

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**

# Relevance between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-072319
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Feb-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Jun; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Zhang, Na; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurology Ding, Cong; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery He, Xiuying; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Li, Meihua; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Meng, Wei; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Ouyang, Taohui; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery
Keywords:	Multiple sclerosis < NEUROLOGY, Ultrasound < RADIOLOGY & IMAGING, NEUROSURGERY

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts



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



1		
2 3		D. I
4	1	Relevance between chronic cerebrospinal venous
5 6	2	insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic
7 8 9	3	review and meta-analysis
10 11 12	4	Jun Yang, <sup>1</sup> Na Zhang, <sup>2</sup> Cong Ding, <sup>1</sup> Xiuying He, <sup>1</sup> Meihua Li, <sup>1</sup> Wei Meng, <sup>1</sup> Taohui Ouyang, <sup>1,*</sup>
12 13 14	5 6	1 Department of Neurosurgery, the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, 330006, China
15 16 17	7 8	2 Department of Neurology, the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, 330006, China
19 20 21	9 10	* Correspondence: husttjouyang110@163.com; Tel.: +86(0791) 88698265; Fax: +86(0791)88698265
22	11	ABSTRACT
23 24 25	12 13 14	<b>Objectives</b> Numerous studies have indicated that chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is a potential factor in causing multiple sclerosis in recent years, but this conclusion remains unconfirmed. This meta-analysis examined the correlation between multiple sclerosis and chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency.
26 27 28	15 16	Methods We searched Embase and Medline (Ovid) for publications published from January 1, 2006, to May 1, 2022. The meta-analysis was performed following PRISMA guidelines.
28 29 30	17 18	<b>Results</b> Eligible studies ( $n = 20$ ) included 3,069 participants from seven countries. Pooled analysis indicated that chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency was more frequent in multiple sclerosis patients than in healthy controls (odds ratio
31	19	(OR) 3.36; 95% confidence interval (CI) $1.92 - 5.85$ ; p < 0.001) with remarkable heterogeneity among studies (I <sup>2</sup> =
32 33 34	20 21 22	79%). Results were more strongly correlated in subsequent sensitivity analyses, but heterogeneity was also more substantial. We removed studies that initially proposed a CCSVI team as well as studies by authors involved in or advocating endovascular therapies.
35 36 27	23 24	<b>Conclusions</b> Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is significantly associated with multiple sclerosis and it is more prevalent in MS patients than in healthy individuals, but considerable heterogeneity of results is still observed.
38	25	STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY
<ol> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> </ol>	26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	The strength of this meta-analysis is the comprehensive pooling of the literature on chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis for analysis, which not only reveals a strong correlation between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis but also finds that the prevalence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is higher in patients with multiple sclerosis than in healthy individuals. It plays an important role in advancing the theory of etiology research of multiple sclerosis. At the level of research methodology, we performed subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis in an attempt to go full circle and explore the important connection points between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis-related. However, this study still has limitations because the strong heterogeneity of the articles prevented us from reaching definitive conclusions, and the small number of recent studies on this subject is one of the limitations of this study.
49 50 51	35 36	<b>KEYWORDS</b> multiple sclerosis; chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency; ultrasound; meta-analysis
52 53	37	Number of words 3062
54 55	38	Number of figures 6 (5 in the body and 1 in the supplementary material.)
56 57	39	Number of tables 4 (1in the body and 3 in the supplementary material.)
58 59		1 / 10
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# BMJ Open

## 2 40 INTRODUCTION

41 Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory condition of the central nervous system of unknown cause, and most findings 42 suggest that the reason is autoimmune pathology.<sup>1</sup> In 2008, Zamboni *et al.* suggested that chronic cerebrospinal venous 43 insufficiency (CCSVI) could potentially cause MS.<sup>2</sup> This hypothesis assumed that multiple stenoses or obstructions of the 44 veins, which in turn affect the extracranial outflow channels of the cerebral venous system (internal jugular and odd veins), 45 eventually lead to an increase in intracranial pressure, followed by blood-brain barrier rupture, local iron deposition, and 46 triggering of the inflammatory chain in MS.<sup>3-6</sup> In addition, Zamboni *et al.* defined five ultrasound criteria for diagnosing 47 CCSVI by transcranial and extracranial echo color Doppler in a study, which revealed that patients had CCSVI when two

47 CCSVI by transcranial and extracranial echo color Doppler in a study, which revealed that patients had CCSVI when two
 48 or more abnormal ultrasound parameters were observed.<sup>3 4</sup> These five ultrasound parameter criteria include (1) Reflux in

49
 the internal jugular and/or vertebral veins in the supine and sitting positions. (2) Reflux in the deep cerebral veins. (3) High-resolution B-mode evidence of internal jugular vein stenoses. (4) Flow is not Doppler-detectable in the internal jugular and/or vertebral veins. (5) Reverted postural control of the main cerebral venous outflow route measured in internal jugular veins.
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 55
 56
 57

Since then, most investigators have used this criterion to diagnose patients with CCSVI, but the evaluation results of the correlation between CCSVI and MS were inconsistent across studies. Coupled with the fact that despite the availability of neuroimaging techniques such as magnetic resonance venogram<sup>7</sup> or selective venography<sup>8</sup> to assess abnormal central system venous drainage, the pathogenic role of CCSVI in MS remains unproven. In addition, the possibility of CCSVI therapy has been a topic of conversation, including intravenous percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (termed "Liberation treatment") proposed by Zamboni et al.<sup>9</sup> This treatment has received widespread attention from patients with MS and scientific institutions worldwide.<sup>10 11</sup> Still, articles have reported potentially adverse consequences<sup>12</sup> and confirmed the procedure as safe but largely ineffective in follow-up trials.<sup>13</sup> The lack of sufficient proof that CCSVI is connected to MS has called into question the idea of intravenous percutaneous transluminal angioplasty, especially given the various research results and associated negative side effects.

