic literature review

Table 8: Cochrane risk of bias assessment of randomized controlled trials included in the feasibility assessment

Trial ID	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (personnal)	Blinding (outcome assessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Arruda 2013	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	None
Ataga 2008	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
Ataga 2011	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of

Trial ID	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (personnal)	Blinding (outcome assessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
							interest of authors
Ataga 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
Bao 2008	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
Cabannes 1984	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Baseline imbalances or not assessed
Deceulaer 1982	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed; Industry funded
Diop 2011	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
Glassberg 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
NCT02482298	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded
Niihara 2018	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	High	Low	Industry funded
Pace 2003	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	High	Low	Industry funded
Schlaeger 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None
Sins 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	None
Tomer 2001	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Baseline imbalances
Wun 2013	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded
Adegoke 2013	Low	Unclear	High	High	High	Unclear	No placebo used in control group
Alvim 2005	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	None
Charnigo 2017	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Subset of a RCT database
Daak 2013	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded
Daak 2018	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed
de Abood 1997	High	High	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed; No placebo used in control group
Eke 2003	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Baseline imbalances or not assessed

Trial ID	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding (personnal)	Blinding (outcome assessor)	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Gail 1982	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	None
Gupta 1995	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	None
Heeney 2016	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
lsaacs 1972	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Baseline imbalances or not assessed; Industry funded
Mann 1974	Unclear	Unclear	High	High	Low	Unclear	Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study; No placebo used in control group
Manrique 1987	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	None
Oski 1968	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Industry funded; Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study
Reid 2014	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Industry funded; Any conflict of interest of authors
Vinchinsky 2010	Unclear	Unclear	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	Industry funded
Wambebe 2001	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study
Zago 1984	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	High	Unclear	Risk of carry-over effect in crossover study

\* Note: Trial bolded were base case studies; Trials shaded in grey were not included in the final network meta-analyses.

Page 50 of 160

**BMJ** Open

Table 9: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment of non-randomized controlled trials included in the feasibility assessment

Al Hashmi 2017		*	*	)	*				*	4
Brandalise 2017		*	*		*	*	*		*	6
Bridges 2017		*	*						*	3
Bumma 2017		*	*		*					3
Colombatti 2018	*	*	*		*	0		*	*	6
Di Maggio 2018	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	7
Hoppe 2017	*	*			*					3
Keikhaei 2015	*	*	*						*	4
Kwiatkowski 2017	*	*						*	*	4
LeBlanc 2016		*	*	*				*	*	5
Lemonne 2017		*	*				*	*	*	5
NCT01476696		*							*	2
Quarmyne 2017	*	*	*		*			*		5
Rigano 2018	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	7
Sethy 2018	*	*	*					*	*	5
Styles 2010		*	*	*						3
Youssry 2017	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	7

**BMJ** Open

Zago 1984



Figure 1: Cochrane assessment of randomized controlled trials included in the feasibility assessment

#### Table 10: Study characteristics of trials included in the feasibility assessment

Trial	Registry number	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
Adegoke 2013		Lime juice + Routine oral drugs	Control (Routine oral drugs)			Open	RCT	6 months	Nigeria
Alvim 2005		Piracetam	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT, crossover	1 year (6 months, then crossover with 2 weeks washout period)	Saudi Arabia
Arruda 2013		Placebo	Vitamins C and E			Double- blind	RCT	180 days	Brazil
Ataga 2008	NCT00040677	Senicapoc (high-dose)	Senicapoc (low- dose)	Placebo		Double- blind	RCT	12 week	US
Ataga 2011	NCT00102791	Senicapoc	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	52 weeks	United States, Jamaica, Brazil, France, Trinidad and the United Kingdom.
Ataga 2017	NCT01895361	Crizanlizumab (high- dose)	Crizanlizumab (low-dose)	Placebo		Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	52 weeks	Brazil, Jamaica, USA
Bao 2008		Zinc	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	3 months	US
Cabannes 1984		Ticlopidine	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	6 months	Africa
Charnigo 2017		PF-04447943	Placebo				RCT (Phase 1b)	29 days	
Daak 2013	ISRCTN80844630	Omega-3	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	1 year	Sudan
Daak 2018		AltemiaTM	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	2 months	USA

1	
י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
21	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
20	
27	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	Registry number	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
de Abood 1997		DMPA	Levonorgestrel + ethinyl estradiol	Surgical sterilized (injectable)		Double- blind	RCT	12 months	Spain
Deceulaer 1982		Medroxyprogesterone acetate	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT, crossover	2 years (9 months, then crossover after 6 months washout)	Jamaica
Diop 2011		Sulfadoxine- pyrimethamine	Placebo			Open	RCT	3 months	Senegal
Eke 2003		Placebo (Vitamin c)	Proguanil			Open	RCT (Phase 2)	9 months	Nigeria
Gail 1982		Urea	Control			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	Average: 13.7 months	Ghana
Glassberg 2017	NCT02061202	Mometasone furoate	Placebo			Triple- blind	RCT	16 weeks	US
Gupta 1995		Zinc	Placebo		C	Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	1.5 years	India
Heeney 2016	NCT01794000	Prasugrel	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 3)	A minimum of 9 months and a maximum of 24 months	Americas, Europe, Asi and Africa
Isaacs 1972		Steroid (Testoserone/ Progesterone)	Saline				RCT, crossover (preliminary report before crossover)	4-6 months	Nigeria
Mann 1974		Folic acid	Folic acid + Sodium bicarbonate				RCT, crossover	2 years (crossover after 1 year, no washout)	UK
Manrique 1987		Pentoxifylline	Placebo				RCT (Phase 2)	6 weeks	Brazil
NCT02482298	NCT02482298	Ticagrelor 45 mg	Ticagrelor 10 mg	Placebo		Double- blind	RCT	12 weeks	USA, Egypt, France, Ital

1	
י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
1/	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
25	
22	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
7-J // /	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	<b>Registry number</b>	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
									Kenya, Lebanon, UK, Turkey
Niihara 2018	NCT01179217	L-glutamine	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 3)	48 weeks	USA
Oski 1968		Promazine hydrochloride	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT, crossover	3 months	USA
Pace 2003		NAC (high-dose)	NAC (mid-dose)	NAC (low- dose)	Placebo	Double- blind	RCT	7 months	USA
Reid 2014	NCT01601340	HQK-1001	Placebo	Dee		Double- blind	RCT	48 weeks	United States, Lebanon, Egypt, Jamaica and Canada
Schlaeger 2017		Pregabalin	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT	3 months	USA
Sins 2017	NCT01849016	NAC	Placebo		/ C	Double- blind	RCT	6 months	Netherlands, Belgium, UK
Styles 2010		GMI-1070					Single-arm	1 month	USA
Tomer 2001		mehaden fish oil	Placebo (olive oil)			Double- blind	RCT	12 months	US
Vichinsky 2010		Transfusion	Standard of care				RCT		USA
Wambebe 2001		Niprisan	Placebo			Phase 2	RCT, crossover (Phase 2)	13 months (6 months per treatment, 1-month washout in- between)	Nigeria
Wun 2013	NCT01167023	Prasugrel	Placebo			Double- blind	RCT (Phase 2)	30 days	United States and Canada
Zago 1984		Aspirin	Placebo				RCT, crossover (Phase 2)	10 months (5 months per treatment)	Brazil

Trial	Registry number	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4	Blinding	Design	Follow-up	Country
Al Hashmi 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	6 months	Oman
Brandalise 2017		Methotrexate					Single-arm	12 weeks	Brazil
Bridges 2017		GBT440					Single-arm	10 weeks	Unclear
Bumma 2017		Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programme					Single-arm	1 year	
Colombatti 2018	NCT02709681	Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	1 years	Italy
Di Maggio 2018		Hydroxyurea		5			Single-arm	Mean: 6.6 years	Italy
Hoppe 2017	NCT00508027	Simvastatin					Single-arm	3 months	USA
Keikhaei 2015		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	1 year	Iran
Kwiatkowski 2017		Deferiprone					Single-arm	1 year	USA
LeBlanc 2016	NCT02709681	Methadone			- / -		Single-arm	Mean: 2.1 years	USA
Lemonne 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	2 years	Guadelou
NCT01476696	NCT01476696	Prasugrel				-	Single-arm (Phase 2 part B)	28 days	USA
Quarmyne 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	3 months	USA
Rigano 2018		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	Median: 7 years	Italy
Sethy 2018		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	12 months	India
Youssry 2017		Hydroxyurea					Single-arm	up to 120 months	Egypt

#### Table 11: Eligibility criteria of RCTs included in the feasibility assessment

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Adegoke 2013	Lime juice + Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil) vs Control (Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil))		-^_	Steady state (no painful episode, anemic crisis, or infection on the day of recruitment)	No hydroxyurea treatment		Not on any other alternative medicine commonly used by some patients with SCA in Nigeria such as Aloe vera gel, Moringa oleifera, Solamine syrup, and Ciklavit (Cajanus cajal) suspension as well as Discriovite suspension and or Nicosan (Niprisan) capsule
Alvim 2005	Piracetam vs Placebo	5-20 years			No hydroxyurea treatment	Regular blood transfusion programmes	
Arruda 2013	Placebo vs Vitamins C and E	≥ 18 years	HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup>				Other investigational drugs in the last 12 months
							J.

1	
י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
10	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
27	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
31	
24	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
27	
40	
41	
42	
43	
11	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Ataga 2008	Senicapoc (high- dose) vs Senicapoc (low-dose) vs Placebo	18-60 years	HbSS	≥ 1 nacute sickle- related painful episode that had required hospitalization, but none in the 4 weeks prior to screening	Stable dose for a minimum of 3 months at study enrollment.	Received a transfusion within 30 days of enrollment or undergone an exchange transfusion within 60 days of enrollment	One or more nonallowed medications within 30 days of enrollment (eg, amiodarone, chlorperazine, disopyramide, dofedilide, haloperidol, procainamide, quinidine, risperidone, sotalol, thioridazine, trifluoperazine, warfarin sodium, and erythropoietin)
Ataga 2011	Senicapoc vs Placebo	16-65 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> , HbSβ <sup>+</sup>	≥ 2 acute sickle- related painful crises in the previous 12 months	Received hydroxyurea for the preceding 12 months and their dose was stabilized for at least 3 months prior to the study	Participated in a chronic transfusion programme	Received previous treatment with senicapoc
Ataga 2017	Crizanlizumab (high-dose) vs Crizanlizumab (low-dose) vs Placebo	16-65 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ⁰, HbSβ⁺	2-10 SCD-related pain crises in the 12 months before enrollment		Undergoing long-term red- cell transfusion therapy	

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Bao 2008	Zinc vs Placebo		HbSS		No hydroxyurea treatment	receiving > 6 transfusions per year	
Cabannes 1984	Ticlopidine vs Placebo			6			Received no antisickling treatment for 2 months before admission
Charnigo 2017	PF-04447943 vs Placebo		SCD		2		
Daak 2013	Omega-3 vs Placebo			Steady state, defined as no evidence of fever, infection, or crisis for .4 wk before the start of the study	No hydroxyurea treatment	Prescence of blood transfusion	
Daak 2018	AltemiaTM vs Placebo	5–17 years		2-10 documented sickle cell crises during the 12 months prior to screening	Either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea	*	-07/v
de Abood 1997	DMPA vs Levonorgestrel + ethinyl estradiol vs Surgical sterilized (injectable)						

1	
2	
2	
1	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
14	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
37	
25	
22	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46 46	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Deceulaer 1982	Medroxyprogester one acetate vs Placebo		-				
Diop 2011	Sulfadoxine- pyrimethamine vs Placebo			6			
Eke 2003	Placebo (Vitamin c) vs Proguanil	1-16 years	HbSS		2		
Gail 1982	Urea vs Control		HbSS				
Glassberg 2017	Mometasone furoate vs Placebo	≥ 15 years	HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	< 15 ED visits for SCD pain over the prior 12 months	- '9		
Gupta 1995	Zinc vs Placebo	> 5 years	HbSS			- 6/	Patients on drug therapy for some other disease
Heeney 2016	Prasugrel vs Placebo	2-18 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	≥2 VOC in the year prior to screening		History of chronic RBC transfusion for prevention of stroke or current chronic treatment with RBC for any reason.	-07J

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Isaacs 1972	Steroid (Testoserone/Prog esterone) vs Saline		HbSS	Moderately severe pain at least once in 3 months (with little or no fever or exacerbations of jaundice)			
Mann 1974	Folic acid vs Folic acid + Sodium bicarbonate	5-17 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ	Previously suffered painful crises	9/		
Manrique 1987	Pentoxifylline vs Placebo		HbSS		- 6		
NCT02482298 2017	Ticagrelor 45 mg vs Ticagrelor 10 mg vs Placebo	18-30 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>		Dose must have been stable for 3 months	Treatment with chronic red blood cell transfusion therapy.	Chronic treatment with anticoagulants or antiplatelet drugs
Niihara 2018	L-glutamine vs Placebo	> 5 years	HbSS, HbSβº	≥ 2 pain crises (no upper limit) documented during the previous year	Stable dose within 3 months and continue during the trial	Received any blood products within 3 weeks before screening	Received treatment with I-glutamine within 30 days before the screening
Oski 1968	Promazine hydrochloride vs Placebo			≥2 painful episodes during			
2							
----------							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
10							
20							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24 25							
25							
20							
27							
20							
29							
30 21							
31							
3Z							
33 24							
34 25							
35							
30							
3/							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
			K	the 2 year period prior to study.			
Pace 2003	NAC (high-dose) vs NAC (mid-dose) vs NAC (low-dose) vs Placebo	> 15 years	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	With dense cells greater than 6% and 2 or more VOC episodes per year for the 2 years prior to enrollment		Chronic transfusions	Investigational drug therapy
Reid 2014	HQK-1001 vs Placebo	12-60 years	HbSS, HbSβ	≥ 1 acute SCD- related complication or leg ulcers in 12 months	No current (i.e., within 3 months prior to enrolment) hydroxyurea treatment	Regular transfusion program or transfusion in the preceding 3 months unless Hb A had decreased to less than 20%	- 07/.
Schlaeger 2017	Pregabalin vs Placebo	18-82 years		Pain now score ≥ 4 on a 0-10 scale at registration			- 7

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
22	
22	
دد ∡د	
54 25	
35	
30 27	
3/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Sins 2017	NAC vs Placebo	≥ 12 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> , HbSβ <sup>+</sup>	≥ 1 VOC per year in the past 3 years	Stable dose for 6 months piror to study	Chronic blood transfusion or transfusion in the preceding 3 months	Use of pain medication for sickle-cell related pains on more than 15 days per month in the past 6 months
Styles 2010	GMI-1070	18-50 years	HbSS and HBSB0thal	- 200	24		
Tomer 2001	mehaden fish oil vs Placebo (olive oil)	≥ 18 years		Frequent pain episodes (≥3 events/year)	Not on hydroxyurea		
Vichinsky 2010	Transfusions vs standard of care	21-55 years			30% on hydroxyurea on transfusion, 50% on hydroxyurea on standard of care	64	0,
Wambebe 2001	Niprisan vs Placebo	2-45 years	HbSS	≥ 3 painful or vaso-occlusive crises in the previous year			

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
10
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
20
27
20
29
50 21
ו כ ככ
2∠ 22
27
25
26
30 27
27 20
20
27 10
40 41
41 42
4Z
43
44 45
45
40

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Wun 2013	Prasugrel vs Placebo	18 to 55 years	HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> , HbSβ <sup>+</sup>	Did not have a diagnosis of acute VOC within 30 days of the study screening visit	Stable dose 30 days prior to randomization		
Zago 1984	Aspirin vs Placebo			00			
Al Hashmi 2017	Hydroxyurea	≥ 18 years		> 3 admissions with VOC/year, history of acute chest syndrome, history of priapism, history of splenic sequestration crises	On hydroxyurea 5-10mg/kg/day	Blood transfusion during the study	
Brandalise 2017	Methotrexate			> 3 severe VOC episodes/year, that were refractory to opioids for periods longer than 3 weeks duration.	Under chronic hydroxyurea treatment	6	-0nj
Bridges 2017	GBT440		SCD and severe anemia, i.e.				

2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
			HB < 6.5 g/dL				
Bumma 2017	Scheduled outpatient red cell exchange programme			- P <sub>Q</sub>			
Colombatti 2018	Hydroxyurea			2-3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or hospitalizations in the last year	91		
Di Maggio 2018	Hydroxyurea			>3 painful VOC per year and/or >2 Acute Chest Syndrome	New to hydroxyurea treatment	-07	
Hoppe 2017	Simvastatin	>10 years	HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	≥ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes in the preceding year	At a stable dose for ≥ 3 months	Red cell transfusion within the 30 days prior to enrolment	Current treatment with statins, amiodarone or other drugs with known metabolic interactions with statins (e.g. cytochrome P450 3A4 metabolism)
Keikhaei 2015	Hydroxyurea	6-18 years	SCD				Treatment other than hydroxyurea

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
10
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
20
27
20
29
50 21
ו כ ככ
2∠ 22
27
25
26
30 27
27 20
20
27 10
40 41
41 42
4Z
43
44 45
45
40

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Kwiatkowski 2017	Deferiprone						
LeBlanc 2016	Methadone		` C	> 5 pain events per year			
Lemonne 2017	Hydroxyurea			Absence of acute episodes (infection, VOC, ACS, stroke, priapisrn) at least one month before inclusion into the study.		No blood transftisions in the previous three months	
NCT01476696	Prasugrel	≥2 to <18 years of age and ≥ 12 kg body weigh t	HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup>		A stable dose for the 60 days prior to enrolment	Treatment with packed RBC or whole blood transfusion therapy within 30 days prior to dosing	Any nonsteroidal anti- inflammatory drug (NSAID) use within 5 days prior to screening or Any aspirin, warfarin, thienopyridine, or other antiplatelet medication use within 10 days prior to dosing or Anticipated use of aspirin, warfarin, thienopyridine, or other antiplatelet medication during the study period

Trial	Interventions	Age	Genotype	History of pain/crises/compl ications	Status of hydroxyurea treatment	Prior transfusion (exclusion criteria)	Concurrent medications (exclusion criteria)
Quarmyne 2017	Hydroxyurea		HbSS, HbSβº			Concurrent chronic transfusion	
Rigano 2018	Hydroxyurea			2–3 VOC and/or acute chest syndrome in the year prior	Received hydroxyurea therapy		
Sethy 2018	Hydroxyurea	≥ 18 years	HbSS	<ul> <li>&gt; 2 attacks of VOC</li> <li>per year and/or</li> <li>rate of transfusion</li> <li>1-2 units/month</li> </ul>	er ro		
Youssry 2017	Hydroxyurea				On hydroxyurea ≥3 consecutive months	Chronic blood transfusion protocol	

\* - VOC: vaso-occlusive crisis; SCD: sickle cell disease; ED: emergency department; Note: Trial bolded were base case studies; Trials shaded in grey were not included in the final network meta-analyses.

## A.4 Outcome definitions

### Table 12: Definitions of crisis used in 5 RCTs included in adult network

Study	Treatments	Crisis
Ataga 2017	Placebo, High-dose Crizanlizumab, Low- dose Crizanlizumab	Sickle cell-related pain crises were defined as acute episodes of pain, with no medically determined cause other than a vaso-occlusive event, that resulted in a medical facility visit and treatment. with oral or parenteral narcotic agents or with a parenteral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug. The acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration, and priapism were also considered to be crisis events.
Ataga 2011	Placebo, senicapoc 🧹	A painful crisis was defined as an episode of acute pain with no cause other than a vaso-occlusive event that required a medical facility visit and treatment with oral or parenteral narcotics, or parenteral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Included in the definition of painful crisis were acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration, priapism, stroke and death (with the exception of homicide, suicide, or accidental death). To ensure consistency across sites, all protocol-defined sickle-related painful crises identified by the Investigators that resulted in a visit to a medical facility were adjudicated by an independent, blinded, Crisis Review Committee (CRC).
Ataga 2008	Placebo, senicapoc (low-dose), senicapoc (high-dose)	An independent, blinded crisis review committee adjudicated all sickle cell painful crises and related adverse event data (Document S1). A painful crisis was defined as a period of severe pain (with no explanation other than SCD) lasting 4 or more hours in duration, requiring a visit to a health care facility, and requiring parenteral opiate or other narcotic for relief
Pace 2003	Placebo, NAC (low- dose) 600 mg/day, NAC (mid-dose) 1200mg/day, NAC (high-dose) 2400mg/day	Defined as a visit to a medical facility that lasted more than 4 hr for acute pain related to vaso-occlusion requiring parenteral narcotics. The occurrence of acute chest syndrome, priapism, splenic, or hepatic sequestration was also counted as a VOC episode. Acute chest syndrome included those subjects with chest wall pain and a new infiltrate on chest X ray.
Niihara 2018	Placebo, L-glutamine	A pain crisis was defined as pain leading to treatment with a parenterally administered narcotic or ketorolac in an emergency department (ED) (or outpatient treatment center) or during hospitalization.

## A.5 Additional risk of bias results

Overall, the RCTs were considered to have low risk of bias based on assessment using the Cochrane Collaboration's tool. Almost 50% were at unclear risk of bias due to allocation concealment, selective reporting, and random sequence generation. Also, 10-15% were at high risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data, blinding of outcome assessor, and blinding of personnel. Full results are in the appendix.

Overall, the single-arm studies were at high risk of bias due on several domains of the Newcastle-Ottawa scaleFigure 4): 93.7% at high risk of bias due to outcome of interest not being present at start, 87.5% at high risk of bias due to assessment of outcome, and 75% at high risk of bias due to comparability on additional factors. Also, almost 50% were at high risk of bias due to representativeness of exposed cohort, comparability on basic factors, or the follow-up not being long enough. This high risk of bias further discourages use of the single-arm studies for analysis.

**BMJ** Open

Figure 2: Cochrane risk of bias assessment of 9 randomized controlled studies included in network meta-analysis

Atuga 2008       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0       0		duence	onceal	Irticipa	Itcome	outcor	portin	
N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N       N		dom sec	cation c	ling (pa	ling (ou	mplete	ctive re	
Ataga 2008       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •		Ranc	Alloc	Blinc	Blinc	Incol	Selec	
Ataga 2011       Image 2017       Image 2017 <td>Ataga 2008</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>Low</td>	Ataga 2008						•	Low
Ataga 2017       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •       •	Ataga 2011	•	•	•		•	•	? Unclear
Glassberg 2017       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1      <	Ataga 2017		•	•	•	?	•	High risk
NCT02482298       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ? <td< td=""><td>Glassberg 2017</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td></td></td<>	Glassberg 2017	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Nihara 2018       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ?       ? <td< td=""><td>NCT02482298</td><td>?</td><td>?</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td>•</td><td></td></td<>	NCT02482298	?	?	•	•	•	•	
Pace 2003           3:       ?       ?       *       *       *         Sins 2017       *       *       *       *       *         Wun 2013       ?       ?       ?       *       *	Niihara 2018	?	?	•	•		•	
Sins 2017 Wun 2013 ? ? ? • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Pace 2003	?	?	•	•		•	
Wun 2013 ? ? ? * * *	Sins 2017	•	•	•	•		•	
	Wun 2013	?	?	?	+	+	•	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml





# Figure 4: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment of non-randomized trials presented as percentages across studies.

Representativeness of the exposed cohort	9/16 (56.3%)
Selection of the nonpexposed cohort	17/16 (100%)
Ascertainment of exposure	14/16 (87.5%)
Outcome of interest not present at start	<b>1/</b> (6.3%)
Comparability: basic characteristics	9/16 (56.3%)
Comparability: additional factors	<mark>4/16 (25%)</mark>
Assessment of Outcome	2 <mark>/16 (12</mark> .
Follow-Up Long Enough	9/16 (56.3%)
Adequacy of follow-up	13/16 (81.3%)
	Low risk of bias High risk of bias

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	
31 32	
33	
34 35	
36	
37	
38 39	
40	
41	
42 43	
44	
45	
46 47	
T/	

# A.6 Table of characteristics and references for of all studies identified by SLR

1												
12Author/Year/C	Design				Participants			Inter	ventions			
13 <sup>ountry</sup> 13 <sub>Ref/Enrolment</sub> 14/NCT registry	Total N of PT (N of female); N of arm	Main in/exclusion criteria	Age (years)† Race (n, %)†	Total N of SCD types (n, %)	Total N of HU use (n, %)	Baseline pain/crisis/VOC (n or %) †	Other baseline characteristics (n or %) †	Group	Duration	Other concomitant therapy	Sponsor	Pub type
15 <sub>Schlaeger</sub> 16 <sup>2017</sup> 17 18 <sup>11]</sup> 19	RCT, double- blind Single centre 22 (16); 2	1. 18-82 years 2. history of SCD pain that was not well controlled (pain now score ≥ 4 on a 0-10 scale at registration) Exclusion: renal impairment	Adults Mean (SD): 33.1 (9.9) African american: 11 (100%)	HbSS: 15 (68%) HbSC: 6 (27%) HbSβ: 1 (5%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Pregabalin 75mg BID oral (n=11) 2. Placebo (n=11)	3 months	NR	NR	JA
20 <sub>Hoppe</sub> 2017 21 <sup>USA</sup> 22[2] 23 <sub>NCT00508027</sub> 24	Single-arm Single centre 24 (13); 1	1. >10 years 2. history of ≥ 3 vaso-occlusive pain episodes requiring treatment with a prescribed oral or parenteral analgesic in the preceding year 3. Patients receiving treatment with HU at a stable dose for ≥3 months were eligible	Adults and children Overall mean: 18.5 (range 10- 34)	HbSS: 17 (89%) HbSβº: 2 (11%)	10 (53%)	NR	NR	Simvastatin (n=19*) OD oral Dose adjusted by weight: 40 mg (weight >60 kg); 30 mg (weight 45–60 kg); 25 mg (weight 35–44 kg)	3 months	NR	DDCF, NHL BI and NCRR	JA
26 262017 27USA 283] 29 562 2014 to 29 0ct 2016 3(NCT02061202 31	RCT, triple- blind Single centre 54 (23); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS or HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>≥15 years</li> <li>self-report of cough or wheeze over the preceding two months</li> <li>Exclusion: Diagnosis of asthma, incareration, pregnancy, ≥15 ED visits for SCD pain over the prior 12 months and discharge from the hospital within the previous 7 days</li> </ol>	Adults and adolescents Mean (SD): 30(8.56)	HbSS: 50 (96%) HbSβ⁰: 2 (4%)	34 (65%)	NR	Prior ED Utilization (past 12 months) 0-5 visits: 71% 6-10 visits: 24% 11-15 visits: 6%	Mometasone furoate     220mcg OD inhale (n=35*)     Placebo (n=17*)     In addition to standard SCD     care	16 weeks	NR	NHLBI	JA
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41												
42 43 44				For peer r	eview on	ıly - http://bi	mjopen.bmj.	com/site/about/gi	uidelines	.xhtml		

1 2 3 4 5 6												
7 Ataga 2017 Brazil, 8 Jamaica, USA 9 [4-8]	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 198 (109); 3	1. HbSS, HbSC, HbSØ <sup>,</sup> HbSØ <sup>,</sup> 2. 16-65 years 3. two to ten SCD-related paincrises in the 12 months before the enrolment	Adults and adolescents Median: 26 (range 16-56)	HbSS: 141 (71%) HbSC: 32 (16%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 12 (6%) HbSβ <sup>+</sup> : 10 5%) Other: 3 (2%)	123 (62%) N	l of SCD-related pain crises during previous 12 months 2-4: 63%	NR	1. High-dose Crizanlizumab 5 mg/kg IV (n=67) 2. Low-dose Crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kg IV (n=66) 3. Placebo (n=65)	52 weeks	NR	Selexys Pharmaceuticals, NHLBI and OOPD	JA, JA supp
1 O <sup>Aug</sup> 2013 to Jan 2015 1 INCT01895361 12 13		Exclusion: long-term red-cell transfusion	Black, or African American: 60 (90%) White: 4 (6%) Other: 3 (4%)			5-10: 37%		Two doses 2 weeks apart (loading dose) and then every 4 weeks. A total of 14 doses for 50 weeks				
14 15												
16 <sub>Lemonne 2017</sub> 17Guadeloupe 18 <sub>9]</sub> 19 20	Single-arm Single centre 28 (13); 1	<ol> <li>at the beginning of the HU therapy</li> <li>patients were at steady state, i.e., no blood transfusions in the previous three months and absence of acute episodes (infection, VOC, ACS, stroke, priapism) at least one month before inclusion into the study.</li> </ol>	Adults Overall mean: 37.0(SD 11.6)	All SCA (50% with α- thalassemia)	N/A	Frequent hospitalized VOC: 14 (50%) N of ACS ≥ 1: 10 (36%)	NR	HU Therapy (n=28)	2 years	NR	Region of Guadeloupe.	JA
21 22 23		Exclusion: renal insufficiency, hepatic insufficiency or human immunodeficiency virus infection										
24 <sup>Quarmyne</sup> 25 <sup>JJSA</sup> 26 <sup>10]</sup> 27 <sup>2009-2011</sup>	Single-arm Retrospective 134 (74); 1	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>started HU in 2009-2011</li> <li>Exclusion: concurrent chronic transfusion and hydroxyurea therapy, underwent bone marrow transplant, no follow-up data</li> </ol>	Adults and Children Overall Median: 7.5 ≤5 years: 39% 6-10 years: 33%	NR	None	NR	NR	HU oral (n=78*) Dose: 20 mg/kg/day (initially), followed by dose escalation every 2 months to 25–30 mg/kg/day or maximum tolerated dose if lower	~3 months	NR	NCATS, NIH and J the Abraham J. & Phyllis Katz Foundation.	A
29			11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8%									
29 30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 31 <sup>USA</sup> 32[11]	RCT, double- blind Multicentre	1. 5–17 years 2. two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening	11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8% Children and Adolescents	NR	51 (76%)	NR	NR	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17)	2 months	NR	NR	CA
29 30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 31 <sup>USA</sup> 32 <sub>111]</sub> 33	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 67(NR); 2	1. 5–17 years 2. two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening 3. either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea(HU)	11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8% Children and Adolescents	NR	51 (76%)	NR	NR	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17)	2 months	NR	NR	CA
29 30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 31 <sup>USA</sup> 32 <sub>111</sub> 33 34 35 <sup>Bridges 2017</sup> 36 37 38 39	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 67(NR); 2 Single-arm	1. 5–17 years 2. two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening 3. either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea (HU) Patients with SCD and severe anaemia, i.e. Hb < 6.5 g/dL	11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8% Children and Adolescents NR Adults	NR HbSS:6 (86%) HbSβ: 1 (14%)	51 (76%) NR	NR Baseline VOC admission (total n): 15	NR Baseline transfusions (total n): 24	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17) GBT440 900mg OD (n=7)	2 months 10 weeks	NR	NR	CA
29 30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 31 <sup>USA</sup> 32[11] 33 34 35 <sup>Bridges 2017</sup> Unclear 36 37 38 39 40 41	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 67(NR); 2 Single-arm	1. 5–17 years 2. two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening 3. either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea (HU) Patients with SCD and severe anaemia, i.e. Hb < 6.5 g/dL	11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8% Children and Adolescents NR Adults	NR HbSS:6 (86%) HbSβ: 1 (14%)	51 (76%) NR	NR Baseline VOC admission (total n): 15	NR Baseline transfusions (total n): 24	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17) GBT440 900mg OD (n=7)	2 months 10 weeks	NR	NR	CA
29 30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 31 <sup>USA</sup> 32 <sub>111</sub> 33 34 35 <sup>Bridges 2017</sup> 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 67(NR); 2 Single-arm	<ol> <li>5–17 years</li> <li>two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening</li> <li>either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea (HU)</li> <li>Patients with SCD and severe anaemia, i.e. Hb &lt; 6.5 g/dL</li> </ol>	11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8% Children and Adolescents NR Adults	NR HbSS:6 (86%) HbSβ: 1 (14%)	51 (76%) NR	NR Baseline VOC admission (total n): 15	NR Baseline transfusions (total n): 24	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17) GBT440 900mg OD (n=7)	2 months 10 weeks	NR	NR	CA
29 30 <sub>Daak 2018</sub> 31 <sup>USA</sup> 32 <sub>111</sub> 33 34 35 <sup>Bridges 2017</sup> 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 67(NR); 2 Single-arm	1. 5–17 years 2. two and ten (inclusive) documented SCC during the 12 months prior to screening 3. either not received, or were on a stable regimen of hydroxyurea (HU) Patients with SCD and severe anaemia, i.e. Hb < 6.5 g/dL	11-15 years: 20% >15 years: 8% Children and Adolescents NR Adults	NR HbSS:6 (86%) HbSβ: 1 (14%)	51 (76%) NR	NR Baseline VOC admission (total n): 15	NR Baseline transfusions (total n): 24	1. AltemiaTM (n=50) 2. Placebo (n=17) GBT440 900mg OD (n=7) om/site/about/qu	2 months 10 weeks	NR NR	NR	CA

1 2 3												
4												
5												
0	Single centre		Overall mean:									
7 <sub>[12]</sub> 8	7(4); 1		48.6(SD 15.8)									
9 <sub>Charnigo</sub> 2017 10 <sup>Jnclear</sup>	RCT (phase 1b)	Stable SCD patients	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1. PF-04447943 25mg or 5mg BID oral (n=22) 2. Placebo (n=7)	29 days	NR	Pfizer	CA
1 1[13] 12	Retrospective 29 (NR); 2											
1 3Sins 2017 Netherlands	RCT, double- blind	1. HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ⁰, HbSβ⁺ 2 ≥ 12 years	Adults	HbSS/HbS <sub>8</sub> : 46	28 ((42%)	N of VOC over	Number of	1. Placebo (n=40*) 2. NAC 600mg BID oral	6 months	NR	ZonMw, the	JA
14 <sub>Belgium</sub> , UK	Multicentre	3. History of at least 1.0 VOC per year in the past 3 years	Mean (SD): 28.4(8.9)	(31%) (31%)		Median: 11 (IQR 6-20)	admission over past three years	(n=27*)			Medical Centre, JANIVO	
14, 15] 16Apr 2013 to 17Nov 2015 17Not 2015 18 19 20 21 22	96 (40); 2	Exclusion: Chronic blood transfusion or transfusion in the preceding 3 months, VOC in the last 4 weeks, pregnancy, active gastric/duodenal ulcers, HU treatment with unstable dose in the last 3 months or started on HU shorter than 6 months prior to study, use of pain medication for SCD-related pains on more than 15 days per month in the past 6 months, poor compliance	Latin- America/Caribbea n: 17 (43%) Africa :23 (57%)				Median: 3 (IQR 1- 6)				Stichting, Egbers Stichting,	
23 <sub>Niihara 2018</sub> 24µs	RCT, double- blind (phase 3)	<ol> <li>5 years</li> <li>had had at least two pain crises (no upper limit) documented during</li> </ol>	Adults and children	SCA: 207 (90%) HbSβº: 21 (9%) HbSβ+: 2 (1%)	153 (66.5%)	N of SCD pain crises in the year before trial	NR	1. L-glutamine 0.3 g/kg BID oral (n=152) 2. placebo (n=78)	48 weeks	NR	Emmaus Medical J	IA
25[16-20] 26Jun 2010 to Dec 2013 27NCT01179217 28	Multicentre 230 (124); 2	the previous year 3. HU at stable dose within 3 months and continue during the trial	Mean (SD): 21.4(12.42) Black: 144 (95%) Hispanic: 4 (3%) Other: 4 (3%)			0-1: 0.7% 2-5: 84.2% 6-9: 9.9% ≥ 10: 5.3%		Maximum dose: 30mg				
29 <sub>Sethy 2018</sub> 30 <sup>ndia</sup> 31 <sub>[21]</sub>	Single-arm Single site 142 (46); 1	1. HbSS 2. ≥ 18 years 3. > 2 attacks of VOC per year and/or rate of transfusion 1–2 units/month were included in the study.	Adults	All HbSS	N/A	64% presented with repeated VOC, 13% with transfusion	NR	HU 10 mg/kg/day oral (n=128*)	12 months	All the patients were advised to take folic acid (5 mg/day) and	NR	JA
32010102010						23% with both the				adequate fluid		
33 24		Exclusion: pregnancy, numan immunodeficiency virus infection or				above teatures				Intake		
34		medications that could potentially enhance HU toxicity, abnormal serum										
36		Cr/ALT levels										
37												
38												
39												
40												
41												
42												
43				For peer r	eview or	lv - http∙//br	niopen bmi c	om/site/about/g	idelines	xhtml		
44				, or peer to		iiy iicepi/01		, site, asoat, gt				
45												

1												
2												
<u>з</u>												
+ 5												
6												
7 Di Maggio	Single-arm	1. start HU treatment	Adults and	HbSS: 25 (18%)	90 (64%)	NR	NR	HU oral (n=140)	Mean	NR	NR	JA, JA
8 Italy	Retrospective	per year and/or >2 Acute Chest	children	HbSβ* : 56 (40%)				Starting dose: 10 mg/kg	6.6 years			supp
9 <sub>[22]</sub>	140 (71); 1	Syndrome	Median(range): 35 (0.4-61)	HbSα-β: 4 (3%) HbSLepore: 1				daily Titration: increased at a				
10 January 2000			× ,	(0.7%)				rate of 5 mg/kg/week				
11												
12Youssry 2017	Single-arm	Patients who were on HU therapy for	Adults and	HbSS: 27 (45%)	N/A	NR	NR	HU 15-30mg/kg/day oral	Up to 120	NR	NR	JA
13 <sup>Egypt</sup>	Retrospective			Hb3p. 33 (35 %)				(11-00)	monuis			
14 <sup>[23]</sup>	60 (37); 1	Exclusion: Chronic blood transfusion, chronic disabling hepatic/renal	Mean: 12.8 (SD 5.5) (range 4 to									
15		disease	24)									
16 Bumma 2017	Single-arm	NR	Adults and	HbSS: 89 (86%)	13%	NR	NR	Scheduled outpatient red	1 year	NR	NR	CA
1 /USA	Retrospective		Adolescents					cell exchange (n=104)				
1 <b>č[24]</b> 1 <b>č</b> [/1/2000 to	104 (60); 1		Median (range): 24(15-62)									
19/1/2000 10 20			21(10 02)									
20 21/wietkowski	Cingle orm	Inducion on a nationt registry has	Adulta and	ND		ND		Deferierene erel (n=201)	Maan: 12		ND	<u></u>
22 <sup>2017</sup>	Sillyle-altii	been maintained for all US patients	children	INT	INFX	INIX		Deletipione oral (II-291)	years	INFX	ND	CA
23	Registry data 291 (166); 0	who receive deferiprone	Mean: 29.5						(range 0- 4.1)			
24 <sup>[25]</sup>			(SD15.7)						,			
25			≤ 18years: 79									
26Rigano 2018	Single-arm	1. On HU therapy	Adults and	HbSS: 277 (47%)	N/A	NR	NR	HU oral (n=628*)	Median	Folic acid was	NR	JA
27 <sup>ntaly</sup>	Retrospective	2. The indication for HO initiation was 2–3 vaso-occlusive crisis and/or	children	HbSβ*: 167 (28%) HbSβ+: 131 (20%)				10 mg/kg/day, and	years	used in 71.3%		
28 <sup>[26]</sup>	cohort 652 (302); 1	acute chest syndrome in the year prior	Mean: 24 5 (SD	Other: 19 (3%)				adjusted or escalated according to tolerance	(range <1- 29)	of patients (n/N =		
29			15)	Total N: 594				·		388/448).		
30			(range 1-67)									
31			Couponion									
32			400/621									
33			Africa: 221/621									
24 25												
35												
37												
38												
39												
40												
41												
42												
43				For peer r		nlv - http://b	mionen hmi /	com/site/about/a	uidelines	vhtml		
44				i oi peel li		iny = nttp.//D	injopen.binj.	com/site/about/gi	undennes			
45												

1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6 7 Al Hashmi 2017	Single-arm	1. Aged ≥ 18 years 2. on HU 5-10mo/ko/day	Adults	NR	N/A	NR	NR	HU 5-10mg/kg/day oral (n=18)	At least 6	NR	NR	CA
8 Oman 9 [27] 10	Single centre 18 (6); 1	<ol> <li>history of more than three admissions with vaso-occlusive crises /year, history of acute chest syndrome, history of priapism, history of science sequestration crises</li> </ol>						(****)				
11 12		Exclusion: pregnancy, blood transfusion during the study, follow-										
13		up of < 6 months										
14Colombatti 15 <sup>2018</sup>	Single arm	1. On HU therapy	Children and adolescents	HbSS:172 (84%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 22 (11%) HbSC: 8 (4%)	N/A	NR	NR	HU therapy (varied by centre) (n=204)	1 year	NR	NR	JA
16 <sub>[28]</sub> 17	204 (20); 1		Overall mean: 7.68 (range 11- 221 months)	HbSC: 0 (476) HbSβ*: 3 (1.5%) Other: 1 (0.5%)								
18 19			Nigeria: 65 (32%) Ghana: 32 (16%) Senegal: 12 (6%)									
20 21 22			Italy and Albania: 37 (18%) Central America and India: 10									
23			(5%) Unknown: 10 (5%)									
2 5Brandalise	Single arm	1. Under chronic hydroxyurea treatment	Adults	HbSS:11(79%) HbSC:3 (11%)	14 (100%)	Previous VOC/month: 3.3	Avascular necrosis: 7	MTX 10mg weekly IM (n=14)	12 weeks	NR	Boldrini Children's Cent	JA er
26 <sub>Brazil</sub> 27 <sub>[29]</sub>	Single centre 14 (5); 1	2. >3 severe VOC episodes/year, that were refractory to opioids for periods longer than 3 weeks duration	Overall median: 23.5 (range 18- 32)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		(95% CI 2.0-5.0) (excluding one PT		· · /			and UNIEMP Institute.	
28 29 <sup>RBR-2s9xvn</sup> 20		Exclusion: pregnancy, concomitant infection				with 19.3 VOC/month)						
31 <sup>Keikhaei 2015</sup>	Single-arm	1. admitted to Shafa Hospital, Ahvaz, Iran, from 2013 to 2014	Children and adolescents	NR	NR	NR	NR	HU 10 mg/kg/day oral (n=48)	1 year	NR	Ahvaz Jundishapur	JA
32 33 <mark>C</mark> ohort 33[30] 32[2013 to 2014	Single centre 48 (24); 1	2. aged 6-18	Overall mean 13.7 (range 6 to 18)								Medical Sciences	
35											-	
36												
37												
38												
39												
40												
41												
42												
43				For neer r		alv - http://br	nionen hmi (	com/site/about/a	uidalinas	vhtml		
44				i oi peel i		iny intep.//DI	njopen.omj.e	com/sic/about/g	andennes			

- 45
- 46

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 LeBlanc 2016 USA 8 9 [31]	Single-arm Retrospective cohort study 16 (6); 1	More than 5 pain events per year	Adults and adolescents Mean: 15.5 (SD 2.8)	HbSS: 14 (88%) HbSß: 1 (6%) HbSC: 1 (6%)	NR	NR	ED visit/month: Mean 0.31 (SD 0.27) Hospitalization/mo nth: 0.19	Methadone oral (n=16) Flexible dose	Mean: 2.1 years	NR	NR	CA
10 <sup>NCT02709681</sup> 11							Chronic transfusions: 10					
12 13 <sup>Heeney 2016</sup> 14 <sup>Europe, Asia</sup> 15 <sup>and Africa</sup> 16 <sup>32</sup> , 33] May 2013 to 17Jun 2015 18 <sup>NCT01794000</sup> 19 20 21 22 23	RCT, double- blind (phase 3) Multicentre 341 (173); 2	1. HbSS, HbSβ <sup>0</sup> 2. At least 2 VOC in the year prior to screening 3. TCD within the last year for patients ≤16 years of age 4. Children aged 2 to <18 years 5. Body weight ≥12 kg Exclusion: abnormal/conditional TCD, chronic transfusion, hepatic/renal dysfunction, history of transient ischemic attach or haemorrha, severe head traumatic stroke, chronic treatment with NSAID, use of anticoagulants or other antiplatelet drugs	Children and adolescents Mean:10.6 (SD 4.3) White: 58/169 Black: 109/169 Multiple: 2/169	NR	153 (45%) M	N of VOCsin previous year: Mean 4.0 (SD 7.9)	NR	1. Placebo (n=170) 2. Prasugrel oral (n=171) Individual dose-adjustment strategy: Initial dose: 0.08 mg/kg; maintenance: 0.04-0.12 mg/kg (maximum 10mg) by a targeted level of platelet reactivity	9 to 24 months	No anticoagulants or antiplatelet drugs during the study No NSAID drugs	Daiichi Sankyo and Eli Lilly	JA
2.5 2.4 Reid 2014 United States, 2.5 Jebanon, 2.6 and Canada 2.7 2.8 Jug 2012 to 2.9 NCT01601340 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	RCT, double- blind (phase 2, terminated early) Multicentre 76 (49); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS or HbSβ</li> <li>Aged 12-60 years</li> <li>at least one acute SCD-related complication or leg ulcers in 12 months prior to enrolment</li> <li>no current (i.e., within 3 months prior to enrolment) HU treatment</li> <li>Exclusion: regular transfusion, an acute vaso-occlusive event within 3 weeks, pulmonary hypertension requiring oxygen therapy, symptomatic untreated peptic ulcer or gastroesophageal reflux disease, history of pancreatitis, abnormal ALT/AST levels, HIV infection</li> </ol>	Adults and children Mean: 27.8 (range 12-55) Black or African- American: 24 (63%) White :14 (37%)	HbSS: 60 (79%) HbSβ9: 16 (21%)	N/A	N of pain crises in the 12 months before enrolment 0-1: 13 >2: 25	NR	1. HOK-1001 15 mg/kg BID oral (n=38) 2. placebo (n=38)	48 weeks	Folic acid daily	HemaQuest Pharmaceuticals	JA
43 44 45 46				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://br	njopen.bmj.o	com/site/about/gı	uidelines	.xhtml		

1 2												
3												
5												
6												
7 Adegoke 2013 Nigeria 8 9 [35] 9 Jul to Dec 2011 10 11	RCT, open Multicentre 113 (56); 2	Steady state (no painful episode, anemic crisis, or infection on the day of recruitment) Exclusion: alternative medicine (Aloe vera gel, Moringa oleifera, Solamine syrup, and Ciklavit (Cajanus cajal) suspension), hydroxyurea, Discriovite suspension, Niorisan	Children and adolescents Mean: 4.55 (SD 3.57)	NR	NR	N of previous significant painful episodes Mean: 3.27 (SD 3.93)	N of previous Transfusion Mean: 1.29 (SD 0.77) N of Previous hospitalization Mean: 2.12 (SD 2.67)	<ol> <li>Lime juice + Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguani) BID oral (n=58)</li> <li>Control (Routine oral drugs (folic acid, vitamin B complex and proguanil)) BID (n=55)</li> </ol>	6 months	NR	NR	JA
12							- /	Adjusted by body weight: ≤10kg: 5 ml: 11-20 kg: 10				
13								ml; ≥20 kg: 15 mg				
15 <sup>Arruda 2013</sup> Brazil	RCT, double- blind	1. HbSS or HbSβ <sup>0</sup>	Adults	HbSS: 73 (88%)	NR	NR	Chronic use of NSAIDs: 52	1. Placebo (n=39) 2. Vitamins C 1400 mg/day	6 months	NR	FAPESP and CNPq	JA
16 [36] 17Sep to Dec 18 <sup>2010</sup>	Single centre 83 (53); 2	Exclusion: hospitalized patients, pregancy, untreated iron overload, other investigational drugs in the last 12 months or contraindications to Vitamin C/E	Overall median: 27 (range 18-68)				Chronic use of opioids: 16 Transfused patients (past 12 months): 18	and E 800 mg/day oral (n=44)				
20 <sup>Wun 2013</sup>	RCT, double-	1. HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ⁰, HbSβ⁺	Adults	HbSS: 37 (61%)	NR	Vaso-occlusive	Acute chest	1. Prasugrel 5 mg/day oral	30 days	NR	Daiichi Sankyo	JA
2 Quinted States 2 Jand Canada 2 2j37-39J 2 3j6 Aug 2010 to 13 Jun 2011 2 4NCT01167023 2 5 2 6	blind (phase 2) Multicentre 62 (30); 2	<ol> <li>aged 18 to 55 years</li> <li>did not have a diagnosis of acute</li> <li>VOC within 30 days of the study screening visit</li> <li>NSAIDs for treatment of pain were not permitted in the 5 days prior to randomization or for ≥5 consecutive days during the study period.</li> <li>HU was permitted in patients already on a stable dose 30 days prior to randomization</li> </ol>	Mean:31.5	HDSC: 15 (25%) HDSβ9: 3 (5%) HDSβ β+: 6 (8%)		crisis: 61% Pain intensity: Mean: 1.8 vs 2.4	syndrome: 22,0% (prasugrel) vs 9,5% (placebo) Pulmonary hypertension: 17.1% (prasugrel) vs 9.5% (placebo)	(n=41) 2. placebo (n=19*)			Co., Ltd. and Eli Lilly and Company.	
2/		Exclusion: hepatic/renal dysfunction,										
28 29 30 31		HCt < 18%, risk of excessive bleeding, history of bleeding disorders, haemorrhagic or ischemic stroke, retinal haemorrhage, TIA or intracranial haemorrhage										
32 Daak 2013	RCT, double-	Steady state, defined as no evidence	Children and	All HbSS	NR	NR	Crisis-induced	1. Placebo (n=61*)	1 year	All of the	Marie Curie	JA
3 <i>3</i> Sudan 34	blind	of fever, infection, or crisis for >4 week before the start of the study	adolescents				hospitalization (N/year)	2. Omega-3 (n=67*)		patients were receiving	Transfer of Knowledge	
35Apr 2009 to 36 <sup>May 2010</sup>	Single centre 140 (61); 2	Exclusion: other chronic diseases, transfusion within 4 months,	Mean (SD): 7.8(5.5)				No. admission: 9.8%			regular folate supplementatio n, and those ,5	Programme, Efamol, and the Kitchner	
37												
38												
39												
40 41												
41 42												
42 //3												
44				For peer re	eview on	ly - http://br	njopen.bmj.c	.com/site/about/gu	uidelines	.xhtml		
45												