To evaluate whether CCSVI was connected with MS and whether its frequency varied between MS patients and healthy controls, this study did a thorough meta-analysis by pooling studies on the connection of CCSVI with MS. Furthermore, sensitivity analyses were utilized to investigate potential explanations for heterogeneity.

#### 30 66 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 67 Literature search

This meta-analysis was based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Reporting Guidelines.<sup>14</sup> Two authors independently searched the Medline versus Embase databases using the OVID portal, with search dates adjusted from January 1, 2006, to April 1, 2022. Search terms included: "Multiple Sclerosis," "multiple adj sclerosis," "Neuromyelitis Optica," "neuromyelitis adj optica," "Myelitis, Transverse," "transverse adj myelitis," "Demyelinating Diseases," "demyelinating adj (disease? or disorder?)", "Encephalomyelitis, Acute Disseminated," "ADEM," "encephalomyelitis," "Optic Neuritis," "optic adj neuriti\$," "devic," "clinically isolated syndrome?" AND "Ultrasound," "exp Ultrasonography," "ultrasonogra\$," "ul-trasound\$," "Doppler\$," "Magnetic Resonance Angiography," "magnetic resonance an-giogra\$," "magnetic resonance arteriogra\$," "Cerebral Angiography," "cerebral adj an-giogra\$," "cerebral adj arteriogra\$," "venous adj angiogra\$," "venous adj arteriogra\$," "brain adj angiogra\$," "brain adj arteriogra\$," "exp Phlebography," "phlebogra\$," "venogra\$." The search findings were restricted to English language articles and human studies. Following that, we critically reviewed all publications that fit these parameters and conducted manual searches of their references and citations of relevant reviews to search for research outside the database. If data were missing or erroneous, the researchers contacted the author again.

### 81 Eligibility

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) English language, (2) use of Doppler ultrasound to detect CCSVI, (3) neurological testing criteria used to identify CCSVI, (4) inclusion of at least one control group, and (5) blinding of study.

Exclusion criteria were: (1) no raw data or incomplete data, (2) overlapping data (the study with the complete data chosen for the series of the same author and pattern), (3) literature of too low quality or literature not available in full text, and (4) less than 10 cases or control subjects.

After deleting duplicates, two researchers independently read the titles and abstracts of all identified papers, read the fulltext versions, compared the results, and resolved discrepancies by consensus.

### 89 Data extraction

Two authors extracted data and entered it into a standardized collection form, independently reviewed and confirmed by a third author. The extracted data were as follows: first author, country, publication date, sample size, demographic

2 / 10 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

characteristics of participants (age vs. percentage female), and study characteristics of patients (dis-ease duration, percentage treated, and expanded disability status scale). For some of the missing data, the researchers were also active in obtaining it from the article's authors via email.

#### Assessment of risk of bias

Using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool, two researchers independently evaluated each paper for possible bias. A third reviewer was consulted to settle any problems with the studies. Of these, we focused on six domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and selective outcome reporting. We did not include other biases from this assessment because the definitions were too broad and, therefore, difficult to judge in the study.

The assessment trial's overall risk of bias was considered low if the investigators had a low risk of bias for all of its conclusions. If it was determined that a test had a high risk of bias in at least one area, it was considered to have a high risk of bias overall. Otherwise, we considered the study's bias risk to be ambiguous.

#### **Quality assessment**

All 20 studies used the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale to assess the risk of bias.<sup>15</sup> The scale is based on case-control studies and consists of three domains: selection, comparability, and exposure, with quality ratings ranging from 0 to 9. Four study items are in the selection domain, each given a maximum of one star. Three study items are in the exposure category, each given at least one star. For comparability, only one item is included, and a maximum of two stars is presented. We consider this high-quality literature with low bias if at least seven stars are awarded.

#### Statistical analyses

STATA 17.0 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, USA) was used to conduct the meta-analysis by the researchers. One investigator entered the detailed data into the software. Another investigator reviewed the data for accuracy, generating forest plots and odds ratios (ORs) to determine whether there was a statistical relevance between CCSVI and MS. The pooled ORs for this study were derived using a random-effects model. An OR greater than 1.0 indicates that at least two ultrasound diagnostic criteria were met and displayed a positive correlation between CCSVI and MS, with p < 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference. The origins of heterogeneity in the included studies were examined using Cochran's Q and  $I^2$  statistics.  $I^2$  values of at least 50% are usually considered to represent substantial heterogeneity, while values of at least 75% indicate considerable heterogeneity. By the Cochrane Review Manager 5.4 version 5.4.1. for publication bias was assessed using the Egger test, p < 0.05 indicates significant publication bias. Meanwhile, the Fill and Trim methods were used to correct for publication bias. To determine the effect of individual studies in the article on the experimental results, the researchers used a sensitivity analysis by excluding individual studies. In addition, we used subgroup analysis to further look for sources of heterogeneity. 