1 2 3 4 5 6												
7 ISRCTN80844 630 8 9		hydroxyurea treatment, history of overt stroke, pregnancy					1-2: 43.7% 3-5: 24.1% > 5: 22.4%			y of age were receiving standard oral prophylactic penicillin.	Memorial Trust Fund and University of Khartoum	
1 O <sub>Ataga</sub> 2011 1 JUnited 1 2states, 1 3Jamaica, Brazil, France, 1 4Trinidad and 1 5 <sup>th</sup> United 1 6 <sup>Kingdom.</sup> 1 7[41] 1 8 <sup>Feb</sup> 2005 to Apr 2007 1 9VCT00102791 20 21	RCT, double- blind (phase 3, terminated early) Multicentre 297 (160); 2	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSC, HbSβ<sup>0</sup>, HbSβ<sup>-</sup></li> <li>aged 16-65 years</li> <li>at least two acute sickle-related painful crises in the previous 12 months</li> <li>Patients were permitted to receive concomitant therapy with HU if they had received HU for the preceding 12 months and their dose was stabilized for at least 3 months prior to the study</li> <li>Exclusion: unstable cardiovascular, neurological, endocrine, hepatic, or renal disorders, Hb &lt; 40 or &gt; 110 g/L, chronic transfusion, cancer diagnosis within 5 years, or hepatitis B/C or HIV infection</li> </ol>	Adults and adolescents Mean: 28.5(SD 9.9) Black: 134 (92%) Multiracial: 6 (4%) Caucasian: 3 (2%) Other: 2 (2%)	HbSS: 245 (85%) HbSC: 16 (6%) HbSβ <sup>3</sup> : 21(7%) HbSβ <sup>3</sup> : 4 (1%) Other: 3 (1%)	163 (56%)	SCD crises history in past 12 months (%) 2-4: 59% >5: 41%	NR	1. Senicapoc 20mg/d BID (loading) and then 10mg/dOD oral (n=145*) 2. placebo (n=144*)	52 weeks	NR	Icagen (Research Triangle Park)	AL
22Diop 2011 23 242,43] 245,ep 2007 to 25Feb 2008 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	RCT, open Single centre 60 (31); 2	<ol> <li>Follow-up at least 2 years before in the clinic with records of standardized clinical and laboratory</li> <li>Exclusion: allergic to sulfonamide</li> </ol>	Adults and adolescents Mean: 23.2 (SD 6.9)	Ali SCA	NR	N of VOC/year: Mean 0.8 (SD 1.25)	n of SCD with chronic complications: 8	1. Sulfadoxine- pyrimethamine (S: 25 mg/kg/P: 1.25 mg/kg) OD oral (n=30) 2. Placebo (n=30) The treatment was given once during the following months: September, October, and November	3 months	1. Folic acid, paracetamol during pains 2. Artemisinin- based combination therapy or injectable quinine for malaria attacks	NR	A
44 45 46				roi peer r	eview Of	ny - nup://bi	njopen.omJ.	com/site/about/g	ulueline	5.XIIUIII		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Alvim 2005 RCT Saudi Arabia Cros 8 4 9 Sep 1998 to 10 <sup>Dec 1999</sup> 73 (c 11 12 13 14 15 16	T, ssover, ıble-blind (40); 2	Exclusion: renal, hepatic, cardiac or coagulation disorders secondary or not to SCD, regular transfusion, hydroxyurea use, age > 20 or < 5 years, cognitive dysfunction	Adults and children Median: 12.1 (range 5 to 20)	HbSS: 42 (58%) HbSC: 26 (36%) HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 5 (7%)	NR	NR	History of transfusion: once: 13; 2-5 times: 19; More than 5: 18 Splenectomy: 5 Cholecystectomy: 5 Osteomyelitis: 11 Acute splenic sequestration: 12 Aplastic crisis: 1 Avascular necrosis of	1. Piracetam 4.8 g/m^2/day QID (n=73*) 2. Placebo (n=73*)	6 months, then crossover with 2 weeks washout period	NR	FAPEMIG, CNPq J	A
175ao 2008 RCT 18 <sup>US blind</sup> 1946] Sing 20 21	T, double- d gle centre (14); 2	Exclusion: non-ambulatory, receiving more than 6 transfusions per year or taking hydroxyurea, history of substance abuse, neurological or psychiatric deficits that could affect compliance, use of immunosuppressive	Adults Overall mean: 32.9 (SD 9.7) (range 18-47) All black	HbSS: 32 (89%) HbSC: 3 (8%) HbSβ: 1 (3%)	None	N of sickle pain episode 3-month prior to the study: 5 (placebo); 3 (zinc)	femoral head: 4 NR	1. Placebo (n=18) 2. Zinc 25mg TID (n=18)	3 months	NR	NR	JA
22       Ataga 2008       RC1         23Js       blind         24       Mult         25 Feb 2002 and       90 (d)         26 NCT00040677       27         28       29         30       31         32       33         34       35         36       37         38       39         40       41         42       43         44       45	T, double- d (phase 2) Iticentre (45); 3	drugs, HIV and hepatitis B 1. HbSS 2. Aged 18-60 years 3. at least one prior acute sickle- related painful episode (commonly referred to as painful crisis) that had required hospitalization, but none in the 4 weeks prior to screening Exclusion: Hb< 40 g/L or > 100 g/L, received a transfusion within 30 days or underwent an exchange transfusion within 60 days, hepatitis B, HIV, cancer diagnosis within 5 years, mediations (eg, amiodarone, chlorperazine, disopyramide, dofedilide, haloperidol, procainamide, quinidine, risperidone, sotalol, thioridazine, trifluoperazine, warfarin sodium, and erythropoietin)	Adults Mean: 33.6(range 19-55)	All HbSS For peer re	24 (27%) eview or	Hospitalizations due to painful episodes in previous 12 months: None: 12 (39%) 1: 6 (19%) ≥3: 7 (23%) ≥3: 7 (23%)	nr njopen.bmj.c	1. Placebo (n=30) 2. Senicapoc (low-dose): 100 mg (loading dose); 6 mg/d (maintenance) oral OD (n=29) 3. Senicapoc (high-dose): 150 mg (loading dose); 10 mg/d (maintenance) oral OD (n=31) Com/site/about/gu	12 weeks	NR	lcagen (Research Triangle Park, NC)	JA

1 2 3 4												
5 6 7 Eke 2003 Nigeria 8 9 [48] 10 11	RCT, open (phase 2) Single centre 101 (48); 3	1. HbSS 2. Aged 1-16 years 3. Stable condition Exclusion: loss to 2 consecutive follow-up, pregnancy	Children and Adolescents Mean: 8.1 (SD 4.3) (Range 2-16)	HbSS: 101 (100%)	NR	NR	Total N of malarial parasites: 20 (equally distributed)	1. Pyrimethamine 0.5 mg/kg once weekly oral (n=36*) 2. Proguanil 1.5 mg/kg OD oral (n=32*) 3. Placebo (Vitamin c 7 mg/kg) OD oral (n=29*)	9 months	NR	Combating Childhood Communicable Diseases (Atlanta, Georgia)	JA
12 13 <sup>Pace 2003</sup> 14 15 <sup>[49]</sup> 16 17	RCT, double- blind Single centre 21 (10); 4	<ol> <li>HbSS or HbSβ<sup>0</sup></li> <li>Aged above 15 years</li> <li>With dense cells greater than 6% and 2 or more VOC episodes per year for the 2 years prior to enrollment.</li> <li>Exclusion: pregnancy, narcotic</li> </ol>	Adults and Adolescents Mean:17.9 (SD1.2)	NR	NR	N of VOC episodes Mean: 5 (SD 2)	NR	1. Placebo (n=5) 2. NAC (low-dose) 600 mg/day (n=5) 3. NAC (mid-dose) 1200mg/day (n=5) 4. NAC (high-dose) 2400mg/day (n=6)	7 months	NR	Zambon Corp.	JA
18 19 <sub>Wambebe</sub> 202001 21 <sup>Nigeria</sup> 22 <b>[50, 65]</b> 23	RCT, cross- over, double- blind (Phase 2) 82 (46); 2	addition, chronic transfusions, history of stroke, HIV, investigational drug 1. HbSS 2. Aged 2:45 years 3. at least 3 painful or vaso-occlusive crises in the previous year Exclusion: HIV, hepatitis, pregnancy	Adults and children Overall (years) < 9: 1 (1%) 10-19: 67 (82%) 20-29: 11 (13%)	All HbSS	NR	Mild to Moderate Pains (Mean): 18.38 Severe Pains: 12.67	NR	All doses were divided by 3 to be taken 1. Niprisan 12 mg/kg OD (n= 70*) 2. Placebo (n=70*)	6 months, then crossover without washout	NR	NR	JA
24 25 <sup>Tomer 2001</sup> 26 27 <sup>[51, 52]</sup>	RCT, double- blind Single centre	1. Frequent pain episodes (≥3 events/year) 2. Not on HU	30-39: 3 (4%) Adults NR	NR	None	Frequency of pain episodes in 12 months: 7.8	NR	1. Mehaden fish oil: 0.25 g/kg/day OD oral daily (n=5*) 2. Placebo (n=5*)	12 months	NR	NR	JA
28 de Abood 1997 29Spain 30 53 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	RCT, double- blind Single centre 43 (43); 3	1. HbSS 2. history of at least one painful crisis per month were included	Adults Overall range: 17- 39	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	<ol> <li>DMPA 150mg per month for first three months, then usual dose of 150mg every 3 months oral (n=13)</li> <li>levonorgestrel/ethinyl estradiol (0.15/0.03 mg) OD oral (n=14)</li> <li>Surgically sterilized (n=16) [not eligible]</li> </ol>	12 months	NR	Special Programme of Human Reproduction of WHO	JA
38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46				For peer re	eview or	ıly - http://br	njopen.bmj.o	com/site/about/gu	uidelines	.xhtml		

1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6 7 <sup>Gupta 1995</sup> India	RCT, double- blind	1. > 5 years 2. HbSS	Adults and children	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1. Zinc: 220 mg TID oral (n=65*) 2. Placebo (n=65*)	1.5 years	NR	NR	JA
8 <sup>[54]</sup> 9 10	Phase 2 145 (34); 0	Exclusion: chronic persistent infection or exposed to extremes of temperature variation frequently, on	Mean: 16.4 (range12-27)					2. 1 10000 (11 00 )				
11		drug therapy for some other disease, evidence of organ failure										
12Manrique 1987	RCT	HbSS	Adults and	All HbSS	NR	Overall pain		1. Placebo (n=29*)	6 weeks	NR	NR	JA
13 <sup>51 a211</sup>	Phase 2	Exclusion: acute infections				None: 11		1200mg; children: 400-600				
1 4[55] 1 E	60 (23); 2		Range: 7-34			< 5 times: 7 < 10 times: 15		mg, depending on body weight) oral (n=28*)				
15 16						> 10 times: 11 Persistent: 14 Not clear: 2						
17 18						Overall pain						
19						duration (days) None: 11						
20						< 5 days: 12 < 10 days: 17						
21						> 10 days: 4 Persistent: 14						
22						Not clear: 2						
23						All in 6 months observation						
24						period						
25 <sup>Zago</sup> 1984 26 <sup>Brazil</sup>	RCT, crossover	NR	Adults and children	HbSS: 25 (86%) HbSβº: 4 (14%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Aspirin 17-45 mg/kg OD (n=29*) 2. Placebo (n=29*)	5 months, then	NR	NR	JA
27 <sup>[56]</sup>	42 (NR); 2		Median: 12 (range 4 - 31)					2.1.100000 (.1. 20 )	without washout			
29 29 1984	RCT, double- blind	No antisickling treatment for two months before admission to the study	Adults and adolescents	All HbSS	NR	N of crises in 6 months before	NR	1. Ticlopidine 250mg BID if body weight <45kg; 250mg	6 months	Acute crises treatment	NR	JA
30 <sup>Africa</sup>	Multicentre	Exclusion: other than HbSS;	Overall range 15-			study: 223		TID if body weight >45kg oral (n=70)		varied depends on regions but		
3 I[57]	140 (NR); 2	uncontrolled parasitic disease; malnutrition: a history of drug abuse:	45					2. Placebo (n=70)		including transfusions.		
3Z 22		glaucoma, prostatis hypertrophy,								analgesic,		
33		ticlopidine or anticholingeric drugs,								anticoagulants		
35		acute cerebro-vascular accidents, severe intercurrent infection,										
36		pulmonary oedema or renal failure										
37												
38												
39												
40												
41												
42												
43				For peer r	eview o	nly - http://b	mjopen.bmj.	.com/site/about/gi	uidelines	.xhtml		
44				-				0				

Or High Bind Bind Bind Bind Bind Bind Bind Bind													
2000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 00	1												
36         60. min         165. min         Adds mode         AlbBS         160. min         100 min         1 Specify (m)	2												
6         6         8         Add and bill of the problem (1)         Add and the problem (1) <th< td=""><td>3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	3												
5         6         8         8         8         8         8         9         9         1         0         9         9         1         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0	4												
6       6       8       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       80       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90       90	5												
7         0.100000000000000000000000000000000000	6												
Chan         Ind         Chan         Und         Chan         Chan         Und         Chan         Und         Chan         Und         Chan         Chan<	<b>7</b> Gail 1982	RCT, double-	HbSS	Adults and	All HbSS	NR	Number of crises	NR	1. Control (n=39)	Average:	1. Folic acid (1	International	JA
Op Sol	Ghana	blind	Evolucion: other major illocoppe	children			in the previous		2. Urea: 0.266 g/kg Low-	13.7	mg) and	Sickle Cell	
9 as prof. 10       7 (10): 2       Control 10       Control 10<	o [58]	Phase 2	Exclusion: other major limesses	Overall:			0-2: 18		dose: daily (n=40)	monuis	daily	Research	
10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10 <td< td=""><td>9 Sep 1976 to</td><td>79 (39); 2</td><td></td><td>&lt; 5 years: 21</td><td></td><td></td><td>&gt; 2: 21</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0 Oblassavias</td><td>Institute and</td><td></td></td<>	9 Sep 1976 to	79 (39); 2		< 5 years: 21			> 2: 21				0 Oblassavias	Institute and	
11	10 <sup>pep 1978</sup>			> 14 years: 28							2.Chloroquine was given with	CSRPM	
12         Description         Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdesc< td=""><td>11</td><td></td><td></td><td><b>,</b></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>urea or sucrose</td><td></td><td></td></thdesc<></thdescription<>	11			<b>,</b>							urea or sucrose		
13       Act.       NEX.       Aduk       AthBS       NR       NR       NR       I.sociation (TT)       Applicity (Tr)	12										ріасеро		
14/630       construction       inclusion	13	RCT	HbSS	Adults	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1 placebo (n=10*)	2 years (9	NR	NR	.IA
1 source         double for         owned lage         and lage	<b>14</b> 1982	crossover,		, launo					2. medroxyprogesterone	months,			0,1
1690 177       Single carter Single for the intervence standing       Notes and region (region (regin (region (region (regin (region (region (regin (region (region (	15 <sup>Jamaica</sup>	double-blind		Overall age					acetate 150mg every 3- month IM (n=13*)	then			
17       25 (25) / 2       menths       menths         18       RC1, crossow       1, HeSS, HisSC, HisSB, Signeme       Crossow       1, HeSS, Figseme       RC3, rossow       1, Rors of rossow       1, R	16 <sup>59]</sup>	Single centre		1011gc. 20-41						after 6			
10       RCT, crossover 19 (S2, 247) Ameri 19 (S2, 247)       1. HoSS, HbSC, HbSB 2. 5-17 years 19 (S2, 247)       Childen and abolescents (S2, 217) S1 (S2, 247)       HbSC, 15 (S3) (S3, 217)       N       N       N       N       N       1. Folks add 5 m gd Jup (S2, 247) (m 2-25)       Parts (T) (m 2-25)       <	17	25 (25); 2								months			
1 Main 19/4       RU, Tockado m (2004)       1 + Focks (2005), TROS m (2004)       Childrah and m (2005), TROS m (2004)       All tend m (2004)       M (2004)       V (2004)	18,	DOT		0	1					washout)			
19         Single cmin         1. Periodically suffered painful crises         H6SE: 1 (%)         Feature (%)         2. Existication (%	1 OMann 1974 1 OUK	RC1, crossover	1. HDSS, HDSC, HDSB 2. 5-17 years	adolescents	HbSS: 15 (83%) HbSC: 2 (11%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Folic acid 5 mg daily oral (n=25)	2 years (1 year than	NR	United Birmingham	JA
2040       16 (2) 2       Overall man 5.4 (2) 32       Description 20 (16-12) (2) 4 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	19	Single centre	3. Previously suffered painful crises		HbSβ: 1 (6%) ´				2. Folic acid 5mg + Sodium	crossover		Hospitals and	
21       Vietness version       0.100 mg/sg/sg/val       0.100 mg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg/sg	2060]	18 (12); 2		Overall mean 8.4 (SD 3.2)					bicarbonate 0.06-0.2 gm/kg/day initially, then	without washout		Endowment Research Fund	
22       Status 170       RCT, crossov, reputer paint less 2. Moderate/y severe paint less 4. All bias non children on concerne tree montes (bit lifter on paraser) free researchations of jaundies 0. All bias NR       NR       NR       NR       NR       NR       1. Salies M(n=44*)       4.6 norths on consputer paint less on consputer paint less (bit lifter on paraser) free researchations of jaundies 0. All bias on parasers (bit lifter on parasers bias of paint less (bit lifter on pai	21			()					0.1-0.4 mg/kg/day oral				
23pass 1972     RCT. rossover 1, 1:BSS in the memories (with life or rossover) (additional or consistence) (mining a construction of junctions) (with life or rossover) (additional or constructions) (with life or rossover) (additional or rossover) (addi	22								(n=25)				
24 <sup>4</sup> cont gright       (pregiminary mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):2       once in their enoties (with life ora- mignor before orassover) 44 (28):10 (7%)       NR       NR       NR       1 Promatic progetierone 10 within the set of the product life or the study with S2 (28%)       3 months       NR       NR <td< td=""><td>23 saacs 1972</td><td>RCT, crossover</td><td>1. HbSS 2. Moderately severe pain at least</td><td>Adults and children</td><td>All HbSS</td><td>NR</td><td>NR</td><td>NR</td><td>1. Saline IM (n=44*)</td><td>4-6 months</td><td>All patients</td><td>Glaxo Allenburys</td><td>Journ</td></td<>	23 saacs 1972	RCT, crossover	1. HbSS 2. Moderately severe pain at least	Adults and children	All HbSS	NR	NR	NR	1. Saline IM (n=44*)	4-6 months	All patients	Glaxo Allenburys	Journ
26 <sup>5</sup> 1       report before crossover, 200       report before crossover, 200       report exacerbations of jaundle 30       Overall range 2- 30       Made: testosterione 10 mg; high or normal serum-invoir values       high or normal serum-invoir values         27       28       80       assover, crossover, double-bind       At least 2 painful episodes during the double-bind       Adults and thirdren       HbSS: 10 (71%) HbSS: 4 (29%)       NR       NR       NR       I. Promazine hydrochiodie or al (n=14 <sup>2</sup> ) Based on weight 2 babes day, 40 80 pounds; 3 tablets a day, 8 80-120 pounds; 2. Placebo (n=14 <sup>4</sup> )       NR	24	(preliminary	once in three months (with little orno	children					(Testoserone/Progesterone	monuis	folates and had	ornigena	article
26       44 (28), 2       adultation (pageworker), adultation (pageworke	25 <sup>[61]</sup>	report before	fever or exacerbations of jaundice)	Overall range 2-					) Male: testosterone 10 mg; Female: progesterone 10		high or normal		
27 28 bit 1988 RCT, At least 2 paintil apiaodes during the Adults and children divides in the second prior to study the bSS: 10 (71%) NR NR NR NR 1. Promatine hydrochoride 3 months NR NR JA 29 ear period prior to study NR NR NR NR NR 1. Promatine hydrochoride 3 months NR NR JA 30 fez NR NR NR NR 1. Promatine hydrochoride 3 months NR NR JA 30 fez NR NR JA 30 fez NR NR JA 30 fez NR JA 3	26	44 (28); 2		55					mg every week IM (n=44*)		values		
28/bit 1968       RCT, crossiver, double-bind       At lest 2 painful lepisodes during the 2 year period prior to study       Adults and children       HbSC: 10 (71%)       NR       NR       I. Promazine hydrochiorite oral (n=14') Based on weight? 12 lablets a day; 40, 80 pounds; 12 balets a day; 40, 80 pounds; 12 balets a day; 40, 80 pounds; 12 balets a day; 40 adv > 120 pounds; 14 balets a day; 40 adv > 120 pounds; 14 balets a day > 120 pounds; 1	27												
29 <sup>15A</sup> crossover, 2 year period prior to study       children       HbSC: 4 (29%)       oral (m=14*) Based on weight: 20 points, 3 tablets a day.0         30(62)       NR       80 pounds; 3 tablets a day.0       80 pounds; 3 tablets a day.0         31       14 (5).2       90 + 20 pounds, 4 tablets a day.0       90 + 20 pounds, 4 tablets a day.0         32       2. Piacebo (n=14*)       33         34       35       36       37         36       37       38       39         39       40       41       42         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	<b>28</b> 0ski 1968	RCT.	At least 2 painful episodes during the	Adults and	HbSS: 10 (71%)	NR	NR	NR	1. Promazine hvdrochloride	3 months	NR	NR	JA
double-blind     weight? 2 bables a day, 40-       31     14 (5): 2       32     80 pounds; 3 tables a day, 520 pounds; 4 bables a day, 520 pounds; 520 po	29 <sup>USA</sup>	crossover,	2 year period prior to study	children	HbSC: 4 (29%)				oral (n=14*) Based on				
14 (6); 2       0,120 pounds; 4 tablets a day; > 120 pounds;         31       day; > 120 pounds;         32       2. Placebo (n=14*)         33       34         35       36         36       37         38       39         40       41         41       42         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         45       50	3(162)	double-blind		NR					weight: 2 tablets a day: 40- 80 pounds: 3 tablets a day:				
31       day. > 120 pounds         32       2. Placebo (n=14*)         33       34         34       35         35       36         37       38         39       40         40       41         42       43         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         45       45	21	14 (5); 2							80-120 pounds; 4 tablets a				
32       33         33       34         34       35         36       37         38       39         40       41         41       42         43       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         44       45	27								day: > 120 pounds 2 Placebo (n=14*)				
33         34         35         36         37         38         39         40         41         42         43         44         45	32								2.1.100000 (				
34         35         36         37         38         39         40         41         42         43         For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         44         45	33												
35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 43 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 45	34												
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 43 44 45 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	35												
<ul> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> </ul>	36												
<ul> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> </ul>	37												
39         40         41         42         43         44         45	38												
40 41 42 43 44 45	39												
4142434445	40												
4243444445	41												
43For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml44For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml45	42												
44       For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml         45	43				-		1 1				1		
45	44				For peer r	eview or	nly - http://bi	mjopen.bmj.o	com/site/about/gi	udelines	s.xhtml		
	45												
46	46												

1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
7 NCT02482298 USA, Egypt, 8 France, Italy, 9 Lebanon, UK, 10 <sup>Turkey</sup> 11[63] 12 <sup>Jul</sup> 2015 to Nov 2016 13	RCT, double- blind Multicentre 87 (47); 3	<ol> <li>HbSS, HbSβ<sup>o</sup></li> <li>Aged 18-30</li> <li>If treated with hydroxyurea, the dose must have been stable for 3 months</li> </ol>	Adults Mean: 21.6 (SD 3.42) Black Or African American: 17 (57%) White: 13 (43%)	NR	NR	NR	NR	1. Placebo (n =30) 2. Ticagrelor 10MG BID oral (n=27) 3. Ticagrelor 45mg BID oral (n=30)	12 weeks	NR	AstraZenec a	СТ
14NCT01476696 15 16[64]	Single-arm Phase 2 (Part B)	1. HbSS, HbSβ 2. ≥2 to <18 years of age and ≥ 12 kg body weight 3. Participants on hydroxyurea must	Children and adolescents NR (only reported	NR	NR	NR	NR	Prasugrel 0.06-0.12 mg/kg depending on their steady- state PD response oral (n=18)	14 ± 4 days	NR	Eli Lilly and Company	СТ
<sup>1</sup> <sup>7</sup> Feb 2014 to 1 7Oct 2016 1 8 <sup>NCT01476696</sup>	18 (NR); 1	be on a stable dose for the 60 days prior to enrolment without signs of hematologic toxicity at screening	overall, part A+B)			201						
19/ichinsky 2010 20 <sup>[66]</sup> 21 22	RCT 36 (NR)	1. HbSS 2. Normal neurological exam, WAIS III PIQ score ≤ 90, hemoglobin ≤ 9 g/dL 3. Aged 21-55	Adults Mean: 29	All HbSS	HU: 14 (39%)	NR	Transfusion group had average of 5.6 transfusions (which differ from standard care group)	<ol> <li>Chronic transfusion (n = 20) maintaining a hemoglobin of 2 g/dL rise over baseline with matched red cells for D, C/c, E/e, and Kell antigens</li> <li>Stendred perce (n = 16)</li> </ol>	4 weeks	NR	NR	СТ
23 24 <sub>Shilos</sub>	Single orm	ND	Adulto	ULCC: 12		VOC: 6 (past	ACS: 2 (past	CMI 1070 20ma/kg /first	29 dava	ND	ND	CT
25USA		NK	Adults	HbSβ <sup>0</sup> : 2	(26.7%)	year)	year)	dose) and 10 mg/kg after	20 days	INIK	INK	CI
26 <sub>[67]</sub>	study		18-50)				(past year)	TO HOURS				
27	Three centers		All African-				Priapism: 1 (past year)					
28 29	15 (0); 1		American									
30	<sup>†</sup> If not stated, on <sup>*</sup> final number use	y one arm data were shown as repre	esentative									
31	ACS: Acute chest	syndrome; ALT: Alanine transaminas	e; CA: Conference a	bstract; Cr: creatinin	e; CSRPM: C	enter for Scientific R	esearch into Plant M	edicine; CT: Clinical trial regi	stry; DDCF: D	oris Duke Charita	ble	
32	Foundation; ED: e Methotrexate; NA	mergency department; HDSS: H0M0Zy D: N-acetylcysteine ;NCATS: National	gous sickle naemogiol Center for Advancing	ITranslational Scien	ces; NCRR: N	In S and naemoglobin lational Center for Re	c; HDSp: sickle beta tr search Resources; N	halassemia, type '0' or '+ ', HU: i HLBI: National Heart Lung an	nydroxyurea; Id Blood Instit	JA: Journal article; ute; NSAID: Nonst	MIX: eroidal	
33	anti-inflammatory and Development	drugs; NR: Not reported; OOPD: FDA's	s Office of Orphan Pro	oducts Development	; PT: patient;	SCD: sickle cell disea	ase; TCD: transcrania	I Doppler; ZonMw: The Nethe	rlands Organi	sation for Health F	Research	
34												
35												
30 27												
27 29												
30												
40												
41												
42												
43				For peer r		alv - http://b	mionen hmi (	om/site/about/a	uideline	vhtml		
44				For peer r	eview Of	iny - mup.//bi	njopen.binj.c	.on/site/about/gt	lidennes			

## Reference

1. Schlaeger JMM, Robert E.; Yao, Yingwei; Suarez, Marie L.; Golembiewski, Julie; Wilkie, Diana J.; Votta-Velis, Gina: Management of Sickle Cell Pain Using Pregabalin: A Pilot Study. Pain Management Nursing 2017, 18(6):391-400.

2. Hoppe CJ, Eufemia; Styles, Lori; Kuypers, Frans; Larkin, Sandra; Vichinsky, Elliott: Simvastatin reduces vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell anaemia: a pilot efficacy trial. British Journal of Haematology 2017, **177**(4):620-629.

- 3. Glassberg JM, Caterina; Cromwell, Caroline; Cytryn, Lawrence; Kraus, Thomas; Skloot, Gwen S.; Connor, Jason T.; Rahman, Adeeb H.; Meurer, William J.: Inhaled steroids reduce pain and sVCAM levels in individuals with sickle cell disease: A triple-blind, randomized trial. American Journal of Hematology 2017, 92(7):622-631.
- 4. Ataga KIK, Abdullah; Kanter, Julie; Liles, Darla; Cancado, Rodolfo; Friedrisch, Joao; Guthrie, Troy H.; Knight-Madden, Jennifer; Alvarez, Ofelia A.; Gordeuk, Victor R.; Gualandro, Sandra; Colella, Marina P.; Smith, Wally R.; Rollins, Scott A.; Stocker, Jonathan W.; Rother, Russell P.: Crizanlizumab for the Prevention of Pain Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2017, **376**(5):429-439.
- 5. Ataga KIK, A.; Kanter, J.; Liles, D.; Cancado, R.; Friedrisch, J.; Guthrie, T. H.; Knight-Madden, J.; Alvarez, O. A.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Gualandro, S.; Collela, M. P.; Smith, W. R.; Rollins, S. A.; Stocker, J. W.; Rother, R. P.: SUSTAIN: A multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, 12-month study to assess safety and efficacy of selg1 with or without hydroxyurea therapy in sickle cell disease patients with sickle cell-related pain crises. Blood Conference: 58th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2016, 128(22).
- 6. Kutlar AK, J; Liles, D; Cancado, R; Bruederle, A; Shi, M; Zhu, Z; Ataga, Ki: Crizanlizumab, A P-selectin inhibitor, increases the likelihood of not experiencing a sickle cell-related pain crisis while on treatment: results from the phase II sustain study. Haematologica Conference: 22th congress of the european hematology association Spain 2017, 102:166.
- 7. Kanter JK, A; Liles, D; Cancado, R; Bruederle, A; Shi, M; Zhu, Z; Ataga, Ki: Crizanlizumab 5.0 mg/kg increased the time to first on-treatment sickle cell pain crisis: a subgroup analysis of the phase ii sustain study. Blood Conference: 59th annual meeting of the american society of hematology, ASH 2017 United states 2017, 130(Supplement 1) (no pagination).
- 8. Washko JKK, A.; Liles, D.; Cancado, R.; Shi, M.; Zhu, Z.; Ataga, K.: Crizanlizumab 5.0mg/kg increased the time to first on-treatment Sickle Cell Pain Crisis (SCPC) and the likelihood of not experiencing SCPC while on treatment: Subgroup analyses of the phase 2 sustain study. *Pediatric Blood and Cancer* 2018, 65 (Supplement 1):S81.
- Lemonne NM, B.; Charlot, K.; Garnier, Y.; Waltz, X.; Lamarre, Y.; Antoine-Jonville, S.; Etienne-Julan, M.; Hardy-Dessources, M. D.; Romana, M.; Connes, P.: Effects of hydroxyurea on blood rheology in sickle cell anemia: A two-years follow-up study. *Clin Hemorheol Microcirc* 2017, 67(2):141-148.
- 10. Quarmyne MOD, W.; Theodore, R.; Anand, S.; Barry, V.; Adisa, O.; Buchanan, I. D.; Bost, J.; Brown, R. C.; Joiner, C. H.; Lane, P. A.: Hydroxyurea effectiveness in children and adolescents with sickle cell anemia: A large retrospective, population-based cohort. *American Journal of Hematology* 2017, **92**(1):77-81.
- 11. Daak AH, M.; Dampier, C.; Fuh, B.; Kanter, J.; Alvarez, O.; Black, V.; McNaull, M.; Callaghan, M.; George, A.; Neumayr, L.; Hilliard, L.; Sancilio, F.; Rabinowicz, A.: Clinical effect of SC411 (Alternia TM) on children with sickle cell disease in the scot trial: A phase 2 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, dose-finding multi-center study. Pediatric Blood and Cancer 2018, 65 (Supplement 1):S8.
  - 12. Bridges KRG, B.; Bronte, L.: A single center experience of GBT440 treatment of severe anemia in sickle cell disease (SCD). Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, 130(Supplement 1).

13. Charnigo RJT, B.; Rybin, D.; Pittman, D. D.; Sivamurthy, K. M.; Beidler, D.; Clarke, N.: Safety and tolerability of PF-04447943 across a clinical trial program including 277 patients. Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, 130(Supplement 1).

- 14. Sins JWRF, K.; Rijneveld, A. W.; Boom, M. B.; Kerkhoffs, J. L. H.; van Meurs, A. H.; de Groot, M. R.; Heijboer, H.; Dresse, M. F.; Le, P. Q.; Hermans, P.; Vanderfaeillie, A.; Van Den Neste, E. W.; Benghiat, F. S.; Kesse-Adu, R.; Delannoy, A.; Efira, A.; Azerad, M. A.; de Borgie, C. A.; Biemond, B. J.: Effect of N-acetylcysteine on pain in daily life in patients with sickle cell disease: A randomised clinical trial. *British Journal of Haematology* 2017.
- Sins JWRF, K.; Rijneveld, A. W.; Boom, M. B.; Kerkhoffs, J. L.; Van Meurs, A. H.; De Groot, M. R.; Heijboer, H.; Dresse, M. F.; Ferster, A.; Hermans, P.; Vanderfaeillie, A.; Van Den Neste, E. W.; Benghiat, F. S.; Howard, J.; Kesse-Adu, R.; Delannoy, A.; Efira, A.; Azerad, M. A.; De Borgie, C. A. J. M.; Biemond, B. J.: N-acetylcysteine in patients with sickle cell disease: A randomized controlled trial. Blood Conference: 58th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2016, 128(22).
- 16. Niihara Y, Miller ST, Kanter J, Lanzkron S, Smith WR, Hsu LL, Gordeuk VR, Viswanathan K, Sarnaik S, Osunkwo I *et al*: A Phase 3 Trial of I-Glutamine in Sickle Cell Disease. N Engl J Med 2018, 379(3):226-235.
- 17. Niihara YT, Lan; Razon, Rafael; Stark, Charles; Macan, Henry: Decrease in the Severity of Painful Sickle Cell Crises with Oral Pglg [Conference]. Blood 2015, 126(23).
- 18. Niihara YK, Han A.; Tran, Lan; Razon, Rafael; Macan, Henry; Stark, Charles; Wun, Ted; Adams-Graves, Patricia: A Phase 3 Study of L-Glutamine Therapy for Sickle Cell Anemia and Sickle beta(0)-Thalassemia [Conference]. Blood 2014, 124(21).
- 19. Niihara YV, K.; Miller, S. T.; Guillaume, E.; Blackwood, M.; Razon, R.; Tran, L.; Stark, C.: Phase 3 study of I-glutamine therapy in sickle cell anemia and sickle beta0 -thalassemia subgroup analyses show consistent clinical improvement. Blood Conference: 58th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2016, 128(22).
- 20. Niihara YM, S.; Razon, R.; Claggett, B.; Onyekwere, O. C.; Ikeda, A.; Singleton, T.; Wood, A. K.; Singh, R.; Tran, L.; Stark, C. W.: Phase 3 study of Iglutamine in sickle cell disease: Analyses of time to first and second crisis and average cumulative recurrent events. *Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH* 2017, **130**(Supplement 1).
- 21. Sethy SP, T.; Jena, R. K.: Beneficial Effect of Low Fixed Dose of Hydroxyurea in Vaso-occlusive Crisis and Transfusion Requirements in Adult HbSS Patients: A Prospective Study in a Tertiary Care Center. Indian Journal of Hematology and Blood Transfusion 2018, 34(2):294-298.
- 22. Di Maggio RH, M. M.; Zhao, X.; Calvaruso, G.; Rigano, P.; Renda, D.; Tisdale, J. F.; Maggio, A.: Chronic administration of hydroxyurea (HU) benefits caucasian patients with sickle-beta thalassemia. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 2018, **19 (3) (no pagination)**(681).
- 23. Youssry IA-S, A.; Ismail, R.; Bou-Fakhredin, R.; Mohamed Samy, R.; Ezz El-Deen, F.; Taher, A. T.: Enhancing Effect of Hydroxyurea on Hb F in Sickle Cell Disease: Ten-Year Egyptian Experience. *Hemoglobin* 2017, **41**(4-6):267-273.
- 24. Bumma NK, A.; Surapaneni, M.; Kim, S.; Swerdlow, P.: Scheduled outpatient red blood cell exchange program reduces admission and complications in sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, 130(Supplement 1).
- 25. Kwiatkowski JLT, F.; Rozova, A.: Safety of deferiprone in individuals with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, 130(Supplement 1).
- 26. Rigano PDF, L.; Sainati, L.; Piga, A.; Piel, F. B.; Cappellini, M. D.; Fidone, C.; Masera, N.; Palazzi, G.; Gianesin, B.; Forni, G. L.: Real-life experience with hydroxyurea in sickle cell disease: A multicenter study in a cohort of patients with heterogeneous descent. *Blood Cells, Molecules, and Diseases* 2018, **69**:82-89.
- 27. Al Hashmi KA-D, H.; Jose, S.; Al-Khabori, M. K.: **Hydroxyurea: Clinical and hematological effects in omani patients with sickle cell disease**. Blood Conference: 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2017, **130**(Supplement 1).

- 28. Colombatti RP, G.; Masera, N.; Notarangelo, L. D.; Bonetti, E.; Samperi, P.; Barone, A.; Perrotta, S.; Facchini, E.; Miano, M.; Del Vecchio, G. C.; Guerzoni, M. E.; Corti, P.; Menzato, F.; Cesaro, S.; Casale, M.; Rigano, P.; Forni, G. L.; Russo, G.; Sainati, L.: Hydroxyurea prescription, availability and use for children with sickle cell disease in Italy: Results of a National Multicenter survey. *Pediatric Blood and Cancer* 2018, 65 (2) (no pagination)(e26774).
- 29. Brandalise SRA, R.; Laranjeira, A. B. A.; Yunes, J. A.; de Campos-Lima, P. O.: Low-dose methotrexate in sickle-cell disease: A pilot study with rationale borrowed from rheumatoid arthritis. *Experimental Hematology and Oncology* 2017, 6 (1) (no pagination)(18).
- 30. Keikhaei BY, H.; Bahadoram, M.: Hydroxyurea: Clinical and Hematological Effects in Patients With Sickle Cell Anemia. Global journal of health science 2015, 8(3):252-256.
- 31. LeBlanc ZV, C.; Zhang, J.; Macksoud, S. R.; Battle, S.; Hilliard, L.; Lebensburger, J. D.; Howard, T. H.: Management of severe chronic pain with methadone in pediatric patients with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 58th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2016, 128(22).
- 32. Heeney MMH, Carolyn C.; Abboud, Miguel R.; Inusa, Baba; Kanter, Julie; Ogutu, Bernhards; Brown, Patricia B.; Heath, Lori E.; Jakubowski, Joseph A.; Zhou, Chunmei; Zamoryakhin, Dmitry; Agbenyega, Tsiri; Colombatti, Raffaella; Hassab, Hoda M.; Nduba, Videlis N.; Oyieko, Janet N.; Robitaille, Nancy; Segbefia, Catherine I.; Rees, David C.: A Multinational Trial of Prasugrel for Sickle Cell Vaso-Occlusive Events. New England Journal of Medicine 2016, 374(7):625-635.
- 33. Heeney MH, C.; Abboud, M.; Inusa, B.; Kanter, J.; Ogutu, B.; Brown, P.; Heath, L.; Jakubowski, J.; Zhou, C.; Zamoryakhin, D.; Agbenyega, T.; Colombatti, R.; Hassab, H.; Nduba, V.; Oyieko, J.; Robitaille, N.; Segbefia, C.; Rees, D.: Determining effects of platelet inhibition on vaso-occlusive events (DOVE) trial: A double-blind, placebo-controlled, study of prasugrel in paediatric patients with sickle cell anaemia. *Haematologica* 2016, **101** (Supplement 1):136-137.
- 34. Reid MEEB, Amal; Inati, Adlette; Kutlar, Abdullah; Abboud, Miguel R.; Haynes, Johnson, Jr.; Ward, Richard; Sharon, Bruce; Taher, Ali T.; Smith, Wally; Manwani, Deepa; Ghalie, Richard G.: A double-blind, placebo-controlled phase II study of the efficacy and safety of 2,2-dimethylbutyrate (HQK-1001), an oral fetal globin inducer, in sickle cell disease. American Journal of Hematology 2014, 89(7):709-713.
- 35. Adegoke SAS, Umar Abdullahi; Mohammed, Lasisi Oluwafemi; Sanusi, Yunusa; Oyelami, Öyeku Akibu: Influence of Lime Juice on the Severity of Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine 2013, 19(6):588-592.
- 36. Arruda MMM, Grazielle; Rodrigues, Celso A.; Matsuda, Sandra S.; Rabelo, Iara B.; Figueiredo, Maria S.: Antioxidant vitamins C and E supplementation increases markers of haemolysis in sickle cell anaemia patients: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. British Journal of Haematology 2013, **160**(5):688-700.
- 37. Wun TS, Denis; Frelinger, Andrew L; Krishnamurti, Lakshmanan; Novelli, Enrico M.; Kutlar, Abdullah; Ataga, Kenneth I.; Knupp, Charles L.; McMahon, Lillian E.; Strouse, John J.; Zhou, Chunmei; Heath, Lori E.; Nwachuku, Chuke E.; Jakubowski, Joseph A.; Riesmeyer, Jeffrey S.; Winters, Kenneth J.: A double-blind, randomized, multicenter phase 2 study of prasugrel versus placebo in adult patients with sickle cell disease. Journal of Hematology & Oncology 2013, 6.
- 38. Soulieres DK, L.; Kutlar, A.; Ataga, K.; Zhou, C.; Heath, L.E.; Nwachuku, C.; Jakubowski, J.A.; Winters, K.J.; Riesmeyer, J. S.; Wun, T.: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Adaptive Phase 2 Multi-Center Study of Prasugrel Compared to Placebo in Adults with Sickle Cell Disease American Journal of Hematology 2012, 87(7):E18-E19.
- 39. Wun TS, Denis; Krishnamurti, Lakshmanan; Kutlar, Abdullah; Ataga, Kenneth; Zhou, Chunmei; Heath, Lori E.; Nwachuku, Chuke E.; Jakubowski, Joseph A.; Winters, Kenneth J.; Riesmeyer, Jeffrey S.: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Adaptive Phase 2 Multi-Center Study of Prasugrel Compared to Placebo in Adults with Sickle Cell Disease. Blood 2011, 118(21):847-847.

40. Daak AAG, Kebreab; Hassan, Zahir; Attallah, Bakhita; Azan, Haj H.; Elbashir, Mustafa I.; Crawford, Michael: Effect of omega-3 (n-3) fatty acid supplementation in patients with sickle cell anemia: randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2013, 97(1):37-44.

- 41. Ataga KIR, Marvin; Ballas, Samir K.; Yasin, Zahida; Bigelow, Carolyn; St James, Luther; Smith, Wally R.; Galacteros, Frederic; Kutlar, Abdullah; Hull, James H.; Stocker, Jonathan W.: Improvements in haemolysis and indicators of erythrocyte survival do not correlate with acute vaso-occlusive crises in patients with sickle cell disease: a phase III randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study of the gardos channel blocker senicapoc (ICA-17043). British Journal of Haematology 2011, 153(1):92-104.
- 42. Diop SS, Fabienne; Seck, Moussa; Gueye, Youssou Bamar; Dieye, Tandakha Ndiaye; Fall, Awa Oumar Toure; Sall, Abibatou; Thiam, Doudou; Diakhate, Lamine: Sickle-cell disease and malaria: evaluation of seasonal intermittent preventive treatment with sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine in Senegalese patients-a randomized placebo-controlled trial. Annals of Hematology 2011, 90(1):23-27.
- 43. Diop SS, Moussa; Gueye, Youssou Bamar; Soudre, Fabienne; Fall, Awa Oumar Toure; Sall, Abibatou; Thiam, Doudou: Sickle-Cell Disease and Malaria: Evaluation of Seasonal Intermittent Preventive Treatment with Sulfadoxine-Pyrimethamine in Senegalese patients-a Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial [Conference]. Blood 2010, 116(21):686-686.
- 44. Viana MBA, R. C.: Painful Crises in Children with Sickle Cell Disease Are Not Prevented by Piracetam. Acta Haematologica 2009, 121(1):9-10.
- 45. Alvim RCV, M. B.; Pires, M. A. S.; Franklin, Hmoh; Paula, M. J.; Brito, A. C.; Oliveira, T. F.; Rezende, P. V.: Inefficacy of piracetam in the prevention of painful crises in children and adolescents with sickle cell disease. *Acta Haematologica* 2005, **113**(4):228-233.
- 46. Bao BP, Ananda S.; Beck, Frances W. J.; Snell, Diane; Suneja, Anupam; Sarkar, Fazlul H.; Doshi, Nimisha; Fitzgerald, James T.; Swerdlow, Paul: Zinc supplementation decreases oxidative stress, incidence of infection, and generation of inflammatory cytokines in sickle cell disease patients. *Translational Research* 2008, **152**(2):67-80.
- 47. Ataga KIS, Wally R.; De Castro, Laura M.; Swerdlow, Paul; Saunthararajah, Yogen; Castro, Oswaldo; Vichinsky, Elliot; Kutlar, Abdullah; Orringer, Eugene P.; Rigdon, Greg C.; Stocker, Jonathan W.: Efficacy and safety of the Gardos channel blocker, senicapoc (ICA-17043), in patients with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 2008, 111(8):3991-3997.
- 48. Eke FUA, I.: Effects of pyrimethamine versus proguanil in malarial chemoprophylaxis in children with sickle cell disease: A randomized, placebo-controlled, open-label study. Current Therapeutic Research-Clinical and Experimental 2003, 64(8):616-625.
- 49. Pace BSS, A.; Pack-Mabien, A.; Mulekar, M.; Ardia, A.; Goodman, S. R.: Effects of N-acetylcysteine on dense cell formation in sickle cell disease. American Journal of Hematology 2003, 73(1):26-32.
- 50. Wambebe CK, H.; Momoh, J. A. F.; Ekpeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, O. S.; Bamgboye, E. A.; Nasipuri, R. N.; Kunle, O. O.; Okogun, J. I.; Enwerem, M. N.; Audam, J. G.; Gamaniel, K. S.; Obodozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, O.: **Double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomised cross-over clinical trial of NIPRISAN (R) in patients with Sickle Cell Disorder**. *Phytomedicine* 2001, **8**(4):252-261.
- 51. Tomer AK, S.; Connor, W. E.; Clark, S.; Harker, L. A.; Eckman, J. R.: Reduction of pain episodes and prothrombotic activity in sickle cell disease by dietary n-3 fatty acids. *Thrombosis and Haemostasis* 2001, 85(6):966-974.
- 52. Tomer AH, L. A.; Kasey, S.; Eckman, J. R.: Dietary n-3 fatty acid treatment reduces the frequency of pain episodes and the prothrombotic state in sickle cell disease (SCD) [Conference]. Blood 1997, 90(10 SUPPL. 1 PART 1):445A-445A.
- 53. de Abood MdC, Z.; Guerrero, F.; Espino, M.; Austin, K. L.: Effect of Depo-Provera (R) or Microgynon (R) on the painful crises of sickle cell anemia patients. *Contraception* 1997, **56**(5):313-316.
- 54. Gupta VLC, B. S.: Efficacy of zinc therapy in prevention of crisis in sickle cell anemia: a double blind, randomized controlled clinical trial. The Journal of the Association of Physicians of India 1995, **43**(7):467-469.
- 55. Manrique RV: Placebo Controlled Double-Blind-Study of Pentoxifylline in Sickle-Cell Disease Patients. Journal of Medicine 1987, 18(5-6):277-291.

2		
3		
5		
6		_
7	56. 57.	C Z
8		tr
9	58.	G
10	59.	D
12	60	2 M
13	61.	ls
14	62. 63.	O N
15		2
16	64. 65	N W
17 18		E
10	66	0 V
20	00.	Ľ.
21		В
22		V
23		C
24 25	67	a Si
26	07.	a
27		2
28		
29		
30		
37		
33		
34		
35		
36		
3/		
30 39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44 45		
45 46		

- 56. Zago MAC, F. F.; Ismael, S. J.; Tone, L. G.; Bottura, C.: **Treatment of Sickle-Cell Diseases with Aspirin**. Acta Haematologica 1984, **72**(1):61-64. 57. Cabannes RL, J.: Castaigne, J. P.: Ondo, A.: Plassard, A.: Zohoun, I.: **Clinical and biological double-blind-study of ticlopidine in preventive**
- 57. Cabaimes RL, J.; Castaigne, J. P.; Ondo, A.; Plassard, A.; Zonoun, I.: Clinical and biological double-blind-study of ticlopidine in preventive treatment of sickle-cell disease crises. Agents and actions Supplements 1984, 15:199-212.
   58. Gail MB, L.: Dark, A.: Lewis, P.: Marrow, H.: A Double-Blind Pandomized Trial of Lew Dass Oral Upper to Provent Sickle Cell Crises. Journal Journal 1995.
- 58. Gail MB, J.; Dark, A.; Lewis, R.; Morrow, H.: A Double-Blind Randomized Trial of Low-Dose Oral Urea to Prevent Sickle-Cell Crises. Journal of Chronic Diseases 1982, 35(2):151-161.
- 59. Deceulaer KH, R.; Gruber, C.; Serjeant, G. R.: Medroxyprogesterone Acetate and Homozygous Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1982, 2(8292):229-231.
- 60. Mann JRS, J.: Sodium-Bicarbonate Prophylaxis of Sickle-Cell Crisis. Pediatrics 1974, 53(3):414-416.
- 61. Isaacs WAA, O.; Effiong, C. E.: Steroid Treatment in Prevention of Painful Episodes in Sickle-Cell Disease. Lancet 1972, 1(7750):570-&.
- 62. Oski FC, F. L.; Lessen, L.: Failure of Promazine Hcl to Prevent Painful Episodes in Sickle Cell Anemia. Journal of Pediatrics 1968, 73(2):265-266.
- 63. NCT02482298: A Study to Assess the Effect of Ticagrelor in Reducing the Number of Days With Pain in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. 2016.
- 64. NCT01476696: A Study of Prasugrel in Pediatric Participants With Sickle Cell Disease. 2012.
- 65. Wambebe COB, E. A.; Badru, B. O.; Khamofu, H.; Momoh, J. A.; Ekpeyong, M.; Audu, B. S.; Njoku, S. O.; Nasipuri, N. R.; Kunle, O. O.; Okogun, J. I.; Enwerem, N. M.; Gamaniel, S. K.; Obodozie, O. O.; Samuel, B.; Fojule, G.; Ogunyale, P. O.: Efficacy of niprisan in the prophylactic management of patients with sickle cell disease. *Current Therapeutic Research-Clinical and Experimental* 2001, 62(1):26-34.
- 66. Vichinsky, E; Neumayr, L.; Gold, J. I.; Weiner, M. W.; Kasten, J.; Truran, D.; Snyder, C.; Kesler, K.; Mahmoud Hussein, A.; Harrington, T. J.; McMahon, L.; Gordeuk, V. R.; Kutlar, A.; Orringer, E. P.; De Castro, L. M.; Field, J.; Swerdlow, P. S.; Bessman, J. D.; Snyder, R.; Strouse, J. J.; Armstrong, F. D. . Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH. A randomized trial of the safety and benefit of transfusion vs. standard care in the prevention of sickle cell-related complications in adults: A preliminary report from the phase II NHLBI comprehensive sickle cell centers (CSCC) study of neuropsychological dysfunction and neuroimaging abnormalities in neurologically intact adult patients with sickle cell disease. 2010;116(21).
- 67. Styles LW, T.; De Castro, L. M.; Telen, M. J.; Kramer, W.; Flanner, H.; Magnani, J. L.; Thackray, H. GMI-1070, a pan-selectin inhibitor: Safety and PK in a phase 1/2 study in adults with sickle cell disease. Blood Conference: 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, *ASH*. 2010;116(21).

J

Appendix C Systematic review

protocol main (non-transfusions)

## 

# Contents

Tables2
Abbreviations
1 Introduction4
2 Objective
3 Methodology
3.1 Eligibility criteria
3.2 Study identification
3.3 Study selection
3.4 Data extraction7
3.4.1 Study characteristics
3.4.2 Intervention characteristics
3.4.3 Patient characteristics
3.4.4 Outcomes
3.4.5 Study quality10
4 Discussion11
Appendix A: Literature search strategies12
Appendix B: ClinicalTrials.gov search17
Appendix C: Risk of bias and quality assessment
References

# Tables

Table 1: Eligibility criteria	6
Table 3: Search strategy for MEDLINE	12
Table 4: Search strategy for EMBASE	14
Table 5: Search strategy for Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials	16
Table 6: Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool <sup>6</sup>	18
Table 9: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale – cohort studies <sup>7</sup>	19

# Abbreviations

CENTRAL	Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
EMBASE	Excerpta Medica dataBASE
MEDLINE	Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online
PICOS	Population, Interventions, Comparisons, Outcomes, and Study Design
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
RBC	Red blood cells
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
SCD	Sickle cell disease
SLR	Systematic literature review
VOC	Vaso-occlusive crisis

# Introduction

Sickle cell disease (SCD) is a genetic blood disorder characterized by abnormality in the oxygen-carrying protein hemoglobin found in red blood cells (RBCs), depicted by RBCs having a rigid sickle-like shape.<sup>1</sup> Vaso-occlusive crises (VOCs) are the hallmark of SCD, with the disease being associated with serious complications, multi-organ failure, and an increased risk of death.<sup>2</sup> Quality of life is severely impaired for these patients due to recurrent chronic pain crises, regular use of analgesics, repeated hospitalization due to VOCs, and multiple organ failure.<sup>3</sup> The ability to modify the disease and prevent VOC episodes can decrease the risk of complications, organ damage, and the subsequent risk of death in SCD patients, as well as reduce health-resource utilization episodes.