#### RESULTS

#### **Included studies**

The selection process of the study is shown in Figure 1. During the initial search, 2,544 studies were located, with 1,910 records from the EMBASE database, 634 from the Medline database, and no additional records. After removing 468 duplicate research, 2,076 publications were included in the title and abstract screening, and 58 were selected for full-text filtering. After full-text screening and checking, 38 of these articles were excluded: 10 examined irrelevant focus, 18 assessed veins in other ways, one without a control group, five did not use blinding, one used duplicate data, two used overlapping, and one had incomplete experimental data. Ultimately, 20 studies<sup>4 16-34</sup> met the eligibility criteria (Fig. 1).

#### **Study characteristics**

Of the currently incorporated studies, 11 were conducted in Italy, three in the USA, two in Germany, one in Canada, one in Denmark, one in the Netherlands, and one in Turkey (Table 1). It is noteworthy that the included studies were conducted in Europe or North America. This study included healthy controls (Table 1). All the studies used Doppler ultrasonography to detect CCSVI. Two studies<sup>22 28</sup> did not report an assessment of the five ultrasound parameters of the CCSVI, and three studies<sup>24 27 29</sup> reported only four estimates because the investigators were unable to perform the full five-item neurological protocol. Although eight papers covered ultra-sound technology training, they did not describe in detail the procedures and quality of the training (Table 1). Four ultrasound investigators<sup>4</sup> <sup>16</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>34</sup> have participated in CCSVI endovascular treatment clinical trials or studies supporting liberation procedures. 

In terms of blinding, eight reports explained the blinding poorly but described the process more entirely in 12 studies, expressed it well in two of them, and reported success with blinding (Table 1). Five studies<sup>16 19 23 25 30</sup> described intra-observer variability. Nevertheless, only four studies<sup>16 19 25 30</sup> described good intra-and inter-observer reliability in a run-in 

#### **BMJ** Open

supplementary appendix 1). Furthermore, most patients received varying degrees of treatment, with acceptance rates ranging from 28% to 90% (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 1). Females were more prevalent in the experimental groups than in the control groups, with percentages ranging from 16.7% to 82.1% in the experimental groups and 36.4% to 75.0% in the control groups. The supplementary appendix 2 summarizes the data for patients with MS for age, the proportion of females, duration of disease, and Expanded Disability Status Scale scores. These data are typical of patients with MS. 

	he charao multiple :	cteristic scleros	s of meta is and cor	a-analysis study on the incidence htrols.	of chronic cere	brospinal veno	us insufficiency in
Study	Country	MS cases (n)	Controls (n)	Blinding	Receive appropriate training in ultrasound operation	Involved in "Liberation procedure"	The way of patie identified for enrolment
Zivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>16</sup>	US	289	163	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	Yes	Convenience
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>18</sup>	Italy	112	67	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	Italy	68	68	The process of blinding is described and has been achieved	Yes	Yes	Consecutively
Cardaioli <i>et al</i> <sup>29</sup>	Italy	39	18	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Imperiale <i>et al</i> <sup>25</sup>	Italy	80	41	The process of blinding is described and has been achieved	Yes	No	Consecutively
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>20</sup>	Germa- ny	20	20	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Convenience
Baracchini <i>et al</i> <sup>32</sup>	Italy	60	60	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Costello <i>et al</i> <sup>27</sup>	Canada	120	60	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Van den Berg <i>et</i> al <sup>17</sup>	Netherl- ands	90	41	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	Yes	No	Convenience
Patti <i>et al</i> <sup>19</sup>	Germa- ny	148	172	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate	Yes	No	Convenience

Baracchini <i>et al<sup>33</sup> Italy 50 110</i>		et al <sup>33</sup> Italy 50 110 Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind			No	No	Consecutively	
_	Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	al <sup>26</sup> US 90 38 Describes the process of blinding, No No but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved		Consecutively				
_	Centonze <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	Italy	84	56 Describes the process of blinding, Yes No but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved		Convenience		
_	Zamboni <i>et al</i> 4	Italy	109	132	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	Yes	Yes	Convenience
_	Mancini <i>et al</i> ²²	Italy	103	42	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
_	Marder <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	US	18	11	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
_	Kantarci <i>et al</i> <sup>24</sup>	Turkey	62	54	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Convenience
_	Blinkenberg <i>et</i> <i>al</i> <sup>31</sup>	Danish	24	15	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
_	Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>30</sup>	Italy	78	28	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	No	Convenience
_	Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>34</sup>	Italy	15	16	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
58	Note. NA = n	ot applica	ıble; n = ı	numbe	r; MS = multiple sclerosis.			
59	<b>Risk of bias</b>	(quality)	assessm	ent				
60 61 62 63	All 20 stud Fifteen studie <sup>29-34</sup> None of the suppleme	lies were es had a q the incor ntary app	included uality ra porated s pendix 1)	in the ting of studies . In ad	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we were categorized as low quality with dition, the risk of bias items for each in	t Scale, and ai re considered a high risk of acluded study	l had a good qu high-quality st bias assessme is shown in Fig	uality rating result. udies. <sup>17</sup> <sup>18</sup> <sup>20</sup> <sup>21</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>27</sup> nt (see table e3 in gure 2.
64	Pooling of st	udies						
65  66  67	In further s CCSVI in MS incidence of	studies, F S versus h CCSVI in	igure 3 p lealthy co l MS con	resent ontrols npared	s the meta-analysis results of the assoc . Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study	iation of CCS e of CCSVI, v y, three studie	VI with MS an with a significant with a significat	d the incidence of at difference in the nce of 0, reaching

-5.85; p < 0.001). However, there was extensive heterogeneity among the studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 79%). 

#### **Publication bias**

The Egger test was employed to analyze publication bias, and its results showed no significant publication bias (t = 1.22, p = 0.241).