There are limited treatment options are for SCD patients.<sup>2</sup> Hydroxyurea (HU) is the mainstay of treatment; however, majority of patients do not persist on HU, or will not take or cannot take HU, and among the HUtreated patients, some still continue to experience VOCs, fatal organ damage, and a shortened life span.<sup>2</sup> Novartis has developed crizanlizumab for the prevention of VOCs in SCD patients. In a recent randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Phase 2 trial, the safety and efficacy of crizanlizumab with or without hydroxyurea was assessed in SCD patients still experiencing  $\geq$ 2VOCs/ year at time of enrollment.<sup>2</sup> Treatment with high-dose crizanlizumab resulted in a 45.3% reduction in annual rate of VOCs compared to placebo;<sup>2</sup> in addition, the median times to first and second VOC were 2-3 times as long for patients receiving crizanlizumab compared to those receiving placebo.<sup>2</sup>

#### Objective

The key parameters for the economic model relate to the treatment effects of the interventions used for the treatment of SCD. Treatment effects of the relevant alternative interventions of interest will be based on currently available published clinical trial evidence identified by means of a systematic literature review and synthesized with meta-analysis techniques. The current document defines the scope and process of the systematic literature review (SLR).

<text>

#### Methodology

#### 3.1 **Eligibility criteria**

The SLR will focus on identifying clinical trials evaluating the treatment effects of relevant competing interventions for the treatment of SCD and will be an update of the recent review by Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> The scope will be expanded by incorporating recently published studies and including single arm trials when RCTs are not available for the relevant interventions of interest. Study eligibility criteria are defined in terms of the population, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) outlined in Table 1, which will guide the identification and selection of studies considered relevant.

Criteria	Description
Population	Inclusion criteria:
	Adult patients with sickle cell disease
Interventions	<ul> <li>Crizanlizumab</li> <li>Hydroxyurea</li> <li>Endari</li> <li>Voxelotor (GBT440)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Any pharmacological interventions for preventing vaso-occlusive crisis (VOC)*</li> </ul>
Comparators	<ul> <li>Placebo or best supportive care</li> <li>Any of the listed interventions of interest</li> <li>Any treatment that facilitates an anchored indirect comparison</li> </ul>
Outcomes	Any efficacy related outcome**
Study design	<ul> <li>RCTs</li> <li>Single-arm trials when RCTs are not available for the interventions of interest</li> </ul>
Language	Only studies published in English

\*We exclude interventions such as gene therapy, stem cell therapy and bone marrow transplantation, as these interventions aim to cure sickle cell disease in severe sickle cell disease patients

\*\*In addition to efficacy outcomes, adverse events are of interest for the review, but will not be used as study selection criteria.

#### 3.2 Study identification

Relevant studies will be identified by searching the following databases using predefined search strategies: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE); and Excerpta Medica database (Embase). It should be noted that CENTRAL database does not contain any single-arm (uncontrolled) trials. Therefore, resources for identifying singlearm trials will be MEDLINE and Embase only. This search strategy is based on Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> and constructed

#### **BMJ** Open

according to the criteria of interest (e.g. outcomes, population, intervention and study design) using MeSH or Emtree terms (thesaurus terms, headings and subheadings) and text words to retrieve potential references. Search strategies have been developed individually for CENTRAL, MEDLINE and Embase and are listed in Appendix A. Please note that the MEDLINE search strategy also aims to identify previously published SLRs and meta-analyses as an additional source to identify relevant primary studies of interest.

Considering the limited searches in Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> due to lack of a clinical trial registry search, a clinical trial registry search on ClinicalTrials.gov will be conducted to identify relevant primary studies of interest, especially unpublished and ongoing studies. This search is based on the search strategy of MEDLINE (**Appendix B**).

Sins et al.<sup>4</sup> completed their literature searches on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2017. Therefore, all searches on databases will be limited from the date 30<sup>th</sup> January 2017 onwards, except CENTRAL database. CENTRAL database lacks limit options by date and indexes for identifying date of reference created. Thus, the limit on CENTRAL database will be performed by restricting the publication year from 2017 onwards.

Although it is possible to restrict searches by language (English), it is highly advisable that the search strategy retains high sensitivity (the proportion of references for the desired topic that are retrieved), especially as the estimated number of recalls is small. Therefore, there is no restriction on language at the search stage.

## 3.3 Study selection

Two reviewers, working independently, will review all abstracts and proceedings identified by the search according to the selection criteria, with the exception of outcome criteria, which will only be applied during the screening of full-text publications. All studies identified as eligible studies during abstract screening will then be screened at a full-text stage by the same two reviewers. Reasons for exclusion will be recorded. The full-text studies identified at this stage will be included for the data extraction. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third reviewer will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies. The process of study identification and selection will be summarized with a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram.<sup>5</sup>

## 3.4 Data extraction

Two reviewers, working independently, will extract data on study characteristics, interventions, patient characteristics, and outcomes for the final list of included studies. Following reconciliation between the two reviewers, a third reviewer will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies. Data will be stored and managed in a Microsoft Excel workbook.

## 3.4.1 Study characteristics
The following study characteristics will be extracted:

- Study name
- Study year
- Study authors .
- Study design .
- Study inclusion criteria
- Study exclusion criteria •
- Location of study (countries) •
- Year of study initiation and study close •
- Follow-up period •
- Outcomes .
- Patient flow •
- Study- and analyses populations (e.g. ITT, mITT, etc.)

#### 3.4.2 Intervention characteristics

The following intervention characteristics will be extracted:

- Treatment regimen •
- Treatment dose .
- Method of administration •
- Frequency of administration •
- Duration of treatment •
- Concomitant/background therapies •
- Compliance/Adherence

#### 3.4.3 Patient characteristics

The following patient characteristics at baseline will be extracted:

- Age .
- Gender •
- Race and ethnicity •
- Other relevant socio-demographics •
- Concomitant hydroxycarbamide/hydroxyurea .
- Fetal hemoglobin •
- Genetic status (HbSS, HbSβo, HbSC, Hbsβ+, other)
- Painful crisis .

1 2		
2	<ul> <li>Hospital admission frequency</li> </ul>	
4		
5	Paintul crisis including nome crisis	
6 7	Transfusions	
8	Previous SCD related complications	
9	Acute chest syndrome	
10	Avascular osteonecrosis	
11	Stroke	
13		
14	Other comorbidities	
15 16	344 Outcomes	
17	olaite outcomes	
18	The following outcomes will be extracted:	
19 20		
20 21	Number of VOCs	
22	Time to the first VOC	
23	Duration of VOCs	
24 25		
26	% of patients with 0 VOCs/ year	
27	Number of SCD-related pain days	
28	<ul> <li>Duration of SCD-related pain days</li> </ul>	
29 30	Number of Hospital Admissions for VOC	
31	• time to first hospital admission for a VOC	
32	Intensity of pain	
33 34	Serious complications	
35	Organ damago	
36		
37 38	Survival	
39	Quality of life	
40	Adverse events	
41 42		
42	For each outcome of interest, the upper & Lower	imits of scales along with definition will be reported. For
44	dichotomous outcomes, the number of patients wit	h the event and the number of patients in each treatment
45	arm will be extracted. For continuous outcomes, the	e change from baseline in all intervention groups will be
46 47	extracted. If the change from baseline is not provid	led, the score at end of follow-up and the baseline score
48	will be extracted. For event rates, the number of e	vents, the number of patients in each treatment arm and
49	follow-up or exposure time will be extracted. For	time-to-event outcomes, hazard ratios and associated
50 51	information regarding uncertainty will be extraction	n Kaplan Meir curves will be extracted in terms of the
52	proportion of patients who had an event over time	using Digitizelt <sup>®</sup> in addition to the number of patients at
53	rick over time	using Digitizert in addition to the number of patients at
54 55	nsk over lime.	
55 56		
57		
58		Q
59 60	For peer review only - http://bmior	en.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
~~		

#### 3.4.5 Study quality

Two independent reviewers will assess study quality. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third investigator will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies.

The Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool will be used to assess risk of bias in included RCTs (**Appendix C**).<sup>6</sup> This instrument is used to evaluate six key domains: sequence generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants, personnel and outcome assessors; incomplete outcome data; selective outcome reporting; and other sources of bias. The risk of bias instrument can be used to assign summary assessments of within-study bias, low risk of bias (low risk of bias for all key domains), unclear risk of bias (unclear risk of bias for one or more key domains), or high risk of bias (high risk of bias for one or more domains).

The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale will be used to assess the quality of single arm studies (**Appendix C**).<sup>7</sup> This instrument is used to evaluate the quality of observational studies based on 1) study group and selection, 2) comparability of the groups within studies, and 3) the ascertainment of either the exposure or outcomes of interest for case-control or cohort studies. Ranking of the study quality will be done by using a 'star system' in which a study can be given a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the "Selection" and "Exposure" categories and a maximum of two stars for "Comparability" category. Two independent reviewers will assess study quality. Following reconciliation between the two investigators, a third investigator will be included to reach consensus on any remaining discrepancies.

## Discussion

This SLR will involve highly sensitive searches in the peer-reviewed literature as well as searches of recent conferences and clinical trial registrations to identify unpublished completed trials with results available. The review processes will be guided by the pre-defined eligibility criteria established in the review protocol. Data quality will be ensured through the involvement of two independent researchers in the study selection and data extraction phases of the project. The primary outcomes will include median time to the first VOC, median time to the second VOC, median rate of VOCs per year, and overall survival (OS), which reflect the primary outcomes as assessed in the Sins, et al. review as well as many clinical trials for this population. Results of the SLR will help to inform clinicians and decision makers and will provide the foundation to assess the feasibility of performing an NMA.

Despite the strengths of the proposed SLR, some limitations are applicable to all SLRs that should be acknowledged. While there is a clear justification to limit the search and selection to June 20, 2018 based on the scope to update the Sins review, there is always a risk select trials will not be identified that align with the selection criteria. Additionally, as the evidence base is continually growing, any trials published after the search date will not be captured. Further, any trials that are published close to the search date but are not yet indexed in the databases at the time of the search will not be captured by the search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials. Hand searches of other published reviews may help overcome these potential limitations.

As always, the SLR is also limited by the use of published data. There is a risk of publication bias as some clinical trials fail to be published while others are published only in abstract form, which presents limited information. However, an extensive search of conference abstracts will be performed, which may mitigate the impact on the results of the SLR. Posters or slides corresponding to the conference abstracts will be identified where available; however, often conferences do not provide complete information. Moreover, conference results should be interpreted with caution, as they do not undergo the same peer review process as fully published results. Finally, the search and selection will be restricted to trials published in English. Therefore, there is a risk that non-English publications will not be identified.

## Appendix A: Literature search strategies

#### Table 2: Search strategy for MEDLINE

#	Searches	Concept
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
3	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp length of stay/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
7	or/1-6	
8	anemia, sickle cell/	Population
9	hemoglobin, sickle/	
10	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	exp antisickling agents/	Interventions
13	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or endari or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	meta analysis.pt.	Systematic review
18	((meta adj analys*) or metaanalys or meta-analys*).ti,ab,sh.	and meta-analysis
19	(systematic adj5 (review or overview*)).ti,ab,sh.	studies
20	or/17-19	
21	16 and 20	
22	clinical trial/	RCTs
23	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	

Τ

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
5	
6	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
1/	
10 10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
50	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
<u>4</u> 2	
-⊤∠ ⁄\ว	
43 44	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
51	
55	
22	
50	
5/	
58	
59	

24	single blind method/	
25	double blind method/	
26	random allocation/	
27	placebos/	
28	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	
29	randomized controlled trial/	
30	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	
31	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	
32	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	
33	or/22-32	
34	16 and 33	
35	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	Single arm trials
36	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	
37	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
38	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	
39	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	
40	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	
41	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	
42	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	
43	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	
44	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	
47	(all adj3 received).ab.	
48	or/35-47	
49	16 and 48	

_		
50	0 limit 21 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on rSLF and meta-analysi
		studies
5'	l limit 34 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on RCTs
52	2 limit 49 to ed=20170130-20180620	Date limit on single

#### Table 3: Search strategy for EMBASE

#	Searches	-
1	exp pain/	Outcomes
2	(pain or painfull).tw.	
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein	
3	occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous	
	occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	
4	exp "length of stay"/	
5	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
6	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	
7	or/1-6	
8	sickle cell anemia/	Population
9	hemoglobin S/	
	(sickle cell or sickle h\$emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	
10	h\$emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an\$emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	
11	or/8-10	
12	antisickling agent/	Intervention
	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or	
13	desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or	
	tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or endari or voxelotor or GBT440).mp.	
14	(8 or 9 or 10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*.tw.	
15	or/12-14	
16	7 and 11 and 15	
17	randomized controlled trial/	RCTs

18	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	
	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide*	
19	or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or	
	treat*)).ab,kw.	
20	trial.ti.	
21	crossover procedure/	
22	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
23	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	
24	or/17-23	
25	16 and 24	
	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or	Single-arm trials
26	cross-sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case controlstudy/	
07	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or	
27	case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	
20	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or	
28	prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	
	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based	
29	or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or	
	surveillance))).ab,kw.	
30	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	
31	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	
32	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	
33	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no	
	control*").ti,ab,kw.	
34	(all adj3 received).ab.	
35	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	
36	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or	
30	studies)).ti,ab,kw.	
37	or/26-36	
38	16 and 37	
39	limit 25 to em=201705-201825	Date limit on RC
10	limit 29 to om-201705 201925	Date limit on sin
49	IIIIII 30 10 EIII-201703-201823	arm trials

#### Table 4: Search strategy for Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials

#	Searches	
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	Outcomes
#2	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	
#3	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	
#4	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	
#5	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#6	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	
#7	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6	
#8	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	Population
#9	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	
#10	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	
#11	#8 or #9 or #10	
#12	MeSH descriptor: [Antisickling Agents] explode all trees	Interventions
#13	(antisickling agent* or sickling inhibitor* or Efaproxiral or Dimethyl Adipimidate or desickling agent* or cetiedil or glutamine or hydroxyurea or rivipansel or senicapoc or tucaresol or velaresol or crizanlizumab or endari or voxelotor or GBT440):ti,ab,kw	
#14	(#8 or #9 or #10) and prevent vaso-occlusiv*	
#15	#11 or #12 or #13	
#16	#7 and #11 and #14	

## Appendix B: ClinicalTrials.gov search

#### Table 6: Search strategy for ClinicalTrials.gov\*

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Drug OR Placebo OR Crizanlizumab OR Hydroxyurea OR Endari OR Voxelotor OR GBT440 OR hydroxycarbamide	Intervention/treatment
#4	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	Outcome Measures
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

## Appendix C: Risk of bias and quality assessment

#### Table 5: Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool<sup>6</sup>

Domain	Support for judgment	Review authors' judgment
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	Describe the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups.	Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate generation of a randomized sequence.
Allocation concealment	Describe the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to determine whether intervention allocations could have been foreseen in advance of, or during, enrolment.	Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate concealment of allocations prior to assignment.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes)	Describe all measures used, if any, to blind study participants and personnel from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	Performance bias due to the knowledge of the allocated interventions by participants and personnel during the study.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes)	Describe all measures used, if any, to blind outcome assessors from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	Detection bias due to the knowledge of the allocated interventions by outcome assessors.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes)	Describe the completeness of outcome data for each main outcome, including attrition and exclusions from the analysis. State whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers in each intervention group (compared with total randomized participants), reasons for attrition/exclusions where reported, and any re-inclusions in analyses performed by the review authors.	Attrition bias due to amount, nature or handling of incomplete outcome data.
Reporting bias	r	1
Selective reporting	State how the possibility of selective outcome reporting was examined by the review authors, and what was found.	Reporting bias due to selective outcome reporting.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	State any important concerns about bias not addressed in the other domains in the tool. If particular questions/entries were pre-specified in the review's protocol, responses should be provided for each question/entry.	Bias due to problems not covered elsewhere in the table.

#### Table 6: Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale – cohort studies<sup>7</sup>

Domain	Response
Selection	
1. Representativeness of the exposed cohort	<ul> <li>a. Truly representative of the average</li></ul>
2. Selection of the non-exposed cohort	<ul> <li>a. Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort*</li> <li>b. Drawn from a different source</li> <li>c. No description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort</li> </ul>
3. Ascertainment of exposure	<ul> <li>a. Secure record (e.g. surgical records)*</li> <li>b. Structured interview*</li> <li>c. Written self-report</li> <li>d. No description</li> </ul>
4. Demonstration that outcome of interest	a. Yes*
was not present at start of study	D. NO
Comparability	
1. Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	<ul> <li>a. Study controls for(select the most important factor)*</li> <li>b. Study controls for any additional factor (this criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor)*</li> </ul>
Outcomes	
1. Assessment of outcome	<ul> <li>a. Independent blind assessment*</li> <li>b. Record linkage*</li> <li>c. Self-report</li> <li>d. No description</li> </ul>
2. Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	<ul> <li>a. Yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest)*</li> <li>b. No</li> </ul>
3. Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	<ul> <li>a. Complete follow up - all subjects accounted for*</li> <li>b. Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - &gt; % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost)*</li> <li>c. Follow up rate &lt; % (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost</li> <li>d. No statement</li> </ul>

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the selection and outcomes categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for comparability.

## References

- 1. National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. Sickle Cell Disease. 2018; https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/sickle-cell-disease.
- 2. Ataga KI, Kutlar A, Kanter J, et al. Crizanlizumab for the Prevention of Pain Crises in Sickle Cell Disease. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;376(5):429-439.
- 3. McClish DK, Penberthy LT, Bovbjerg VE, et al. Health related quality of life in sickle cell patients: the PiSCES project. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2005;3:50.
- 4. Sins JWR, Mager DJ, Davis S, Biemond BJ, Fijnvandraat K. Pharmacotherapeutical strategies in the prevention of acute, vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell disease: a systematic review. *Blood Adv.* 2017;1(19):1598-1616.
- 5. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol*.2009;62(10):1006-1012.
- 6. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2011;343:d5928.
- 7. Wells GS, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2013; <u>http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp</u>. Accessed October 1, 2016.

## Appendix D. Systematic literature review protocol for transfusions.

#### Search protocol

#### **Objective**

This search protocol aims to supplement new evidence on the treatment effects of transfusion used for preventing crises in sickle cell disease (SCD) patients in adults and adolescents for previous systematic literature review (led by Thomas Statistical Consultants). The search strategy and concept are modified from a recent systematic review by Sins et al.<sup>1</sup> and Fortin et al<sup>2</sup>. The strategy has been developed to fulfil updated eligibility criteria (Table 1) and retrieve single-arm trials.

Table 1. Eligibility criteria

Critorio	Description	
Criteria	Description	
Population	Trials that included SCD patients aged 16 and above	
Interventions	Red blood cell transfusions	
	<ul> <li>Other types of transfusions</li> </ul>	
Comparators	Placebo or best medical care	
	<ul> <li>Interventions included in previous systematic review</li> </ul>	
Outcomes	Pain, crisis and VOC (frequency, intensity and duration in one event)	
	Hospital admission, including emergency department (ED) and nurse visits	
	<ul> <li>SCD complications, including acute chest syndromes</li> </ul>	
	Analgesic use	
	Adverse events*	
Study design	Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)	
	Single-arm studies	
Language	Only studies published in English	

\*In addition to efficacy outcomes, adverse events are of interest for the review, but will not be used as study selection criteria

#### <u>Resources</u>

#### Electronic databases

Studies will be identified by searching the following electronic databases:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
- Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE)
- Excerpta Medica database (Embase)

#### Hand-searches

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Sins JWR, Mager DJ, Davis S, Biemond BJ, Fijnvandraat K: **Pharmacotherapeutical strategies in the prevention of acute, vaso-occlusive pain in sickle cell disease: a systematic review**. *Blood advances* 2017, **1**(19):1598-1616.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Fortin PM, Hopewell S, Estcourt LJ. **Red blood cell transfusion to treat or prevent complications in sickle cell disease:** an overview of Cochrane reviews. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 8. Art. No.: CD012082. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD012082.pub2.

• ClinicalTrial.gov

#### Search strategy

Search strategies have been developed individually for CENTRAL, MEDLINE, Embase and ClinicalTrial.gov and their results are listed in Appendix 1-4. The concept of a search strategy is elaborated using MEDLINE as an example (Table 2). The search strategy was constructed according to the criteria (e.g. outcomes, population, intervention and study design) using MeSH or Emtree terms (thesaurus terms, headings and subheadings) and text words to retrieve potential references.

Table 2. Search strings and concepts

No	Searches	Results	
1	anemia, sickle cell/	19329	
2	hemoglobin, sickle/	3011	
3	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	27120	Population
4	1 or 2 or 3	27602	
5	Blood Transfusion/	48056	
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	8033	
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	90906	
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	47785	
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	35184	Intervention
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	26829	
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1217	
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	24060	
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	183648	
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	3477	
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	16726	

1	
1	
2	
3	
4	
т Г	
5	
6	
7	
,	
8	
9	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
1.4	
14	
15	
16	
17	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
22	
25	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
33	
34	
35	
55	
36	
37	
38	
20	
39	
40	
<u>4</u> 1	
40	
42	
43	
44	
45	
45	
46	
47	
40	
48	
49	
50	
E 1	
ы	
52	
53	
E /	
54	
55	
56	
57	
5/	
58	
59	

16	14 not 15	3229	
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	128578	
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	216650	
19	17 or 18	258199	
20	16 and 19	834	
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	13177	
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	3326	
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	188025	
24	exp pain/	362648	
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	547392	
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	66169	Outcome
27	exp length of stay/	77857	
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	104873	
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	6507	
30	or/24-29	901074	
31	4 and 23 and 30	848	
32	clinical trial/	512148	
33	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	1010	
34	single blind method/	25632	
35	double blind method/	147368	
36	random allocation/	95709	
37	placebos/	34063	RCT filter
38	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	1263924	
39	randomized controlled trial/	467730	
40	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	786522	
41	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	145215	
42	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	6481	

**BMJ** Open

44	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	2187051	
45	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	1071161	Single-arm studies filter
46	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	615678	
47	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	340559	
48	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	18409	
49	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	29604	
50	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	14110	
51	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	139501	
52	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	53439	
53	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	114108	
54	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	34084	
55	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	2644	
56	(all adj3 received).ab.	41192	
57	or/44-56	3114626	
58	31 and 43	120	
59	31 and 57	278	

#### **Search results**

 The numbers of references retrieved by search strategies from three databases are listed below. The search date was from the earliest date to 29<sup>th</sup> Aug 2018 in all databases. In total, there were 1,631 references retrieved.

CENTRAL

• Number of references related to controlled trials: 332

#### MEDLINE

- Number of references related to randomised controlled trials: 120
- Number of references related to single-arm studies: 279

#### Embase

- Number of references related to randomised controlled trials: 245
- Number of references related to single-arm studies: 599

#### ClinicalTrial.gov

• Number of references: 56

#### **Deduplication**

Duplicates were identified firstly by 'find duplicates' function in Endnote X8 and then doublechecked manually by sorting author, title, volume and issue. After that, all references were de-duplicate against references retrieved from previous systematic review. This left 825 references from the electronic databases to be screened.

In terms of references from ClinicalTrial.gov, there were only 16 references left to be screened after deduplication.

In total, there are 841 references to go through during the title and abstract screening stage.

#### Appendix 1. Search strategy and results for CENTRAL database

Search	Strategy:
Search	Silaleyy.