#### Sensitivity analyses

#### BMJ Open

Sensitivity analysis of the 20 included papers was applied using STATA 17.0. The results demonstrated that the combined
effect sizes were not affected by the effects of any single study, suggesting good stability of the Meta-analysis results (see
figure f1 in the supplementary appendix 2).

Since Zamboni and colleagues were overly aggressive in their studies on CCSVI (n = 11), additional subgroup analyses were performed by removing studies about Zamboni's team and those that had previously been conducted with that team (n = 7). Although MS patients had CCSVI at a higher rate than controls, the correlation between CCSVI and MS was diminished (OR 2.83; 95% CI: 1.46 - 5.48, p < 0.05; Figure 4) and remained strongly heterogeneous (I<sup>2</sup> = 56%). On the other hand, the correlation between the two was stronger (OR 4.11; 95% CI: 1.62 - 10.39, p < 0.001; Figure 4), and the heterogeneity was more pronounced in the seven excluded studies ( $I^2 = 89.4\%$ ). 

In the following sensitivity analysis, considering the potential conflicts of interest between the studies, we deleted articles by authors involved in CCSVI endovascular treatment clinical trials or studies supporting liberation procedures (n = 4). There was no substantial change in outcome, a diminished correlation (OR 2.87; 95% CI: 1.82 – 4.52; p < 0.05; Figure 5), and heterogeneity remained significant ( $I^2 = 54.4\%$ ). In contrast, a more significant correlation was obtained for those studies assessed in support of liberation therapy authors (OR 17.05: 95% CI: 1.27 - 229.53; p < 0.0001; Figure 5), along with more significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 96.1\%$ ). 

#### 191 DISCUSSION

This meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between CCSVI and MS and a wide range of heterogeneity. In a subsequent sensitivity analysis, the results showed that the combined effect size was not affected by any single study. We also performed subgroup analyses to seek sources of heterogeneity, but none of the results were satisfactory.

The meta-analysis also found that patients with MS had a higher prevalence of CCSVI than healthy groups, but it varied considerably across studies. On the other hand, however, we could not confirm what factors led to the significant differences in incidence between the studies. One of these possibilities is the ultrasound detection aspect. Many studies have shown that the quality level of Doppler ultrasound for diagnosing CCSVI depends on the operator and that trained operators perform better in reproducibility.<sup>35 36</sup> This imaging technique is more difficult when testing veins at low-pressure flow, and the dehydrated state of the subject<sup>37</sup> and head rotation<sup>38</sup> contribute to the poor quality of the results. Of all included studies, only eight articles had relevant operator training.<sup>4</sup> <sup>16</sup> <sup>17</sup> <sup>19</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>28</sup> <sup>30</sup> For consistency of operation, performance was equally poor, where only five included studies were evaluated,<sup>16 19 23 25 30</sup> and four showed good agreement.<sup>16 19 25 30</sup> These data further suggest that the reproducibility of CCSVI diagnostics requires additional studies while emphasizing the importance of relevant operator training in the skills. 

Ultrasound detection of the intracranial cerebral venous system is the most challenging part. On the one hand, the cerebral vein detection procedure is complex and usually studied through a transcranial approach, taking either a temporal window or a trans-occipital approach.<sup>39 40</sup> Although both provide better information on blood flow, detecting venous abnormalities is difficult. Due to the skull, the intracranial veins are not regulated by the respiratory pump as the extracranial veins usually are.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, 17 of the surveyed studies conducted transcranial testing,<sup>4 16-23 25 26 28 30-34</sup> 8 employed a transtemporal window.<sup>4 17 20 25 31-34</sup> while the other two utilized a trans-temporal and trans-occipital approach<sup>18 21</sup> without detailing the modality used for the remaining. On the other hand, all included studies were performed in the context of a potential association between multiple sclerosis and CCSVI. However, when examined from an objective perspective, it seems more accurate to test the validity of a test versus a test using an established gold standard rather than focusing on the presence or absence of MS.<sup>42</sup> This suggests that the five neurological tests proposed by Zamboni are questionable, such as vascular stenosis, internal jugular vein cross-sectional area differences or reflux which are challenging to detect objectively by these criteria.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, the relationship between CCSVI and multiple sclerosis still needs more studies and uniform standards to be validated.

Interestingly, this study contradicts a previous meta-analysis<sup>43</sup> that showed reduced heterogeneity after removing publications related to the liberation procedures ( $I^2 = 37.3\%$ ). In contrast, considerable heterogeneity was still observed after the same manipulation in this paper ( $I^2 = 54.4\%$ ), which may be due to inconsistent inclusion criteria for both studies. Although both included studies used neurological criteria, Tsivgoulis *et al.*<sup>43</sup> included non-blinded studies as well as reports from experimental groups with fewer than 10 cases, leading to a final inclusion of demographics varying widely and inconsistent sensitivity analysis results.

### 225 LIMITATION

The current meta-analysis has some limitations that must be taken into account. Although 20 papers were selected based on strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, there were significant differences in sample size, blinding practices, neurological

> 6 / 10 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

protocols for ultrasound testing, and patient diagnostic criteria. Although studies that did not use blinding were excluded. most included studies had insufficient information on blinding. Furthermore, six studies<sup>4 16 19 25 33 34</sup> also included non-MS groups with other neurological disorders. In the current study, we included only healthy controls. We did not acquire the data of the individuals in the study, and there were considerable age and sex differences between the studies, coupled with the fact that five reports did not have controls of the same age and sex as the MS patients, so it was impossible to determine whether demographic factors influenced the morbidity of CCSVI in controls and patients with MS. More critically, the topic of CCSVI versus MS remains controversial. Studies may be published regardless of the examination method or whether they are positively or negatively evaluated. Finally, the inconsistent diagnostic criteria for screening patients with MS across studies and the lack of reliable evidence in the text to determine the diagnosis of subjects made it impossible to judge the accuracy of the experimental versus control groups.

#### CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the present meta-analysis exhibited a strong correlation between CCSVI and MS, while CCSVI was more likely to occur in patients with MS than in healthy controls. Nevertheless, the heterogeneity was highly significant that we cannot draw clear conclusions. Future studies of higher quality, especially in terms of blinded quality and reproducibility of ultrasound diagnosis, are still needed to derive a deeper discussion of the association of CCSVI with MS. 

Acknowledgments We are very grateful to Chole Fu and Dr Liu for their support and assis-tance in this study. 

Author Contributions JY was the first author. NZ received funding. TO and JY designed the study. WM and ML collected the data. XH participated in data verification. CD analyzed the data. JY drafted the manuscript. TO and NZ participated in the interpretation of the results and critical revision of important intellectual content of the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript. wM and ML were the guarantors of the study. 

Funding This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81960247). 

- Competing interests None declared.
- Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.
- **Patient consent for publication** This study does not involve human participants and patient consent was not required.
- Ethics approval This study does not involve human participants and ethical approval was not required.
- **Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
- Data Availability Statement All data in this article were available from included studies and were provided by the authors without reservation.

**Supplemental material** This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer- reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise. 

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Baecher-Allan C, Kaskow BJ, Weiner HL. Multiple Sclerosis: Mechanisms and Immunotherapy. Neuron 2018;97(4):742-68. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2018.01.021
- 2. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Weinstock-Guttman B, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is related to inverted and decreased cerebrospinal fluid flow and greater brain atrophy in patients with multiple sclerosis. Multiple Sclerosis 2009;15(9 Suppl. S):S210. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1352458509106963
- 3. Zamboni P, Galeotti R, Menegatti E, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis. Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry 2009;80(4):392-9. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2008.157164