#	Searches	Results
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Anemia, Sickle Cell] this term only	583
#2	MeSH descriptor: [Hemoglobin, Sickle] this term only	19
#3	(sickle cell or sickle h*emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or h*emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an*emia or meniscocytosis):ti,ab,kw	4790
#4	#1 or #2 or #3	4790
#5	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Transfusion] this term only	1766
#6	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocyte Transfusion] explode all trees	564
#7	((blood or erythrocyte* or "red cell*" or "red blood cell*" or RBC*) near/5 (transfus* or infus* or unit*))	14775
#8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) near/5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program* or therapy)):ab	30189
#9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)):ti	3612
#10	("allogeneic blood" or (unit* near/2 blood) or "allogenic blood" or (blood near/2 exposure) or "donor blood" or "blood product*" or "blood component*" or "blood support")	3365
#11	hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*	107
#12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*) and transfus*:ti	2434
#13	#5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12	41927
#14	MeSH descriptor: [Blood Component Transfusion] this term only	115
#15	MeSH descriptor: [Erythrocytes] this term only	1478
#16	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*)	12756
#17	#14 and (#15 or #16)	39
#18	#13 or #17	41927
#19	MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explode all trees	42323
#20	(pain or painfull):ti,ab,kw	124349

	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion"	
#21	or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-	4404
	occlusiv* or crisis or crises):ti,ab,kw	
#22	MeSH descriptor: [Length of Stay] explode all trees	6488
#23	(hospital near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	20854
#24	(patient near/3 (admission or stay)):ti,ab,kw	1779
#25	#19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24	153780
#26	#4 and #18 and #25	332

Of 332 results:

- Certeries only Cochrane reviews: 35 •
- Cochrane Protocol: 1 •
- Trials: 296
- Editorials: 0 •
- Special collections: 0 •
- Clinical Answers: 0 •

#### Appendix 2. Search strategy and results for MEDLINE

Database(s): Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Daily 1946 to August 29, 2018 Search Strategy:

L

#	Secretes	Poculto
#	Searches	Results
1	anemia, sickle cell/	19329
2	hemoglobin, sickle/	3011
	(sickle cell or sickle h?emoglobin or drepanocyt* or drepanotic or drepanocytemia or	07400
3	h?emoglobin-s or Hb-S or sickle an?emia or meniscocytosis).mp.	27120
4	1 or 2 or 3	27602
5	Blood Transfusion/	48056
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	8033
	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or	
7	therap*)).ti,ab.	90906
	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or	
8	usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or	47785
	management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	
	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis*	
9	or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or	35184
	indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	
	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood	
10	or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	26829
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1217
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	24060
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	183648
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	3477
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	16726
16	14 not 15	3229
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	128578
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	216650

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
27
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
д6
40 17
4/ 10
40 40
49 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

19	17 or 18	258199
20	16 and 19	834
	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or	
21	restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy	13177
	or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or	3326
	intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	0020
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	188025
24	exp pain/	362648
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	547392
	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion"	
26	or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso-	66169
	occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	1
27	exp length of stay/	77857
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	104873
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	6507
30	or/24-29	901074
31	4 and 23 and 30	848
32	clinical trial/	512148
33	(clinic adj5 trial*).ti,ab,sh.	1010
34	single blind method/	25632
35	double blind method/	147368
36	random allocation/	95709
37	placebos/	34063
38	(placebo or random*).ti,ab,sh.	1263924
39	randomized controlled trial/	467730
40	(randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial or clinical trial).pt.	786522
41	((single or double or triple or treble) adj (blind or mask*)).ti,ab,sh.	145215
42	randomi?ed control trial*.tw.	6481
43	or/32-42	1565168
	epidemiologic studies/ or case-control studies/ or cross-sectional studies/ or cohort studies/ or	
44	follow-up studies/ or longitudinal studies/ or prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/	2187051
	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case	
45	control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 (study or trial* or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	1071161

46	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	615678
47	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab.	340559
48	Clinical Trial, Phase I.pt.	18409
49	Clinical Trial, Phase II.pt.	29604
50	Clinical Trial, Phase III.pt.	14110
51	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kf,hw.	139501
52	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kf,hw.	53439
53	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kf.	114108
54	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kf.	34084
55	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kf.	2644
56	(all adj3 received).ab.	41192
57	or/44-56	3114626
58	31 and 43	120
59	31 and 57	278

#### Appendix 3. Search strategy and results for Embase database

Database(s): **Embase** 1974 to 2018 Week 35 Search Strategy:

#	Searches	Results
1	exp Anemia, Sickle Cell/	32009
2	(h?emoglobin s or h?emoglobin sc or h?emoglobin se or h?emoglobin ss or h?emoglobin c or h?emoglobin d or Hb s or Hb sc or Hb se or Hb ss or Hb c or Hb d or sc disease*).tw.	5794
3	(sickle cell or sicklemia or sickled or sickling or meniscocyt* or drepanocyt*).tw.	29569
4	1 or 2 or 3	38361
5	Blood Transfusion/	108332
6	Erythrocyte Transfusion/	23021
7	((blood or erythrocyte* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj5 (transfus* or infus* or unit* or therap*)).ti,ab.	135137
8	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or red blood cell* or whole blood or transfus*) adj5 (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ab.	77239
9	((red cell* or RBC* or erythrocyte* or blood or transfus*) and (use* or usage* or utiliz* or utilis* or requir* or need* or administ* or replac* or support* or strateg* or management or practic* or indicat* or criteri* or standard* or program*)).ti.	38387
10	(allogeneic blood or (unit* adj2 blood) or allogenic blood or (blood adj2 exposure) or donor blood or blood product* or blood component* or blood support).ti,ab.	43111
11	(hemotransfus* or haemotransfus* or hypertransfus* or hemotherap* or haemotherap*).tw.	1555
12	(red cell* or erythrocyte* or blood or RBC*).tw. and transfus*.ti.	28985
13	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	273982
14	Blood Component Transfusion/	2629
15	PLASMA EXCHANGE/ or PLATELET TRANSFUSION/ or exp LEUKOCYTE TRANSFUSION/	19765
16	14 not 15	2279
17	ERYTHROCYTES/	112741
18	(red cell* or red blood cell* or erythrocyte* or RBC*).tw.	256379

2
2
ر ۸
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
18
19
20
21
22
23
20
∠ <del>'1</del> ⊃⊏
25
26
27
28
29
30
50 21
51
32
33
34
35
36
27
20
38
39
40
41
42
43
11
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
57
58
59
60

19	17 or 18	278120
20	16 and 19	523
21	((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC*) adj10 (trigger* or thresh?old* or target* or restrict* or liberal* or aggressive* or conservative* or prophylactic* or limit* or protocol* or policy or policies or practice* or standard*)).tw.	22304
22	(((transfus* or red cell* or red blood cell* or RBC* or h?ematocrit*) and (level* or critical* or intensive* or h?emorrhag* or bleed*)) or hypertransfus*).ti.	4095
23	13 or 20 or 21 or 22	279695
24	exp pain/	1146280
25	(pain or painfull).tw.	789805
26	(venoocclusive or "vein occlusive" or "vein interruption" or "vein obstruction" or "vein occlusion" or "vena obstruction" or "veno occlusive" or "venous obstruction" or "venous occlusion" or vaso- occlusiv* or crisis or crises).tw.	82887
27	exp length of stay/	150699
28	(hospital adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	169748
29	(patient adj3 (admission or stay)).tw.	12514
30	or/24-29	1690290
31	4 and 23 and 30	2325
32	randomized controlled trial/	508600
33	(RCT or randomi#ed or randomi#ation).ab,ti,kw,hw.	1062285
34	(random* adj3 (administ* or allocat* or assign* or class* or control* or determine* or divide* or distribut* or expose* or fashion* or number* or place* or recruit* or subsitut* or treat*)).ab,kw.	560662
35	trial.ti.	248694
36	crossover procedure/	56042
37	((singl* or doubl* or tripl* or trebl*) adj3 (blind* or mask* or dumm*)).ti,ab,kw,hw.	276112
38	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 4 clinical trial/	99658
39	or/32-38	1386841
40	prospective study/ or retrospective study/ or longitudinal study/ or cohort analysis/ or cross- sectional study/ or case control study/ or population based case control study/	1771952
41	((epidemiologic or prospective or retrospective or cross-sectional or feasibil* or pilot or case control* or cohort or longitudinal) adj3 study).ti,ab,kw.	1282224
42	(case control* or cross-sectional or cohort? or follow-up or followup or longitudinal or prospective or retrospective or observational or population).ti.	790240
43	((cohort? adj2 (analys* or compar* or data or study or studies)) or (population adj2 (based or data* or study or studies or register? or registry or registries or survey? or surveillance))).ab,kw.	500633

3	
4	
5	
ر د	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
27	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
40	
40 1	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
57	
52	
55	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

60

-		
44	(registry or registries).ti,ab,kw,hw.	183687
45	(nonrandom* or non-random*).ti,ab,kw.	42777
46	((control* adj2 before adj2 after) or CBA study).ti,ab,kw.	3333
47	((single adj arm*) or single-arm or single group or uncontrol* or un-control* or "no control*").ti,ab,kw.	80316
48	(all adj3 received).ab.	75969
49	phase 2 clinical trial/ or phase 3 clinical trial/ or phase 1 clinical trial/	126474
50	((phase 1 or Phase i or Phase 2 or Phase ii or Phase 3 or Phase iii) and (trial* or study or studies)).ti,ab,kw.	205403
51	or/40-50	3180246
52	31 and 39	245
53	31 and 51	599

#### Appendix 4. Search strategy and results for ClinicalTrial.gov

#	Searches	Search column
#1	Anemia, Sickle Cell OR Sickle Beta Thalassemia OR Sickle Cell Anemia OR Sickle Cell trait	Condition or disease
#2	SCD OR SCA OR Sickle	Other terms
#3	Transfusion OR blood OR RBC OR hematocrit OR erythrocyte	Intervention/treatment
	pain OR hospitalisation OR hospitalization OR (hospital AND (admission OR stay)) OR crisis	Outcome Measures
#4	OR VOC OR ((vaso OR vein OR vena OR venous) AND (occlusive OR occlusive OR	
	interruption OR obstruction)) OR survival OR quality of life	
	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4	

\*Advanced Search option without any restrictions except search strings listed.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# Appendix E. Additional details of the network meta-analysis

#### E.1 Methods of the network meta-analysis

We first define the Bayesian network meta-analysis (NMA) statistical models used to synthesize transformed outcomes, on the log hazard scale, from each randomized controlled trial (RCT). The link functions to connect these models to the different data summaries are then presented. The same statistical models are used for crisis, hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events but the link functions vary depending on what data is reported by each RCT (see main text for outcomes analyzed). The NMA models are in line with the recommendations of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Decision Support Unit (DSU) technical support documents (TSD), in particular NICE DSU TSD 2. OpenBUGS code is provided for each outcome in appendix **B.4**.

For all random parameters (i.e.  $\mu_{..}$  and  $d_{..}$ ) vague *Normal*(0, 0.001) priors were used.

#### Fixed-effects network meta-analysis model

When the available evidence consists of a network of multiple pairwise comparisons (i.e. AB-trials, AC-trials, BC-trials, etc.) the standard fixed effects model for NMA can be specified as follows:

$$\theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} \mu_{jb} & \text{if } k = b \\ \mu_{jb} + d_{bk} = \mu_{jb} + d_{Ak} - d_{Ab} & \text{if } k > b \\ d_{AA} = 0 \end{cases}$$
(3)

There are *k* treatments labelled as A, B, C, etc., and treatment A is taken to be the reference treatment for the analysis.  $\mu_{jb}$  is the (transformed) outcome in study *j* on 'baseline' treatment *b* which will vary across studies.  $d_{bk}$  is the fixed effect of treatment *k* relative to 'baseline treatment' *b*.  $d_{bk}$  are identified by expressing 0them in terms of the reference treatment A:  $d_{bk} = d_{Ak} - d_{Ab}$  with  $d_{AA} = 0$ .

#### Random-effects network meta-analysis model

$$\theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} \mu_{jb} & \text{if } k = b \\ \mu_{jb} + \delta_{jbk} & \text{if } k > b \end{cases}$$
(4)

$$\delta_{jbk} \sim Normal(d_{bk}, \sigma^2) = Normal(d_{Ak} - d_{Ab}, \sigma^2)$$
  
 $d_{AA} = 0$ 

 $\delta_{jbk}$  is the trial-specific treatment effect of *k* relative to treatment *b*. These trial-specific effects are drawn from a random-effects distribution:  $\delta_{jbk} \sim N(d_{bk}, \sigma^2)$ . Again, the pooled effects,  $d_{bk}$ , are identified by expressing them in terms of the reference treatment A. The heterogeneity  $\sigma^2$  is assumed constant for all treatment comparisons. (A fixed effect model is obtained if  $\sigma^2$  equals zero.)

**BMJ** Open

Page 126 of 160

This random-effects model treats multiple-arm trials (>2 treatments) without taking account of the correlations between the trial-specific  $\delta$ s that they estimate. Bayesian random-effects models with a heterogeneity parameter for  $d_{Ak}$  can be easily extended to fit trials with 3 or more treatment arms by decomposing a multivariate normal distribution as a series of conditional univariate distributions.<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta_{jbk_1} \\ \vdots \\ \delta_{jbk_p} \end{pmatrix} \sim Normal \begin{pmatrix} d_{bk_1} \\ \vdots \\ d_{bk_p} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & \cdots & \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{2} & \cdots & \sigma^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
 (5)

Then the conditional univariate distributions for arm *i* given the previous 1, ....(*i*-1) arms are:

$$\delta_{jbk_i} \mid \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{jbk_1} \\ \vdots \\ \delta_{jbk_{i-1}} \end{pmatrix} \sim Normal \left( d_{bk_i} + \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( \delta_{jbk_j} - d_{bk_j} \right), \frac{(i-1)}{2i} \sigma^2 \right)$$
(6)

#### Random-effects network meta-analysis model with constant covariate interaction term

$$\theta_{jk} = \begin{cases} \mu_{jb} & \text{if } k = b \\ \mu_{jb} + \delta_{jbk} & \text{if } k > b \end{cases}$$
  
$$\delta_{jbk} = \begin{cases} Normal(d_{Ak} - d_{Ab} + \beta X_j, \sigma^2) & \text{if } b = A \\ Normal(d_{Ak} - d_{Ab}, \sigma^2) & \text{if } b \neq A \end{cases}$$
  
$$d_{AA} = 0$$

 $X_j$  is the trial-specific covariate value.  $\beta$  is the corresponding treatment-by-covariate interaction term, which is the same for all interventions.

#### Link functions for shared parameter models

As described above, the available data is connected to the model via the likelihood and the link function  $\theta_{jk} = g(\gamma_{jk})$ . If different data summaries are used by different studies, it is necessary to use a shared parameter model, where different link functions and likelihoods are used for each study<sup>2</sup>. Our underlying model will be on the log hazard ratios *d*..., which can be fixed or random and include meta-regression effects as discussed. In SCD it will be necessary to connect the following data summaries.

1) Estimated annualized event log rate  $log(\lambda_{jk})$  (mean or median) with standard error  $se_{jk}$  are modelled with identity link and Normal likelihood

$$\log(\lambda_{jk}) \sim Normal(\theta_{jk}, se_{jk}^2)$$

2) Total number of events  $r_{jk}$  over exposure  $E_{jk}$  are modelled with log link and Poisson likelihood

$$r_{jk} \sim Pois(\lambda_{jk}E_{jk})$$
  
 $\theta_{jk} = \log(\lambda_{jk})$ 

- 3) Mean number of events per patient  $\bar{r}_{jk}$  over  $n_{jk}$  patients is transformed to total number of events  $r_{jk}$  and modelled as type 2 data.
- 4) Number of patients  $w_{ij}$  with  $\geq 1$  event over mean follow-up time  $t_{ij}$  are modelled with a binomial likelihood and complementary log log (cloglog) link with log time as offset

$$r_{jk} \sim Binomial(P_{jk}, n_{jk})$$
$$cloglog(P_{jk}) = \log(-\log(P_{jk})) = \log(t_{jk}) + \theta_{jk}$$

5) Log hazard ratio or log rate ratio  $log(hr_{jk})$  with standard error  $se_{jk}$  between active arm k and control arm b. This is slightly different as we no longer have data on both arms, only on the contrasts.

$$log(hr_{jk}) \sim Normal(\theta_{jk}, se_{jk}^2), \text{ for } k > b$$

and

 $heta_{jk}=d_{bk}$  if fixed effects  $heta_{jk}=\delta_{jbk},$  if random effects or meta-regressions

An adjusted standard error is needed for log hazard ratios if trials have more than 2 arms, as there is induced correlation between arms due to the common control.

## Table 1 Summary of analyses planned for different outcome measures on each of the outcomes

Outcome	Outcome		Analysis	Why this analysis
	measure		planned	
Crisis	Total crises	pain	Poisson likelihood, log link (Type 2 data)	Multiple events per patient so modelling underlying log hazard with a Poison likelihood.

	Mean or rate	Scale to total	Mean per patient gives total when scaled
	pain crises	pain crises	by patient number.
	Patients with ≥1	Binomial	At most one such 'event' per patient,
	pain crisis	likelihood	giving a binomial. Convert to log hazard
		with cloglog	scale modelled via Poisson using a
		link (type 4	cloglog function and a log follow-up time
		data)	offset.
		,	
	Risk	Normal	Direct observation of difference in log
	ratio/hazard	likelihood	rates/hazards.
	ratio of crisis	with identity	
		link (type 5	
		data)	
		,	
Hospitalization	Total	Poisson	Multiple events per patient so modelling
	hospitalization	likelihood, log	underlying log hazard with a Poison
	days	link (Type 2)	likelihood.
	Mean, median,	Scale to total	Mean per patient gives total when scaled
	or rate	hospitalizatio	by patient number.
	hospitalization	n days	
	days		
	<b>T</b> .(.).		
Adverse	I otal events	Poisson	Multiple events per patient so modelling
events or		likelihood, log	underlying log hazard with a Poison
serious		link (Type 2)	likelihood.
adverse	No. of potiente	Dinomial	At most one such 'avent' nor nationt
events	NO. OF patients	Binomiai	At most one such event per patient,
	with ≥ 1 event	likelinood	giving a binomial. Convert to log hazard
		with cloglog	scale modelled via Poisson using a
		link (type 4	cloglog function and a log follow-up time
		data)	offset.
	% nationts with	Scale to	Percentage gives total when multiplied by
	> 1 overt		notiont numbers
		patients with	
		≥ 1 event	

#### E.2 Outcome definitions used in the analyzed trials

#### Table 2: Definitions of VOC used in 5 RCTs included in base case crisis network

Study	Treatments	Crisis
Ataga 2017	Placebo, High-dose	Sickle cell–related pain crises were defined as acute episodes of pain, with
/ laga 2011	Crizanlizumab.	no medically determined cause other than a vaso-occlusive event that
	Low-dose	resulted in a medical facility visit and treatment, with oral or parenteral
	Crizanlizumab	narcotic agents or with a parenteral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug.
		The acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration.
		and priapism were also considered to be crisis events.
Ataga 2011	Placebo, senicapoc	A painful crisis was defined as an episode of acute pain with no cause
		other than a vaso-occlusive event that required a medical facility visit and
		treatment with oral or parenteral narcotics, or parenteral non-steroidal
		anti-inflammatory drugs. Included in the definition of painful crisis were
		acute chest syndrome, hepatic sequestration, splenic sequestration,
		priapism, stroke and death (with the exception of homicide, suicide, or
		accidental death). To ensure consistency across sites, all protocol-defined
		sickle-related painful crises identified by the Investigators that resulted in
		a visit to a medical facility were adjudicated by an independent, blinded,
		Crisis Review Committee (CRC).
Ataga 2008	Placebo senicanoc	An independent blinded crisis review committee adjudicated all sickle cell
7 augu 2000	(low-dose)	nainful crises and related adverse event data (Document S1). A nainful
	senicanoc (high-	crisis was defined as a period of severe pain (with no explanation other
	dose)	than SCD) lasting 4 or more hours in duration, requiring a visit to a health
		care facility, and requiring parenteral opiate or other narcotic for relief
Pace 2003	Placebo, NAC (low-	Defined as a visit to a medical facility that lasted more than 4 hr for acute
	dose) 600 mg/day,	pain related to vaso-occlusion requiring parenteral narcotics. The
	NAC (mid-dose)	occurrence of acute chest syndrome, priapism, splenic, or hepatic
	1200mg/day, NAC	sequestration was also counted as a VOC episode. Acute chest syndrome
	(high-dose)	included those subjects with chest wall pain and a new infiltrate on chest
	2400mg/day	X ray.
Niihara 2018	Placebo, L-	A pain crisis was defined as pain leading to treatment with a parenterally
	glutamine	administered narcotic or ketorolac in an emergency department (ED) (or
		outpatient treatment center) or during hospitalization.

#### Table 3: Adverse events reported in the 8 RCTs in the base case adverse events network

Study	Treatments	Outcome	Adverse events included
		name	
Ataga 2017	Placebo, High-dose	Adverse	"Headache, Back pain, Nausea, Arthralgia,
	Crizanlizumab,	events	Pain in extremity, Urinary tract infection, Upper
			respiratory tract infection, Pyrexia, Diarrhea,

	Low-dose Crizanlizumab		pain
		Serious adverse events	Pyrexia, Influenza, Pneumonia
Ataga 2011	Placebo, senicapoc	Adverse events	Nausea, Urinary tract Infection, Headache, Arthralgia, Upper respiratory tract Infection, Vomiting, Pyrexia, Pneumonia, Back pain, Pain in extremity, Nasopharyngitis, Cough, Constipation, Fatigue, Hypokalaaemia, Haematuria, Diarrhoea, Abdominal pain, Pharyngolaryngeal pain, Pruritus, Drug hypersensitivity
Ataga 2008	Placebo, senicapoc (low-dose), senicapoc (high- dose)	Adverse events	Diarrhea, Nausea, Constipation, Gastroenteritis, Upper respiratory tract infection, Chest pain, Increased SGOT, Arthralgia, Back pain
Niihara 2018	Placebo, L- glutamine	Adverse events	Tachycardia, Constipation, Nausea, Vomiting, Abdominal pain upper, Diarrhea, Chest pain (noncardiac), Fatigue, Urinary tract infection, Pain in extremity, Back pain, Headache, Dizziness, Nasal congestion
		Serious adverse events	A serious adverse event was defined as any adverse event, occurring while the patient was receiving the trial medication or placebo at any dose, that resulted in death, a life-threatening event, inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, a persistent or clinically significant disability or incapacity, or a congenital anomaly or birth defect. Notable medical events
			that might not have resulted in death, been life- threatening, or required hospitalization could be considered serious adverse events if it was determined, on the basis of appropriate medical judgment, that they could place the patient's health in jeopardy and might require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed in the definition of serious adverse events.

Glassberg 2017	mometasome placebo		Hoarseness of voice, thrush, sore throat
Sins 2017	NAC placebo	Adverse events	Gastro-intestinal complaints, Pruritus / Rash plus Discontinuation of study drug or placebo because of adverse event and serious adverse events
		Serious adverse events	Acute Chest Syndrome, Liver/splear sequestration, Pyelonefritis with admission Cholelithiasis with admission, Gastrointestina perforation, Pulmonary embolism, Pneumonia with admission
Wun 2013	Prasugrel, placebo	Any serious adverse event	No detail given but they were non-hemorrhagi events
NCT0248229 8	Placebo TICAGRELOR 10MG, TICAGRELOR 45MG	Adverse events Serious	Sickle cell anaemia with crisis, Abdominal pain nausea, toothache, vomiting, fatigue, non cardiac chest pain, pain, pneumonia, Uppe respiratory tract infection, Urinary trac infection, Arthralgia, Back pain Musculoskeletal chest pain, Musculoskeleta pain, pain in extremity, Headache Dysmenorrhoea, Cough, Epistaxis Oropharyngeal pain Reticulocytopenia, Sickle cell anemia wit crisis Local swelling, Henatic inchemic
		adverse events	crisis, Local swelling, Hepatic ischemia Cellulitis, Gastroenteritis, Lower respirator tract infection, Face injury, Arthralgia, Bac pain, Musculoskeletal chest pain, headache Acute chest syndrome, Vascular occlusion
Glassberg 2017	mometasome placebo		Hoarseness of voice, thrush, sore thr`oat

### E.3 Additional results of the network meta-analysis

Extended network for potential indirect evidence

We wished to assess whether additional direct or indirect evidence would be provided on comparators studied in the 9 RCTs of the adult only NMA by including the 25 excluded non-adult RCTs as well as Vichinsky 2010 on transfusions under the assumption that their standard of care was a placebo. To do this we plotted the evidence networks including non-adult RCTs reporting on crisis, hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events and connected to high-dose crizanlizumab. However, there were only additional RCTs connected to high-dose crizanlizumab reporting on the crisis outcome. No additional RCTs connected to high-dose crizanlizumab reported on hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events.

The extended evidence network for crisis is presented in Figure 1. This network consists of 9 RCTs, including 4 RCTs not in the adult only network: Daak 2018 (AlterniaTM vs placebo)<sup>3</sup>, Heeney 2016 (prasugrel vs placebo)<sup>4</sup>, Reid 2014 (HQK-1001 vs placebo)<sup>5</sup>, Vichinsky 2010 (transfusions vs standard of care)<sup>6</sup>. The extended network included 3 treatments not in the base case (AlterniaTM, HQK-1001, and Prasugrel). However, these additional RCTs did not provide direct or indirect evidence on any comparisons in the base case network.





\* Network included adult (base case) and non-adult studies. Adult studies: Ataga 2017 (crizanlizumab vs placebo), Ataga 2011 (senicapoc vs placebo), Ataga 2008 (senicapoc low-dose, senicapoc high-dose vs placebo), Pace 2003 (NAC vs placebo), Niihara 2017 (L-glutamine vs placebo), Vichinsky 2010 (transfusion vs placebo). Non-adult studies: Daak 2018 (AltemiaTM vs placebo), Heeney 2016 (prasugrel vs placebo), Reid 2014 (HQK-1001 vs placebo)

## Sensitivity analysis using >18 years old subgroup results from Niihara 2018 on L-glutamine

As our target population was patients  $\geq$ 16 years old the Niihara 2018 study with 51 patients aged 5-12, 67 aged 13-18, and 112 aged >18 potentially differed in important effect modifiers. We used the reported rate ratio of 0.64 with 95% confidence interval (0.45, 0.89) in a subgroup of patients aged >18 years old to repeat our NMA. The results are presented as forest plots in Figure 2 with p-value table in Table 4 and pairwise results in Table 13. Notably, the hazard ratio for crises on crizanlizumab vs L-glutamine is 0.86 (0.57, 1.29) with p-value 0.77; this is higher and more uncertain that the hazard ratio of 0.67 (0.51, 0.88) and p-value >0.99 estimated using the full results of Niihara 2018.

#### Figure 2. Forest plot using >18 years old subgroup results from Niihara 2018 on L-glutamine



Sd

Table 4. Bayesian probabilities that crizanlizumab is superior or inferior on each outcome analyzed using >18 year old subgroup results from Niihara 2018.
Treatment	Probability superior
Placebo	>0.9999
NAC (high-dose 2400mg)	0.1495
L-glutamine	0.7707
Low-Dose Crizanlizumab	0.9454
Senicapoc	>0.9999
High-Dose Senicapoc	0.8066
Low-Dose NAC	0.9429
Low-Dose Senicapoc 📈	0.8354
Mid-Dose NAC	0.6649

# Model assessment of the crisis network meta-analysis

Model fit and meta-regressions were explored. The base case fixed effects model fit well (total residual deviance close to number of data points<sup>7</sup>) but the meta-regressions did not converge (Gelman-Rubin Rhat statistic far from 1.000, very wide credible intervals for the regression coefficient). This was because there was only one RCT on each treatment contrast. Deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification as they are similar to the fixed effects analysis.