## **BMJ** Open

1		
2	273	4. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Galeotti R, et al. The value of cerebral Doppler venous haemodynamics in the assessment of
3	274 275	multiple scierosis. Journal of the Neurological Sciences 2009;282(1-2):21-27. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jps.2008.11.027
4 5	276	5. Zamboni P. Menegatti E. Weinstock-Guttman B. et al. The severity of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in
6	277	patients with multiple sclerosis is related to altered cerebrospinal fluid dynamics. <i>Functional neurology</i>
7	278	2009;24(3):133-8.
8	279	6. Zamboni P. The Big Idea: Iron-dependent inflammation in venous disease and proposed parallels in multiple sclerosis.
9	280	Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2006;99(11):589-93. doi:
10	281	$\frac{\text{https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014107680609901122}}{\text{7} Wetting MD and Overfull and the first second state of the second st$
11	282 283	/. Wattjes MP, van Oosten BW, de Graaf WL, et al. No association of abnormal cranial venous drainage with multiple
12	284	and psychiatry 2011:82(4):429-35 doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/inpp.2010.223479
13	285	8. Hojnacki D. Zamboni P. Lopez-Soriano A. et al. Use of neck magnetic resonance venography. Doppler sonography and
14	286	selective venography for diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a pilot study in multiple
15	287	sclerosis patients and healthy controls. International angiology : a journal of the International Union of Angiology
16	288	2010;29(2):127-39.
17 10	289	9. Zamboni P, Galeotti R, Menegatti E, et al. A prospective open-label study of endovascular treatment of chronic
10	290	cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. Journal of vascular surgery 2009;50(6):1348-3. doi:
20	291	https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvs.2009.07.096
21	292	the treatment of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency <i>CardioVascular and Interventional Radiology</i>
22	294	$2011^{3}4(1)^{1-2}$ doi http://dx doi org/10.1007/s00270-010-0050-5
23	295	11. Chafe R, Born KB, Slutsky AS, et al. The rise of people power. <i>Nature</i> 2011;472(7344):410-11. doi:
24	296	http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/472410a
25	297	12. Tsivgoulis G, Faissner S, Voumvourakis K, et al. "Liberation treatment" for chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency
26	298	in multiple sclerosis: The truth will set you free. Brain and Behavior 2015;5(1):3-12. doi:
27	299	$\frac{\text{http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/brb3.297}}{12.7}$
28	300	13. Zamboni P, Tesio L, Galimberti S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Extracranial Vein Angioplasty in Multiple Scierosis: A Bendemized Clinical Trial 14M4 Neural 2018;75(1):25-42, doi: 10.1001/jemenaural 2017.2825
29	307	14 Page MI McKenzie IF Bossuvt PM et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an undated guideline for reporting systematic
30 21	303	reviews. Syst Rev 2021:10(1):89. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4 [published Online First: 2021/03/31]
22	304	15. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell J. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing The Quality of Nonrandomised
32	305	Studies in Meta-analyses. Ottawa Health Research Institute Web site 2014;7
34	306	16. Zivadinov R, Marr K, Cutter G, et al. Prevalence, sensitivity, and specificity of chronic cerebrospinal venous
35	307	insufficiency in MS. <i>Neurology</i> 2011;77(2):138-44. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e318212a901</u>
36	308	17. Van den Berg PJ, Van den Berg GB, Westerhuis LW, et al. Occurrence of CCSVI in patients with MS and its
37	309	relationship with iron metabolism and varicose veins. European journal of neurology 2013;20(3):519-26. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/org.12010
38	310	18 Tromba I. Blasi S. Vestri A. et al. Prevalence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple sclerosis: a
39	312	blinded sonographic evaluation. <i>Phlebology</i> 2015:30(1):52-60. doi:
40	313	https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0268355513512823
41	314	19. Patti F, Nicoletti A, Leone C, et al. Multiple sclerosis and CCSVI: a population-based case control study. PloS one
42	315	2012;7(8):e41227. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041227
43	316	20. Mayer CA, Pfeilschifter W, Lorenz MW, et al. The perfect crime? CCSVI not leaving a trace in MS. Journal of
44 45	317	neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry 2011;82(4):436-40. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2010.231613
45 46	310	21. Marder E, Gupta P, Greenberg BM, et al. No cerebral or cervical venous insufficiency in US veterans with multiple selerosis. Archives of neurology 2011;68(12):1521.5. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1001/orchpourol.2011.185
40 47	320	22 Mancini M Morra VB Di Donato O et al Multiple sclerosis: cerebral circulation time <i>Radiology</i> 2012;262(3):947-
48	321	55. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1148/radiol.11111239
49	322	23. Leone MA, Raymkulova O, Naldi P, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is not associated with multiple
50	323	sclerosis and its severity: a blind-verified study. <i>PloS one</i> 2013;8(2):e56031. doi:
51	324	https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056031
52	325	24. Kantarci F, Albayram S, Demirci NO, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: does ultrasound really
53	326	distinguish multiple sclerosis subjects from healthy controls? <i>European radiology</i> 2012;22(5):970-9. doi:
54	১∠। ३२०	<u>nups://dx.doi.org/10.100//S00550-011-2558-5</u> 25. Impariala D. Malia E. Giacona C. et al. Chronic corphrominal various insufficiency in multiple coloradia a
55	320	25. Impenate D, Wens F, Olaccone C, et al. Chlonic celebrospillar venous insufficiency in multiple sciences: a sonographer-blinded case-control study. <i>Clinical neurology and neurospiragery</i> 2013:115(8):1304.9 doi:
56	330	https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2013.01.003
57		
50 50		8 / 10
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- Page 10 of 28
- 331
   332
   333
   26. Gandhi S, Marr K, Mancini M, et al. No association between variations in extracranial venous anatomy and clinical outcomes in multiple sclerosis patients over 5 years. *BMC neurology* 2019;19(1):121. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12883-019-1350-2
  - 27. Costello F, Modi J, Lautner D, et al. Validity of the diagnostic criteria for chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and association with multiple sclerosis. *CMAJ* : *Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne* 2014;186(11):E418-26. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.131431
  - 28. Centonze D, Floris R, Stefanini M, et al. Proposed chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency criteria do not predict multiple sclerosis risk or severity. *Annals of neurology* 2011;70(1):51-8. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.22436</u>
  - 29. Cardaioli G, Di Filippo M, Bianchi A, et al. Extracranial Venous Drainage Pattern in Multiple Sclerosis and Healthy
     Controls: Application of the 2011 Diagnostic Criteria for Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous Insufficiency. *European neurology* 2016;76(1-2):62-8. doi: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000445540">https://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000445540</a>
     Caprio MG, Marr K, Gandhi S, et al. Centralized and Local Color Doppler Ultrasound Reading Agreement for Diagnosis
    - 30. Caprio MG, Marr K, Gandhi S, et al. Centralized and Local Color Doppler Ultrasound Reading Agreement for Diagnosis of the Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous Insufficiency in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis. *Current neurovascular research* 2017;14(3):266-73. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1567202614666170718095203</u>
  - 345 31. Blinkenberg M, Akeson P, Sillesen H, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and venous stenoses in multiple
     346 sclerosis. Acta neurologica Scandinavica 2012;126(6):421-7. doi: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.2012.01671.x">https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.2012.01671.x</a>
  - 348 32. Baracchini C, Perini P, Causin F, et al. Progressive multiple sclerosis is not associated with chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. *Neurology* 2011;77(9):844-50. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31822c6208
  - 350 33. Baracchini C, Perini P, Calabrese M, et al. No evidence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency at multiple 351 sclerosis onset. *Annals of neurology* 2011;69(1):90-9. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.22228</u>
     352 34. Amato MP. Saia V. Hakiki B, et al. No association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and pediatric-
    - 34. Amato MP, Saia V, Hakiki B, et al. No association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and pediatriconset multiple sclerosis. *Multiple sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England)* 2012;18(12):1791-6. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1352458512445943</u>
  - 355 35. Simka M. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: Current perspectives. J Vasc Diagnostics 2014;2:1-13. doi: 10.2147/JVD.S47384
  - 357 36. Menegatti E, Genova V, Tessari M, et al. The reproducibility of colour Doppler in chronic cerebrospinal venous
     358 insufficiency associated with multiple sclerosis. *Int Angiol* 2010;29(2):121-26.
  - 359 37. Diaconu CI, Fox RJ, Grattan A, et al. Hydration status substantially affects chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency assessments. *Neurology Clinical practice* 2013;3(5):386-91.
  - 361 38. Farina M, Novelli E, Pagani R. Cross-sectional area variations of internal jugular veins during supine head rotation in multiple sclerosis patients with chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a prospective diagnostic controlled study with duplex ultrasound investigation. *BMC Neurol* 2013;13:162. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-13-162
  - 364 39. Baumgartner RW, Nirkko AC, Müri RM, et al. Transoccipital power-based color-coded duplex sonography of cerebral
     365 sinuses and veins. *Stroke* 1997;28(7):1319-23.
  - 366 40. Baumgartner RW, Gönner F, Arnold M, et al. Transtemporal power- and frequency-based color-coded duplex sonography of cerebral veins and sinuses. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 1997;18(9):1771-81.
  - 368 41. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Pomidori L, et al. Does thoracic pump influence the cerebral venous return? *J Appl Physiol* (1985) 2012;112(5):904-10. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00712.2011
  - 42. Simka M, Ludyga T, Latacz P, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of current sonographic criteria for the detection of outflow abnormalities in the internal jugular veins. *Phlebology* 2013;28(6):285-92. doi: 10.1258/phleb.2012.011125
    - 43. Tsivgoulis G, Sergentanis TN, Chan A, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: A comprehensive meta-analysis of case-control studies. *Therapeutic Advances in Neurological Disorders* 2014;7(2):114-36. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1756285613499425