Table 5	. Crisis	among	the adult	population:	Model	comparison
---------	----------	-------	-----------	-------------	-------	------------

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman- Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	14	15.44 (6.11, 25.85)	102.8	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	14	15.59 (6.14, 26.23)	102.9	45.66 (-83.88, 188.64)	1.681

	17	16.07 (6.23,	103.8	-3.89 (-4.95, -	9 652	
Mean age FE	14	27.08)	105.8	2.85)	5.052	
	1.1	15.4 (6.15,	102.7	44.14 (8.16,	2 019	
Proportion HbSS FE	14	25.73)	102.7	72.78)	2.016	
	14	15.29 (6.18,	102.5	76.07 (47.4,	7 202	
Proportion HU use FE		25.44)		106.76)	7.592	
	14	15.18 (6,	102 E	-7.35 (-50.24,	7 5 2 0	
Trial duration FF	14	25.34)	102.5	37.51)	/.528	
Proportion	14	15.77 (6.37,	102.2	-2.93 (-78.26,	21 211	
	14	26.29)	103.3	72.71)	21.211	
		$\mathbf{O}$				

# Model assessment of the hospitalization days network meta-analysis

Model assessment and exploration of meta-regressions are presented in Table 6. The base case fixed effects model fits well (total residual deviance close to number of data points). Meta-regressions did not converge (Rhat statistic far from 1.000 and very wide credible intervals on the regression coefficient) as there was only one study on each treatment contrast. The deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification.

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman-Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	9	10.32 (3.02, 18.67)	72.69	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	9	10.46 (2.93, 19.2)	72.6	37.75 (-98.37, 172.76)	24.655
Mean age FE	9	10.52 (3.09, 19.2)	72.57	-5.85 (-7.09, - 4.67)	6.029
Proportion HbSS FE	9	10.28 (2.91, 18.68)	72.71	39.4 (-33.02, 108.38)	21.868

Table 6. Hospitaliza	tion days among	the adult population:	: Model comparison
	, , ,		

	0	10.22 (2.99,	72 44	78.51 (15.98,	7 5 9 2
use FE	5	18.53)	72.44	139.67)	7.302
	9	10.03 (2.9,	72.33	16.54 (-3.57,	34.345
Trial duration FE		18.16)		36.27)	
Proportion black FE		9.99 (3.05,	72.25	29.18 (-26.53,	27.276
	9	17.91)	/2.25	86)	27.376

# Model assessment for the adverse events network meta-anlaysis

Model assessment and exploration of meta-regressions are presented in Table 7. The base case fixed effects model fits well (total residual deviance close to number of data points). Meta-regressions did not converge (Rhat statistic far from 1.000 and very wide credible intervals on the regression coefficient) as there was only one study on each treatment contrast. The deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification.

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman-Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FF		12.38 (4.25,	71.72	NA	NA
DaserL	11	21.55)			
Proportion	11	12.51 (4.27,	71 96	57.94 (2,	1 838
female FE	11	21.81)	71.50	114.04)	1.030
	11	12.35 (4.11,	71 /6	0.27 (-4.32,	38 731
Mean age FE		21.73)	/1.40	4.95)	50.751
Proportion	11	12.65 (4.22,	71 8/	-45.33 (-	10 912
HbSS FE		22.29)	71.04	137.28, 42.08)	10.013
Proprotion HU	11	12.15 (4.25,	71 /	-25.25 (-81.24,	5 985
use FE		21.02)	/1.4	28)	5.985

### Table 7. Adverse events among the adult population: Model comparison

Trial duration FE	11	12.02 (4.18, 20.87)	71.11	21.33 (-1.45, 43.98)	20.575
Proportion black FE	11	12.31 (4.33, 21.3)	71.61	-20.3 (-48.26, 3.68)	4.349

# Model assessment for the serious adverse events network meta-anlaysis

Model assessment and exploration of meta-regressions are presented in Table 8. The base case fixed effects model fits well (total residual deviance close to number of data points). Meta-regressions did not converge (Rhat statistic far from 1.000 and very wide credible intervals on the regression coefficient) as there was only one study on each treatment contrast. The deviance and DIC do not in any case suggest evidence of effect modification.

Table 8. Serious adverse events a	among	the adult po	pulation: model	comparison
				00111pa.10011

Model	Number data points	Total residual deviance	DIC	Regression coefficient	Gelman- Rubin Rhat for regression
Base FE	12	13.49 (4.86, 23.2)	70.89	NA	NA
Proportion female FE	12	13.87 (4.96, 23.98)	71.27	-57.35 (-183.99, 65.33)	1.204
Mean age FE	12	13.98 (5.08, 24.06)	71.49	-2.06 (-4.45, 0.36)	40.773
Proportion HbSS FE	12	14.08 (5.04, 24.24)	71.96	51.6 (35.74, 65.75)	1.652
Proportion HU use FE	12	13.49 (4.92, 23.1)	70.99	-140.71 (-210.66, - 68.54)	13.326
Trial duration FE	12	13.62 (4.92, 23.54)	70.87	-19.04 (-34.58, -3.28)	15.267

Proportion black FE	12	13.37 (4.75, 23.13)	70.66	-5.77 (-118.35, 104.8)	36.318
------------------------	----	------------------------	-------	------------------------	--------

# **B.3 OpenBUGS code for the network meta-analysis**

The code for the four shared parameter models used to analyze crisis, hospitalization days, adverse events, and serious adverse events are presented below. This code was run in OpenBUGS version 3.2.3 <sup>8</sup> with two MCMC chains of 400,000 iterations for burn-in and 30,000 iterations for posterior sampling.

# Fixed effects model used for analyzing crisis.

model{ # Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2 # Poisson likelihood, log link # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials for(i in 1:ns2){ **#LOOP THROUGH STUDIES** *mu2[i]* ~ *dnorm(0,.0001)* # vague priors for all trial baselines # LOOP THROUGH ARMS for (k in 1:na2[i]) { r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]\*E2[i,k] # failure rate \* exposure # model for linear predictor log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]] #Deviance contribution dev2[i,k] <- 2\*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]\*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k])) # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]]) totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])</pre> #Total Residual Deviance totresdev<-totresdev2+0 # Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods d[1]<-0 # treatment effect is zero for control arm # vague priors for treatment effects for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) } for(k in 1:nt) { # Bayesian one-sided p-values # Probability that treatment j has higher hazard than treatment k # step(x) is 1 if x>=0 for (j in 1:nt){ pval[j,k] <- step(d[j]-d[k]) } } } # Data in BUGS format (some data is redundant) list(E2= structure(.Data= c(6.50000E+01, 6.70000E+01, 6.60000E+01, NA, 1.44000E+02, 1.45000E+02, NA, 6.92308E+00, 7.15385E+00, 6.69231E+00, NA. NA, 1.75000E+00, 2.91667E+00, 2.33333E+00, 2.91667E+00, 7.20000E+01, 1.40308E+02, NA, NA), .Dim=c(5, 4)),t2= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, 7.00000E+00, 9.00000E+00, NA, NA, 1.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, 1.00000E+01, 1.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00, NA, NA), .Dim=c(5, 4)), r2= structure(.Data= c(1.93700E+02, 1.09210E+02, 1.32660E+02, NA, 8.90000E+01, 1.06000E+02,

60

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

NA. NA. 5.00000E+00. 5.00000E+00. 5.00000E+00. NA. 8.00000E+00. 4.00000E+00.
1.20000E+01, 9.00000E+00, 3.04200E+02, 4.86400E+02, NA, NA), .Dim=c(5, 4)), n4=
structure(.Data= c(3.80000E+01, 3.80000E+01), .Dim=c(1, 2)), ns1=0.00000E+00, ns2=5.00000E+00.
ns4=0.00000E+00, ns5=0.00000E+00, na1=0.00000E+00, na2=c(3.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00,
3.00000E+00. 4.00000E+00. 2.00000E+00). na4=c(0.00000E+00. 0.00000E+00).
na5=c(0.00000E+00, 0.00000E+00), nt=1.00000E+01, x= structure(.Data= c( NA. NA. NA. NA.
NA. NA. 5.50505E-01. 2.80152E+01. 7.12121E-01. 6.21212E-01. 1.00000E+00. 9.19192E-01. NA.
NA,
NA. NA. 5.53633E-01. 2.89983E+01. 8.47751E-01. 5.64014E-01. 1.00000E+00. 9.51557E-01. NA.
NA,
NA, NA, 5.00000E-01, 3.54833E+01, 1.00000E+00, 5.37603E-01, 2.30769E-01, 8.14103E-01, NA,
NA,
NA, NA, 4.76190E-01, 2.05286E+01, 8.49869E-01, 5.37603E-01, 5.83333E-01, 8.14103E-01, NA,
NA,
NA, NA, 5.39130E-01, 2.20609E+01, 9.00000E-01, 6.65217E-01, 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01, NA,
NA,
01, 2.52754E+01, 8.49869E-01, 5.37603E-01, 9.51465E-01, 8.14103E-01), r2.base=c(1.93700E+02,
1.22000E+02, 8.90000E+01, 5.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, 3.04200E+02), E2.base=c(6.50000E+01,
1.27500E+02, 1.44000E+02, 6.92308E+00, 1.75000E+00, 7.20000E+01), r4.base=1.90000E+01,
time4.base=4.61538E-01, n4.base=3.80000E+01, ns2.base=6.00000E+00, ns4.base=1.00000E+00)
# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant)
# Inits 1
list(B=5.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00,
1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00), sd=1.00000E+00,
mu.base=1.00000E+00, mu2=c(1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00,
1.40000E+00))
# Inits 2
list(B=1.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01,
5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01), sd=5.00000E-01, mu.base=5.00000E-01,
mu2=c(7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01))
Fixed effects model used for analyzing hospitalization days.
model{
# Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2
# Poisson likelihood, log link
# Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
for(i in 1:ns2){    #LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
mu2[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) # vague priors for all trial baselines
for (k in 1:na2[i]) { # LOOP THROUGH ARMS
r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood
theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]*E2[i,k] # failure rate * exposure
# model for linear predictor
log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]]

#Deviance contribution

dev2[i,k] <- 2\*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]\*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k])) }

# summed residual deviance contribution for this trial resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]])

}

totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])</pre> #Total Residual Deviance totresdev<-totresdev2+0 # Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods d[1]<-0 # treatment effect is zero for control arm # vague priors for treatment effects for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) } for(k in 1:nt) {

1.00000E+00.

1.40000E+00,

# Bayesian one-sided p-values # Probability that treatment j has higher hazard than treatment k # step(x) is 1 if x>=0 for (j in 1:nt){ pval[j,k] <- step(d[j]-d[k]) }

}

}

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29 30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39 40 41

42 43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56 57

58

59

60

*# Data in BUGS format (some data is redundant)* 

NA, 6.50000E+01, 6.70000E+01, 6.60000E+01, 8.50000E+00, 5.00000E+00, NA, 7.20000E+01, 1.40308E+02. NA), .Dim=c(4, 3)), t2= structure(.Data=c(1.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00,NA. 1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, NA), .Dim=c(4, 3)),  $r^2 = structure(.Data = c(6.95300E+01, 9.34500E+01, 0.34500E+01)$ 4.00000E+00. NA 4.46550E+02, 2.68000E+02, 4.53420E+02, 5.30000E+01, 9.00000E+00, NA. 1.81000E+01. 1.21000E+01. NA), .Dim=c(4, 3)), ns1=0.00000E+00, ns2=4.00000E+00, na1=0.00000E+00, na2=c(2.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00. 2.00000E+00. 2.00000E+00),nt=6.00000E+00. X =structure(.Data = c(NA,NA, NA, NA, 4.42308E-01, 3.19615E+01, 9.61538E-01, NA, NA, 5.23307E-01, 3.07692E-01, 8.09945E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA. NA, NA, 5.50505E-01, 2.80152E+01, 7.12121E-01, NA. NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, 6.21212E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.19192E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA. NA, 5.97015E-01, 2.88836E+01, NA, NA, NA. NA. NA, NA, NA, NA. NA, 6.86567E-01, 4.17910E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.67164E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA. NA. NA, NA, 5.39130E-01, 2.20609E+01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, 9.00000E-01, 6.65217E-01, 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA. NA, NA. NA, NA, NA), .Dim=c(4, 4, 6)), mx=c(5.32240E-01, 2.81176E+01, 8.15057E-01, NA. NA. 5.23307E-01, 6.82692E-01, 8.09945E-01))

# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant) # Inits 1 list(B=5.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00), sd=1.00000E+00, mu.base=1.00000E+00, mu2=c(1.40000E+00,

# Inits 2

1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00))

*list*(*B*=1.00000*E*-01, d=c( NA, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, sd=5.00000*E*-01, mu.base=5.00000*E*-01, mu2=c(7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.0000*E*-01, 7.00

# Fixed effects model used for analyzing adverse events.

ł{ # Data type 2: r2 events in exposure E2 # Poisson likelihood, log link # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials **# LOOP THROUGH STUDIES** for(i in 1:ns2){ *mu2[i]* ~ *dnorm(0,.0001)* # vague priors for all trial baselines for (k in 1:na2[i]) { # LOOP THROUGH ARMS r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]\*E2[i,k] # failure rate \* exposure # model for linear predictor log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]] #Deviance contribution dev2[i,k] <- 2\*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]\*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k])) # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]]) totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])</pre> #Total Residual Deviance

Z	
3	
4	# Data type 4: number of patients r4 out of n4 with >=1 event in time4
5	# Binomial likelihood, cloglog link
6	# Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
7	for(i in 1:ns4){ #LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
8	mu4/ii ~ dnorm(00001) # vague priors for all trial baselines
9	for (k in 1:na4[i]) { #LOOP THROUGH ARMS
10	$r4i_i k_l \sim dbin(p[i_k].n4[i_k]) \# Binomial likelihood$
10	# model for linear predictor
17	cloaloa(p[i,k]) <- loa(time4[i,k]) + mu4[i] + d[t4[i,k]] - d[t4[i,1]]
12	$r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{2}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1}$ $r_{1$
13	#Deviance contribution
14	dev4[i k] <-2 * (r4[i k] * (log(r4[i k])-log(rhat[i k]))
15	+ $(n4[i k] - r4[i k]) * (log(n4[i k] - r4[i k]) - log(n4[i k] - rhat[i k]))) }$
16	# summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
17	resdev4[i] <- sum/dev4[i] 1:na4[i]])
18	
19	totresdev4 <- sum(resdev4[]) #Total Residual Deviance
20	totresdev-totresdev/2+totresdev/2+0
21	# Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods
22	$d[1]_{-0}$ # treatment effect is zero for control arm
23	# vague priors for treatment effects
24	for $(k \text{ in } 2 \text{ in } k)$ $d[k] \sim dnorm(0, 0001)$
25	for $(k \text{ in } 2.nk)$ ( $a[k]$ - $a(k)$ - $a(k$
26	
27	t # Bavesian one-sided n-values
28	# Probability that treatment i has higher hazard than treatment k
29	# resulting that total next free higher hazard than total next $x$
30	for (i in 1:nt){ $pvalli kl <- step(dlil-dlkl)$ }
31	
37	
32	,
34	# Data in BLIGS format (some data is redundant)
25	list(ns5=0.00000E+00) ns1=0.00000E+00 E2= structure(Data= c(3.92308E+00) 8.07692E+00)
26	240000F+01 = 240000F+01 = 144000F+02 = 145000F+02 = Dim=c(3 = 2)) t2= structure(Data=
30 27	$c(1\ 00000E+00\ 3\ 00000E+00\ 1\ 00000E+00\ 2\ 00000E+00\ 1\ 00000E+00\ 4\ 00000E+00)$ Dim= $c(3\ 00000E+00\ 1\ 0\ 0000E+00\ 1\ 0\ 0000E+00\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\$
57	2)) $r^2 = structure(Data= c/9.0000E+00.320000E+01.360000E+01.390000E+01.119000E+02.200)$
38	127000F+02 Dim=c(3 2)) time4= structure(Data= c(100000F+00 100000F+00 10000F+00 1000F+00 100F+00 1000F+00 1000F+00 1000F+00 1000F+00 100F+00 100F+000F+0
39	923077F-01 923077F-01 NA) Dim=c(2 3)) n4= structure( Data= c(6 20000F+01 6 60000F+01
40	6 40000F+01 7 80000F+01 1 52000F+02 NA) Dim=c(2 3)) t4= structure(Data= c(1 00000F+00))
41	5.00000E+00, 7.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00. NA). Dim=c(2. 3)). r4= structure(.Data=
42	c(5.50000E+01, 5.70000E+01, 5.60000E+01, 7.75000E+01, 1.48460E+02, NA) $Dim=c(2, 3)$
43	ns2=3.00000E+00, $ns4=2.00000E+00$ , $na2=c(2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00)$
44	na4=c(3.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00), nt=7.00000E+00, x= structure(.Data= c(NA_NA
45	NA. NA. 4.42308E-01. 3.19615E+01. 9.61538E-01. 5.31449E-01. 3.07692E-01. 8.45348E-01
46	5 50505F-01 2 80152F+01 7 12121F-01 6 21212F-01 1 00000F+00 9 19192F-01 NA NA
47	NA S97015E-01 2 88836E+01
48	6.86567E-01. 4.17910E-01. 5.00000E-01. 5.67164E-01. 5.39130F-01. 2.20609E+01. 9.00000E-01
49	6.65217E-01, 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01. NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. NA
50	NA. NA. NA. 5.53633E-01. 2.89983E+01. 8.47751E-01. 5.64014E-01. 1.00000E+00. 9.51557E-
51	(1  NA  N
52	(0, $\pi$ ) mx=c(5.36518E-01 2.82643E+01 8.21596E-01 5.31449E-01 7.46154E-01 8.45348E-01)
53	$r_2$ base=c(9,00000E+00) 3,60000E+01 1,19000E+02) E2 base=c(3,92308E+00) 2,40000E+01
54	1.44000F+02) r4 base=c(5.50000F+01 7.75000F+01) time4 base=c(1.00000F+00 9.23077F-01)
55	n4 hase=c(6.20000E+01, 7.80000E+01) ns2 hase=3.00000E+00, ns4 hase=2.00000E+00)
55	
50	

# Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant) # Inits 1

*list*(*B*=5.00000*E*-01, *d*=*c*( NA, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00, 1.00000*E*+00), *sd*=1.00000*E*+00, *mu.base*=1.00000*E*+00, *mu2*=*c*(1.40000*E*+00, 1.40000*E*+00), *mu4*=*c*(5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01))

# Inits 2

*list*(*B*=1.00000*E*-01, *d*=c( NA, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, 5.00000*E*-01, *mu.base*=5.00000*E*-01, *mu2*=c(7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01, 7.00000*E*-01), *mu4*=c(2.50000*E*-01, 2.50000*E*-01))

# Fixed effects model used for analyzing serious adverse events.

```
model{
         # Data type 2; r2 events in exposure E2
        # Poisson likelihood, log link
        # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
        for(i in 1:ns2){
                                     #LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
                 mu2[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001)
                                                 # vague priors for all trial baselines
                                            # LOOP THROUGH ARMS
                 for (k in 1:na2[i]) {
                         r2[i,k] ~ dpois(theta2[i,k]) # Poisson likelihood
                         theta2[i,k] <- lambda[i,k]*E2[i,k] # failure rate * exposure
                         # model for linear predictor
                         log(lambda[i,k]) <- mu2[i] + d[t2[i,k]] - d[t2[i,1]]
                          #Deviance contribution
                         dev2[i,k] <- 2*((theta2[i,k]-r2[i,k]) + r2[i,k]*log(r2[i,k]/theta2[i,k]))
                         # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
                         resdev2[i] <- sum(dev2[i,1:na2[i]])
                 }
        totresdev2 <- sum(resdev2[])</pre>
                                              #Total Residual Deviance
        # Data type 4; number of patients r4 out of n4 with >=1 event in time4
        # Binomial likelihood, cloglog link
        # Fixed effects model for multi-arm trials
        for(i in 1:ns4){
                                     # LOOP THROUGH STUDIES
                 mu4[i] ~ dnorm(0,.0001)
                                                 # vague priors for all trial baselines
                                            # LOOP THROUGH ARMS
                 for (k in 1:na4[i]) {
                         r4[i,k] ~ dbin(p[i,k],n4[i,k]) # Binomial likelihood
                         # model for linear predictor
                         cloglog(p[i,k]) <- log(time4[i,k]) + mu4[i] + d[t4[i,k]] - d[t4[i,1]]
                         rhat[i,k] <- p[i,k] * n4[i,k]
                                                        # expected value of the numerators
                         #Deviance contribution
                          dev4[i,k] <- 2 * (r4[i,k] * (log(r4[i,k])-log(rhat[i,k]))
                 + (n4[i,k]-r4[i,k]) * (log(n4[i,k]-r4[i,k]) - log(n4[i,k]-rhat[i,k])))
                                                                                    }
                         # summed residual deviance contribution for this trial
                         resdev4[i] <- sum(dev4[i,1:na4[i]])
                 }
        totresdev4 <- sum(resdev4[])
                                               #Total Residual Deviance
totresdev<-totresdev2+totresdev4+0
        # Treatment effect model is shared between the three likelihoods
                    # treatment effect is zero for control arm
        d[1]<-0
        # vague priors for treatment effects
        for (k in 2:nt){ d[k] ~ dnorm(0,.0001) }
        for(k in 1:nt)
        {
                 # Bayesian one-sided p-values
                 # Probability that treatment j has higher hazard than treatment k
                 \# step(x) is 1 if x>=0
                 for (j in 1:nt){ pval[j,k] <- step(d[j]-d[k]) }
        }
}
```

57

58

59

6

7

8

9

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

- # Data in BUGS format (some data is redundant) list(ns5=0.00000E+00, ns1=0.00000E+00, E2= structure(.Data= c(2.40000E+01, 2.40000E+01, NA, NA, 6.92308E+00, 6.92308E+00, 6.00000E+00), .Dim=c(3, 3)), t2= 1.56164E+00, 3.36986E+00, structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00, NA, 1.00000E+00, 3.00000E+00, NA. 1.00000E+00, 4.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00), .Dim=c(3, 3)), r2= structure(.Data= c(2.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, NA, 4.00000E+00, 8.00000E+00, NA, 6.00000E+00, 5.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00), 10 .Dim=c(3, 3)), time4= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 9.23077E-01, 11 NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), n4= structure(.Data= c(6.20000E+01, 6.60000E+01, 6.40000E+01, 9.23077E-01, 12 7.80000E+01, 1.52000E+02, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), t4= structure(.Data= c(1.00000E+00, 6.00000E+00, 13 8.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 7.00000E+00, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), r4= structure(.Data= c(1.70000E+01, 14 1.70000E+01, 2.10000E+01, 6.79380E+01, 1.18864E+02, NA), .Dim=c(2, 3)), ns2=3.00000E+00, 15 ns4=2.00000E+00. na2=c(2.00000E+00, 2.00000E+00. 3.00000E+00). na4=c(3.00000E+00. 16 2.00000E+00), nt=8.00000E+00, x= structure(.Data= c( NA, NA. NA. NA. NA. NA. 17 5.97015E-01, 2.88836E+01, 6.86567E-01, 4.17910E-01, 5.00000E-01, 5.67164E-01, 5.50505E-01, 18 2.80152E+01, 7.12121E-01, 6.21212E-01, 1.00000E+00, 9.19192E-01, NA. NA. NA. NA. 19 NA, 4.83871E-01, 3.24258E+01, 5.96774E-01, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA. 20 5.23307E-01, 6.45161E-02, 7.39642E-01, 5.39130E-01, 2.20609E+01, 9.00000E-01, 6.65217E-01, 21 9.23077E-01, 9.43478E-01, NA, 22 NA, 5.40230E-01, 2.22448E+01, 7.23866E-01, 5.23307E-01, 2.30769E-01, 5.28736E-01, NA, NA. 23 NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA), .Dim=c(3, 4, 6)), mx=c(5.42150E-NA, NA. NA, NA, 24 01, 2.72162E+01, 7.23866E-01, 5.23307E-01, 5.43672E-01, 7.39642E-01), r2.base=c(2.00000E+00, 25 4.00000E+00. 6.00000E+00), E2.base=c(2.40000E+01, 1.56164E+00. 6.92308E+00). 26 r4.base=c(1.70000E+01, 6.79380E+01), time4.base=c(1.00000E+00, 9.23077E-01), 27 n4.base=c(6.20000E+01, 7.80000E+01), ns2.base=3.00000E+00, ns4.base=2.00000E+00) 28
  - # Initial values (includes initial values for meta-regressions, which are redundant) # Inits 1

list(B=5.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00, 1.00000E+00. 1.00000E+00. 1.00000E+00).sd=1.00000E+00, mu.base=1.00000E+00. mu2=c(1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00, 1.40000E+00), mu4=c(5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01))

#### # Inits 2

list(B=1.00000E-01, d=c( NA, 5.00000E-01, 5.00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-0000E-00000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-0000E-000 5.00000E-01), sd=5.00000E-01, mu.base=5.00000E-01, mu2=c(7.00000E-01, 5.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01, 7.00000E-01), mu4=c(2.50000E-01, 2.50000E-01))

# E.4 Pairwise results of the NMA

# Table 9 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on crisis\*

	1.83 (1.45,	3.48 (1.06,	1.22 (1.06,	1.49 (1.19,	0.84 (0.64,	1.03 (0.28,	0.88 (0.33,	0.97 (0.26,	1.48 (0.55,
	2.31)	13.60)	1.40)	1.85)	1.12)	3.88)	2.15)	3.49)	3.90)
Placebo									
	High-Dose								
0.55 (0.43,	Crizanlizum	1.91 (0.57,	0.67 (0.51,	0.81 (0.63,	0.46 (0.32,	0.57 (0.15,	0.48 (0.18,	0.53 (0.14,	0.81 (0.29,
0.69)	ab	7.58)	0.88)	1.05)	0.67)	2.17)	1.21)	1.95)	2.18)
0.29 (0.07,	0.52 (0.13,	High-Dose	0.35 (0.09,	0.43 (0.11,	0.24 (0.06,	0.30 (0.04,	0.25 (0.07,	0.27 (0.04,	0.42 (0.11,
0.95)	1.76)	NAC	1.16)	1.42)	0.82)	1.77)	0.74)	1.65)	1.32)
0.82 (0.71,	1.50 (1.14,	2.85 (0.86,	L-	1.22 (0.94,	0.69 (0.50,	0.85 (0.23,	0.72 (0.27,	0.80 (0.21,	1.21 (0.44,
0.95)	1.97)	11.31)	glutamine	1.59)	0.95)	3.22)	1.79)	2.90)	3.22)
				Low-Dose					
0.67 (0.54,	1.23 (0.96,	2.34 (0.70,	0.82 (0.63,	Crizanlizum	0.57 (0.40,	0.70 (0.18,	0.59 (0.22,	0.65 (0.17,	1.00 (0.36,
0.84)	1.59)	9.28)	1.07)	ab	0.81)	2.65)	1.48)	2.39)	2.65)
1.18 (0.89,	2.17 (1.50,	4.12 (1.22,	1.45 (1.05,	1.76 (1.23,		1.23 (0.32,	1.04 (0.38,	1.15 (0.30,	1.75 (0.62,
1.57)	3.13)	16.55)	1.99)	2.53)	senicapoc	4.75)	2.63)	4.29)	4.75)
0.97 (0.26,	1.77 (0.46,	3.39 (0.57,	1.18 (0.31,	1.44 (0.38,	0.82 (0.21,	High-Dose	0.84 (0.17,	0.93 (0.25,	1.42 (0.27,
3.63)	6.74)	22.44)	4.43)	5.47)	3.15)	Senicapoc	4.19)	3.47)	7.25)

1.14 (0.46,	2.09 (0.82,	3.97 (1.36,	1.39 (0.56,	1.70 (0.68,	0.97 (0.38,	1.19 (0.24,	Low-Dose	1.11 (0.22,	1.70 (0.71,
3.00)	5.65)	15.03)	3.68)	4.58)	2.62)	6.02)	NAC	5.61)	4.16)
1.03 (0.29,	1.89 (0.51,	3.65 (0.61,	1.26 (0.34,	1.54 (0.42,	0.87 (0.23,	1.08 (0.29,	0.90 (0.18,	Low-Dose	1.53 (0.30,
3.88)	7.20)	23.66)	4.76)	5.86)	3.38)	3.97)	4.46)	Senicapoc	7.79)
0.68 (0.26,	1.23 (0.46,	2.36 (0.76,	0.82 (0.31,	1.00 (0.38,	0.57 (0.21,	0.70 (0.14,	0.59 (0.24,	0.65 (0.13,	Mid-Dose
1.83)	3.46)	8.95)	2.26)	2.80)	1.61)	3.67)	1.41)	3.35)	NAC

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= Nacetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

Table 10 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on a	all-cause hospitalization days*
------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Table 10 Hazard ratio	os comparing all treat	ments on all-cause h	ospitalization days*		
	1.72 (1.48, 2.00)	3.57 (1.85, 7.95)	2.97 (1.44, 6.35)	1.53 (1.12, 2.09)	1.00 (0.88, 1.14)
Placebo					
	High-Dose			_	
0.58 (0.50, 0.68)	Crizanlizumab	2.08 (1.06, 4.66)	1.73 (0.82, 3.76)	0.89 (0.63, 1.26)	0.58 (0.50, 0.68)
0.28 (0.13, 0.54)	0.48 (0.21, 0.95)	Low-Dose NAC	0.83 (0.28, 2.28)	0.43 (0.18, 0.89)	0.28 (0.12, 0.55)
0.34 (0.16, 0.70)	0.58 (0.27, 1.22)	1.21 (0.44, 3.52)	L-glutamine	0.51 (0.23, 1.13)	0.34 (0.16, 0.71)

0.66 (0.48, 0.90)	1.13 (0.80, 1.58)	2.35 (1.13, 5.47)	1.95 (0.89, 4.41)	Mometasome	0.66 (0.47, 0.92)
1.00 (0.88, 1.14)	1.72 (1.48, 2.00)	3.57 (1.82, 8.03)	2.97 (1.42, 6.45)	1.52 (1.09, 2.14)	Low-Dose Crizanlizumab

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

 High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= Nacetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 6mg daily, High-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 150mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

BMJ Open

	allos comparing an	treatments on aux	erse events			
	0.92 (0.59, 1.46)	0.57 (0.25, 1.13)	0.94 (0.74, 1.21)	1.09 (0.70, 1.70)	1.42 (0.79, 2.97)	1.05 (0.67, 1.64)
Placebo						
1.08 (0.69, 1.71)	Low-Dose NAC	0.61 (0.25, 1.42)	1.02 (0.61, 1.72)	1.19 (0.62, 2.24)	1.56 (0.74, 3.66)	1.14 (0.60, 2.17)
1.77 (0.88, 4.01)	1.64 (0.70, 4.08)	Mometasome	1.67 (0.80, 3.86)	1.95 (0.84, 4.83)	2.55 (1.02, 7.58)	1.86 (0.80, 4.59)
1.06 (0.82, 1.36)	0.98 (0.58, 1.65)	0.60 (0.26, 1.25)	Senicapoc	1.16 (0.69, 1.91)	1.51 (0.80, 3.30)	1.11 (0.67, 1.86)
				High-Dose		
0.91 (0.59, 1.43)	0.84 (0.45, 1.60)	0.51 (0.21, 1.19)	0.86 (0.52, 1.44)	Crizanlizumab	1.31 (0.62, 3.08)	0.96 (0.61, 1.48)
0.70 (0.34, 1.26)	0.64 (0.27, 1.36)	0.39 (0.13, 0.98)	0.66 (0.30, 1.25)	0.76 (0.32, 1.60)	L-glutamine	0.73 (0.31, 1.53)
						Low-Dose
0.95 (0.61, 1.50)	0.88 (0.46, 1.68)	0.54 (0.22, 1.25)	0.90 (0.54, 1.50)	1.04 (0.67, 1.63)	1.37 (0.65, 3.21)	Crizanlizumab

Table 11 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on adverse events\*

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

1	
2	
2	
ر ۸	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
17	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
<u>4</u> 0	
 ⊿1	
יד ⊿ר	
+∠ ∕\?	
45 44	
44	
45	
46	

		0.22	(0.03,	1.04	(0.27,	1.22	(0.35 <i>,</i>	0.88	(0.27,	1.08	(0.54,	1.34	(0.95 <i>,</i>	0.80	(0.42
		0.92)		3.36)		4.39)		2.85)		2.14)		1.89)		1.53)	
Placebo															
4.50	(1.08,			4.67	(0.68,	5.70	(0.81,	4.05	(0.59,	4.92	(1.00,	6.05	(1.40,	3.66	(0.75
37.94)		Low-Do	ose NAC	50.13)		63.02)		43.70)		42.52)		50.86)		31.45)	
0.96	(0.30,	0.21	(0.02,			1.19	(0.22,	0.85	(0.16,	1.04	(0.27,	1.30	(0.38,	0.78	(0.20
3.64)		1.48)		Prasugr	el	7.18)		4.95)		4.55)		5.12)		3.32)	
0.82	(0.23,	0.18	(0.02,	0.84	(0.14,	High-Do	ose	0.72	(0.20,	0.87	(0.21,	1.10	(0.29,	0.65	(0.16
2.82)		1.24)		4.63)		Ticagre	lor	2.42)		3.69)		3.97)		2.66)	
1.14	(0.35,	0.25	(0.02,	1.18	(0.20,	1.40	(0.41,	Low-Do	se	1.23	(0.32,	1.53	(0.45,	0.92	(0.24
3.75)		1.69)		6.24)		5.00)		Ticagre	lor	4.86)		5.28)		3.52)	
0.93	(0.47,	0.20	(0.02,	0.96	(0.22,	1.14	(0.27,	0.81	(0.21,	High-Do	se	1.24	(0.58,	0.75	(0.39
1.87)		1.00)		3.74)		4.81)		3.17)		Crizanli	zumab	2.70)		1.43)	

Ī	0.74	(0.53,	0.17	(0.02,	0.77	(0.20,	0.91	(0.25,	0.65	(0.19,	0.80	(0.37,			0.60	(0.29,
	1.05)		0.71)		2.64)		3.41)		2.22)		1.72)		L-glutamine		1.24)	
	1.24	(0.65,	0.27	(0.03,	1.29	(0.30,	1.54	(0.38,	1.09	(0.28,	1.34	(0.70,	1.67	(0.81,	Low-Dos	se
	2.40)		1.33)		4.95)		6.35)		4.20)		2.58)		3.47)		Crizanliz	umab

\* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

Table 13 Hazard ratios comparing all treatments on crisis	s us	sin	ng >	>18 year old subgroup results from Niihara 2018*

	1.83 (1.44,	3.49 (1.09,	1.56 (1.11,	1.48 (1.19,	0.85 (0.64,	1.02 (0.28,	0.88 (0.34,	0.97 (0.26,	1.47 (0.55,
	2.32)	13.48)	2.19)	1.86)	1.12)	3.75)	2.10)	3.52)	3.90)
Placebo									
	High-Dose								
0.55 (0.43,	Crizanlizum	1.91 (0.58,	0.86 (0.57,	0.81 (0.63,	0.46 (0.32,	0.56 (0.15,	0.48 (0.18,	0.53 (0.14,	0.81 (0.29,
0.69)	ab	7.46)	1.29)	1.05)	0.67)	2.10)	1.18)	1.96)	2.20)
0.29 (0.07,	0.52 (0.13,	High-Dose	0.45 (0.11,	0.43 (0.11,	0.24 (0.06,	0.29 (0.04,	0.25 (0.07,	0.27 (0.04,	0.42 (0.11,
0.92)	1.72)	NAC	1.52)	1.40)	0.81)	1.66)	0.74)	1.60)	1.32)
0.64 (0.46,	1.17 (0.77,	2.24 (0.66,	L-	0.95 (0.63,	0.54 (0.35,	0.65 (0.17,	0.56 (0.20,	0.62 (0.16,	0.94 (0.33,
0.90)	1.77)	8.93)	glutamine	1.43)	0.84)	2.51)	1.43)	2.35)	2.66)

				Low-Dose					
0.67 (0.54,	1.23 (0.96,	2.35 (0.71,	1.05 (0.70,	Crizanlizum	0.57 (0.40,	0.69 (0.18,	0.59 (0.22,	0.65 (0.17,	0.99 (0.37,
0.84)	1.59)	9.19)	1.58)	ab	0.81)	2.57)	1.45)	2.43)	2.69)
1.18 (0.89,	2.16 (1.50,	4.14 (1.23,	1.85 (1.19,	1.76 (1.23,		1.21 (0.32,	1.04 (0.38,	1.14 (0.30,	1.75 (0.62,
1.57)	3.12)	16.30)	2.88)	2.51)	Senicapoc	4.58)	2.60)	4.29)	4.79)
0.98 (0.27,	1.79 (0.48,	3.45 (0.60,	1.53 (0.40,	1.45 (0.39,	0.82 (0.22,	High-Dose	0.86 (0.18,	0.94 (0.25,	1.43 (0.28,
3.61)	6.83)	22.24)	5.91)	5.48)	3.14)	Senicapoc	4.13)	3.47)	7.35)
				2					
1.13 (0.48,	2.08 (0.85,	3.98 (1.35,	1.77 (0.70,	1.68 (0.69,	0.96 (0.38,	1.17 (0.24,	Low-Dose	1.10 (0.23,	1.68 (0.72,
2.94)	5.48)	14.62)	4.89)	4.45)	2.61)	5.71)	NAC	5.49)	4.17)
					10.				
1.04 (0.28,	1.89 (0.51,	3.66 (0.63,	1.63 (0.43,	1.54 (0.41,	0.88 (0.23,	1.07 (0.29,	0.91 (0.18,	Low-Dose	1.53 (0.30,
3.84)	7.17)	23.10)	6.32)	5.82)	3.39)	3.93)	4.36)	Senicapoc	7.76)
						<u> </u>			
0.68 (0.26,	1.24 (0.46,	2.36 (0.76,	1.06 (0.38,	1.01 (0.37,	0.57 (0.21,	0.70 (0.14,	0.60 (0.24,	0.65 (0.13,	Mid-Dose
1.81)	3.41)	9.08)	3.00)	2.73)	1.60)	3.53)	1.39)	3.31)	NAC

 \* Pairwise hazard ratios of row vs. column; values below 1 in, for example, the high-dose crizanlizumab row suggest lower hazard of event on crizanlizumab than on comparator.

High-Dose Ticagrelor=twice daily 45mg, Low-Dose Ticagrelo=twice daily 10mg; Low-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 600mg, Mid-Dose NAC=N-acetylcysteine 1200mg, High-Dose NAC= N-acetylcysteine 2400mg; Senicapoc=loading dose of 20mg twice daily for 4 days followed by 10mg daily maintenance, Low-Dose Senicapoc=single loading dose of 100mg followed by maintenance 10mg daily.

# E.5 Cumulative ranking plots - Rankograms

In this appendix we provide the cumulative ranking plots, which are called 'rankograms'. These are the cumulative probability that each treatment is in the top 1, 2, 3, ... treatments on the basis of each outcome.

### Figure 3 Cumulative ranking plot for Crisis



Figure 4 Cumulative ranking plot for adverse events





# Figure 5 Cumulative ranking plot for serious adverse events





# Figure 6 Cumulative ranking plot for all-cause hospitalization days

# E.6 Sensitivity analysis using precise priors on treatment and baseline effects

A sensitivity analysis was conducted using a more precise prior on the baseline and treatment effects (i.e.  $\mu_{..}$  and  $d_{..}$ , respectively). Instead of the base case priors of Normal(0, 0.0001) we used Normal(0, 0.1). The forest plot of results is in Figure 7 and the Bayesian probabilities of superiority (along with a comparison with base case results) are presented in Table 14. There is very limited impact on the results so our results are likely robust to prior assumptions.

Mid-Dose NAC

Low-Dose NAC

Senicapoc

L-glutamine

Placebo

High-Dose NAC

Low-Dose Senicapoc

High-Dose Senicapoc

Crizanlizumab 2.5mg/kg

#### Figure 7. Forest plot of all outcomes using more precise prior distributions

0.78 (0.28, 2.09)

0.54 (0.15, 1.92)

0.48 (0.18, 1.16)

0.57 (0.16, 2.07)

0.46 (0.32, 0.67)

0.81 (0.63, 1.05)

0.67 (0.51, 0.88)

1.78 (0.54, 6.66)

0.55 (0.43, 0.69)

# VOC

•

÷







#### Adverse events



#### Serious adverse events





Table 14 Bayesian probabilities that crizanlizumab is superior on each outcome analyzed using both the precise prior sensitivity analysis and the vague priors of the base case\*

				Serious				Serious
		All-cause	Adverse	adverse		All-cause	Adverse	adverse
	VOC	hospitalization	events	events	voc	hospitalization	events	events
Placebo	>0.9999	>0.9999	0.6384	0.5895	>0.9999	>0.9999	0.6558	0.5857
L-glutamine	0.9982	0.0747	0.2563	0.2847	0.9982	0.0731	0.2480	0.2854
Crizanlizumab 2.5mg/kg	0.9425	>0.9999	0.5772	0.8136	0.9452	>0.9999	0.5743	0.8134
Mometasome	-	0.7548	0.9408	-	- 16	0.7496	0.9399	-
Low-Dose NAC	0.9486	0.0193	0.6978	0.9601	0.9396	0.0166	0.6996	0.9744
Mid-Dose NAC	0.6919	-	-	-	0.6619	-	0	-
High-Dose NAC	0.1720	-	-	-	0.1507	-	-	2
Prasugrel	-	-	-	0.5398	-	-	-	0.5242
Senicapoc	>0.9999	-	0.7038	-	>0.9999	-	0.7176	-

 BMJ Open

High-Dose Senicapoc	0.8077	-		-	-	0.8010	-	-	-	
Low-Dose Senicapoc	0.8328	-		-	-	0.8334	-	-	-	
High-dose Ticagrelor	-	-	4	De	0.4380	-	-	-	0.4247	
Low-dose Ticagrelor	-	-		- <i>K</i>	0.6267	-	-	-	0.6181	

# References

- 1. Cooper NJ, Sutton AJ, Morris D, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Addressing between-study heterogeneity and inconsistency in mixed treatment comparisons: Application to stroke prevention treatments in individuals with non-rheumatic atrial fibrillation. *Stat Med.* 2009;28(14):1861-1881.
- 2. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making.* 2013;33(5):607-617.
- Daak AH, M.; Dampier, C.; Fuh, B.; Kanter, J.; Alvarez, O.; Black, V.; McNaull, M.; Callaghan, M.; George, A.; Neumayr, L.; Hilliard, L.; Sancilio, F.; Rabinowicz, A. Clinical effect of SC411 (Alternia TM) on children with sickle cell disease in the scot trial: A phase 2 randomized, doubleblind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, dose-finding multi-center study. *Pediatric Blood and Cancer.* 2018;65 (Supplement 1):S8.
- Heeney MH, C.; Abboud, M.; Inusa, B.; Kanter, J.; Ogutu, B.; Brown, P.; Heath, L.; Jakubowski, J.; Zhou, C.; Zamoryakhin, D.; Agbenyega, T.; Colombatti, R.; Hassab, H.; Nduba, V.; Oyieko, J.; Robitaille, N.; Segbefia, C.; Rees, D. Determining effects of platelet inhibition on vasoocclusive events (DOVE) trial: A double-blind, placebo-controlled, study of prasugrel in paediatric patients with sickle cell anaemia. *Haematologica*. 2016;101 (Supplement 1):136-137.
- 5. Reid MEEB, Amal; Inati, Adlette; Kutlar, Abdullah; Abboud, Miguel R.; Haynes, Johnson, Jr.; Ward, Richard; Sharon, Bruce; Taher, Ali T.; Smith, Wally; Manwani, Deepa; Ghalie, Richard G. A double-blind, placebo-controlled phase II study of the efficacy and safety of 2,2-dimethylbutyrate (HQK-1001), an oral fetal globin inducer, in sickle cell disease. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2014;89(7):709-713.
- 6. Vichinsky EP, Neumayr LD, Gold J, Weiner MW. A Randomized Trial of the Safety and Benefit of Transfusion Vs. Standard Care In the Prevention of Sickle Cell-Related Complications In Adults: a Preliminary Report From the Phase II NHLBI Comprehensive Sickle Cell Centers (CSCC) Study of Neuropsychological Dysfunction and Neuroimaging Abnormalities In Neurologically Intact Adult Patients with Sickle Cell Disease. *Blood (abstract only).* 2010;116:3221.
- 7. Dias S, Welton N, Sutton A, Ades A. NICE DSU Technical Support Document 2: A Generalised Linear Modelling Framework for Pairwise and Network Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials. *Report by the Decision Support Unit.* 2011 (last updated September 2016).
- 8. Lunn D, Jackson C, Best N, Thomas A, Spiegelhalter DJ. *The BUGS book : a practical introduction to Bayesian analysis.* Boca Raton ; London: CRC Press; 2013.

Author/Year/Country Ref/Enrolment/NCT registry	Design Total N of PT (N of female); N of arm Follow-ups	Interventions	Crisis	All-cause Hospitalization days	Adverse events (AE)	Serious adverse events (SAE
Glassberg 2017 <sup>47</sup> USA	RCT, triple-blind Adults and adolescents	<ol> <li>Mometasone furoate 220mcg OD inhale (n=35)</li> <li>In addition to standard SCD care</li> </ol>		Rate hospitalization days: 2.67	Total number of AE: 32	
Feb 2014 to Oct 2016 NCT02061202	Single centre 54 (23); 2 16 weeks	2. Placebo (n=17) In addition to standard SCD care		Rate of hospitalization days: 4.09	Total number of AE: 9	
Ataga 2017 <sup>15</sup>	RCT, double-blind	1. Crizanlizumab 5 mg/kg IV	Median annual	Annual rate of days		
Brazil, Jamaica, USA Aug 2013 to Jan 2015	Adults and adolescents	(n=67) Two doses 2 weeks apart (loading dose) and then every 4 weeks. A	rate of crisis 1.63	hospitalized 4.00	Number of patients with ≥1 AE: 57	Number of patients with ≥1 SAE: 17
NCT01895361	Multicentre	total of 14 doses for 50 weeks	6			
	198 (109); 3 52 weeks	<ul> <li>2. Crizanlizumab 2.5 mg/kgIV (n=66)</li> <li>Two doses 2 weeks apart (loading dose) and then every 4 weeks. A</li> <li>total of 14 doses for 50 weeks</li> </ul>	Median annual rate of crisis 2.01	Annual rate of days hospitalized 6.87	Number of patients with ≥1 AE: 56	Number of patients with ≥1 SAE: 21
		3. Placebo (n=65)	Median annual rate of crisis 2.98	Annual rate of days hospitalized 6.87	Number of patients with ≥1 AE: 55	Number of patients with ≥1 SAE: 17
Sins 2017 <sup>48</sup> Netherlands, Belgium, UK	RCT, double-blind	1. NAC 600mg BID oral (n=27)		Total hospital admission days: 9	Total number of AE: 39	Total number of SAE: 8
Apr 2013 to Nov 2015 NCT01849016	Multicentre 96 (40); 2 6 months	2. Placebo (n=40)		Total hospital admission days: 53	Total number of AE: 36	Total number of SAE: 2
Niihara 2018 <sup>12</sup> US	RCT, double-blind (phase 3)	1. L-glutamine 0.3 g/kg BID oral (n=152)	Mean number pain crises: 3.2	Total hospitalization days: 12.1	Percentage with ≥1 AE: 0.98	Percentage with ≥1 SAE: 0.782

Page 160 of 160

BMJ Open

3 4 5	Jun 2010 to Dec 2013 NCT01179217	Adults and children 2. pl Multicentre 230 (124); 2	acebo (n=78) Mean number T pain crises: 3.9 c	otal hospitalization lays: 18.1	Percentage with ≥1 AE: 1.00	Percentage	with ≥1 SAE: 0.871
6 7		48 weeks					
, 8 9	Ataga 2011 <sup>56</sup> United	RCT, double-blind (phase 3, terminated early)	1. Senicapoc 20mg/d BID (loading) and then 10mg/dOD oral (n=145)	Total number of crises: 89		Total number of AE:	
10 11	States, Jamaica, Brazil,	Adults and adolescents				127	
12 13 14	France, Trinidad and - the United Kingdom.	Multicentre 497 (160); 2	2. Placebo (n=144)	Total number of crises: 106		Total number of AE: 119	
15 16 17 18	Feb 2005 to Apr 2007 NCT00102791	52 weeks					
19 20 21	Ataga 2008 <sup>52</sup> US	RCT, double-blind (phase 2) Adults	1. Senicapoc (high-dose): 150 mg (loading dose);10 mg/d (maintenance) oral OD (n=31)	0 Total number of crises: 5		· · · ·	
21 22 23	Feb 2002 and Jan 2004 NCT00040677	Multicentre 90 (45); 3	<ol> <li>Senicapoc (low-dose): 100 mg (loading dose);6 mg/d(maintenance) oral OD (n=29)</li> </ol>	Total number of crises: 5		· · · ·	
24 25 26		12 weeks	3. Placebo (n=30)	Total number of crises: 5			
27 28	Pace 2003 <sup>51</sup>	RCT, double-blind	1. NAC (high-dose) 2400mg/day (n=6)	Total number of		· · · ·	
29 30		Adults and Adolescents	All doses were divided by 3 to be taken	crises. 5			
31 32		Single centre 21 (10); 4	2. NAC (mid-dose) 1200mg/day (n=5) All doses were divided by 3 to betaken	Total number of crises: 5	J.		
33 34 35		7 months	3. NAC (low-dose) 600 mg/day (n=5)	Total number of crises: 4			
36			All doses were divided by 3 to be taken				
38 39			4. Placebo (n=5)	Total number of crises: 3			
40 41	NCT02482298⁵⁵ USA, Egypt, France,	RCT, double-blind	1. Ticagrelor 45mg BID oral (n=30)				Total number of SAE: 5
42 43	Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, UK, Turkey	Adults	2. Ticagrelor 10MG BID oral (n=27)			·	Total number of SAE: 6
44 45 46 47		·	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.co	om/site/about/guidelin	es.xhtml		

1				
2				
3		Multicentre	3. Placebo (n =30)	Total number of
4	Jul 2015 to Nov 2016	87 (47); 3		SAE: 6
5				
6		12 weeks		
/	Wun 2013 <sup>46</sup>	RCI, double-blind (phase 2)	1. Prasugrei 5 mg/day oral (n=41)	lotal number of
8	Canada	Adults		SAE: 8
9	Canada	Adults	$2 \operatorname{placeha}(n, 10)$	Tatal mumber of
10		Multicentre	2. placebo (n=19)	Lotal number of
11	26 Aug 2010 to 13 Jun	62 (30); 2		JAL. 4
12	2011			
1.0	NCT01167023			
14				
16	*****			
17	*ACS: ACUTE	cnest syndrome; ALL: Alanine transa	minase; CA: Conference abstract; Cr: creatinine; CSRPM: Center for Scientific Research into Plant Medicine; C1: Clinical trial registry; DDCF: Doris Duke nt: HhSS: Homozygous sickle beemoglobin (HhS): HhSC: sickle beemoglobin S and beemoglobin C: HhSB: sickle bete thelessemia, type (0' or '±': HU:	
18	hvdroxvurea	JA: Journal article: MTX: Methotrex	ate: NAD: N-acetvlcvsteine :NCATS: National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences: NCRR: National Center for Research Resources: NHLBI:	
19	National Hea	rt Lung and Blood Institute; NSAID: N	Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; NR: Not reported; OOPD: FDA's Office of Orphan Products Development; PT: patient; SCD: sickle cell disease;	
20	TCD: transcra	nial Doppler; ZonMw: The Netherla	nds Organisation for Health Research and Development	
21	** Entry is hl	ank if no data provided for crisis all-	cause hospitalization days, advarse events, or serious advarse events. See annendiv for relevant link function to connect different outcome	
22	summaries to	o network meta-analysis.	cause hospitalization days, adverse events, or sendus daverse events. See appendix for relevant link function to connect different outcome	
23		,		
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
3/				
38				
39				
40 ⊿1				
41 ∕\2				
+∠ ⊿२				
د⊢ ⊿⊿				
44 45			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
 Δ6				
47				