- 53 382 54 383
- **38**4
- <sup>56</sup> 385

**9 / 10** For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- 2 386 3 387 4 388 5 388 6 389 7 390 8 391 Figure legends
  - 10 392 Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection.

12393<br/>recentages (upper figure); risk of bias summary (lower figure).12393

Figure 3 Meta-analysis of the probability of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls.

Figure 4 Sensitivity analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (lower panels).
 with Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (lower panels).

400
 22 401
 401
 402
 403
 404
 404
 405
 405
 406
 406
 407
 407
 408
 409
 409
 409
 400
 400
 401
 402
 401
 402
 402
 403
 404
 405
 405
 405
 406
 407
 408
 408
 409
 409
 409
 400
 400
 401
 401
 402
 401
 402
 402
 403
 404
 404
 405
 405
 405
 406
 407
 408
 408
 409
 409
 401
 401
 402
 402
 402
 403
 404
 404
 405
 405
 405
 406
 407
 408
 408
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409
 409</li

25 403

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

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a manuscript entitled "Relevance between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis" (bmjopen-2023-072319). This is my reply email to the last rejected manuscript (bmjopen-2022-068364), and I have responded to the reviewers' criticisms. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have put into providing your valuable feedback on the paper.

Below is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

#### **Reviewer 1**

#### Comment 1, 2

1. There is one substantial problem with this submission which needs correction. While the Authors claim for significant role for latitude in the possible association between CCSVI and MS, actually they don't present data supporting such a link. Moreover, they are ignoring geographical data – Italian studies were performed at the same latitude as American ones, Germany, Netherlands, Denmark and Canada are north of Italy (while the prevalence of MS increases with the location closer to the north pole). Then, why to exclude Italy because of geographic location?

2. Also, a lack of centers located in tropical and polar regions is understandable. Tropical countries, maybe except for Singapore, are poor and no many scientific research comes from these countries.
Polar regions, on the other hand, are nearly uninhabited, thus there will be no patients to examine there.
Response 1, 2

We removed the previous conclusion that " Latitude plays an important role in the possible link between CCSVI and MS". After much discussion and analysis by the team members, we were unable to find an indicator that plays an important role in the linkage between CCSVI and MS (manuscript, p. 7, lines 237-

 241).

#### Comment 3

The Authors should mention in the discussion problem with the examining intracranial vein.

Evaluation of the flow in these veins has been excluded from revised protocol for CCSVI diagnosis:

Zamboni et al Screening for chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency (CCSVI) using ultrasound-

recommendations for a protocol

http://www.ccsvicampaniaonlus.it/public/files/nuovapropostadiprotocolloecocodopplerccsviprofzambo

ni.pdf

and

Zivadinov et al. Recommendations for multimodal noninvasive and invasive screening for detection of extracranial venous abnormalities indicative of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a position statement of the International Society for Neurovascular Disease https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1051044314007465

#### **Response 3**

We have added issues related to intracranial examination to the Discussion (manuscript, p. 6, lines 195-

204).

#### **Comment 4**

There are also other problems with interpretation of ultrasonographic examination during screening for

CCSVI. These were summarized in:

Simka M. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: current perspectives

https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4f37/a27ba6aec25aabe6d0057c68b9f66860fddb.pdf

and there has been published the study aimed at validation of accuracy of ultrasonographic examination

in CCSVI/MS patients

Simka et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: current perspectives

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1258/phleb.2012.011125

The Authors may discuss these issues

### Response 4

We further add l to the discussion in Discussion about exploring the interpretation of ultrasonography in screening for CCSVI. (manuscript, p. 6, lines 205-217).

#### **Reviewer 2**

#### **Comment 1**

Zamponi et al. conducted a randomized-controlled clinical trial entitled Brave Dreams (PMID: 29150995) concluding that venous percutaneous transluminal angioplasty has proven to be a safe but ineffective technique in treating chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in about half of patients and the treatment could not be recommended for treatment of patients with multiple sclerosis. Additionally, they described that no further double-blinded clinical studies were needed. This information was not included in the manuscript.

#### **Response 1**

We have already pointed out in Introduction that intravenous percutaneous transluminal angioplasty has proven to be a safe but ineffective technique (manuscript, p. 2, lines 59-60).

### Comment 2

In the data extraction please specify whenever possible, missing data were obtained via email from the study authors.

#### **Response 2**

We have stated in Data extraction that we will actively contact authors by email for missing data (manuscript, p. 3, lines 93-94).

#### **Comment 3**

In the statistic analyses "An 12 > 50% was considered a sign of significant heterogeneity." According to the Cochrane Handbook, 12 values of at least 50% are usually considered to represent substantial heterogeneity, while values of at least 75% indicate considerable heterogeneity.

#### **Response 3**

We removed the explanation for the heterogeneity error and added " I<sup>2</sup> values of at least 50% are usually considered to represent substantial heterogeneity, while values of at least 75% indicate considerable heterogeneity." to Statistical analyses (manuscript, p. 3, lines 117-118).

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

#### **Comment 4**

The Egger's test or Begg's test were not used to maximize the power of the statistical analyses with regard to publication bias.

#### **Response 4**

We included the Egger's test in terms of publication bias. Its methodology is described in Statistical analyses (manuscript, p. 3, lines 118-119), and its results are described in Publication bias (manuscript, p. 5, lines 172-174).

## Comment 5

Please provide if trim and filling method was used to detect and adjust for publication bias.

#### **Response 5**

We included the trim and filling method in our study to detect and adjust for publication bias. Its method is described in Statistical analyses (manuscript, p. 3, lines 119-120), and its results are described in Sensitivity analyses (manuscript, p. 5, lines 175-178).

#### **Comment 6**

Please include in the manuscript a figure with the results of the bias risk assessment.

#### **Response 6**

We added an assessment of bias for the included studies. Its methods are described in the Assessment of risk of bias (manuscript, p. 3, lines 95-103) and its results are described in the Risk of bias (quality) assessment (manuscript, p. 5, line 163).

#### **Comment 7**

According to the eligibility criteria, only blinded studies were included. According to the tables most of the studies included have insufficient information on blinding. This is a major limitation for the validity of the results reported in this study.

#### **Response 7**

We describe the limitations of insufficient information from opposite blinding for the current study in the Limitation (manuscript, p. 6, lines 225-228).

#### **Comment 8**

The authors did not submit the meta-analysis protocol in PROSPERO databases. This represents another major limitation.

#### **Response 8**

We have submitted the protocol for this study in PROSPERO, but it still has not been effectively reviewed (ID:392787).

We thank you for the critical and helpful suggestions. We have taken all these comments and

suggestions into account, and have made corrections in this revised manuscript.

We are responding to the criticisms of previous reviewers as you requested. We hope that this attachment will reach your heart and we hope that the manuscript will continue to receive further processing. On behalf of all members, thank you for your hard work.

#### Kind regards,

Mr. Taohui Ouyang, author for bmjopen-2023-072319 

E: husttjouyang110@163.com

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



60



Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection.

131x131mm (600 x 600 DPI)



Figure 2 Article authors' judgments about each risk of bias item for each included study. Risk of bias graph presented as percentages (upper figure); risk of bias summary (lower figure).

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

200x145mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 3 Meta-analysis of the probability of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls.

157x113mm (300 x 300 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1	
י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
11	
14	
15	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
45	
40 47	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	



Figure 4 Sensitivity analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni were removed (upper panels); studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (lower panels).

153x112mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.





Figure 5 Sensitivity analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy were removed (upper panels); studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy (lower panels).

157x120mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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

#### Relevance between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple

- sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis
- **Supplementary Appendix 1**

#### **Table e1** Characteristics of participants included in controls.

Study	Participants (n)	Age (year)	Female (%)	Controls matched to cases on sex and age
Zivadinov et al <sup>16</sup>	163	50 †	73.1	No
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>18</sup>	67	32 *	49.3	No
Leone et al <sup>23</sup>	68	40 *	64.7	Yes
Cardaioli et al <sup>29</sup>	18	31 *	66.7	No
Imperiale et al <sup>25</sup>	41	45 *	56.1	Yes
Mayer et al <sup>20</sup>	20	34 *	50.0	No
Baracchini et al <sup>32</sup>	60	46 *	55.0	Yes
Costello et al <sup>27</sup>	60	45 *	75.0	Yes
Van den Berg <i>et al</i> <sup>17</sup>	41	44 †	48.8	Yes
Patti et al <sup>19</sup>	172	43 *	58.1	Yes
Baracchini et al <sup>63</sup>	_			Yes
Group 1 ‡	50	33 *	70.0	
Group 2 §	60	63 *	53.3	
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	38	45 *	67.0	Yes
Centonze et al <sup>28</sup>	56	42 *	64.3	Yes
Zamboni et al <sup>4</sup>				Yes
Group 1 ‡	60	37 †	53.3	
Group 2 §	72	58 †	59.7	
Mancini et al22	42	38 †	54.8	Yes
Marder et al <sup>21</sup>	11	55 *	36.4	Yes
Kantarci et al <sup>24</sup>	54	37 *	50.0	No
Blinkenberg et al <sup>31</sup>	15	37 *	73.0	Yes
Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>60</sup>	28	50 *	60.7	Yes
Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>β4</sup>	16	18 †	44.0	Yes

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

Note. \*: mean. 

†: median.

‡: Healthy controls in group 1 were matched with MS patients.

§: In the study by Baracchini et al., healthy controls in group 2 were matched with controls who had neurologic diseases other than MS; in the study by Zamboni et al., healthy controls in group 2 were older than the median age of the European MS population. 

Study		Patier	nts with	MS (n)	)	Age	Proportion	Duration	Receive	EDSS
-	MS	CIS	RRMS	SPMS/	Other	(year)	of female	of MS	treatment (%)	score
				PPMS			(%)			
Zivadinov et al <sup>1</sup>	289	21	191	30	68	48 <sup>†</sup>	76.5	12 † years	89	3.0 †
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>18</sup>	112	9	78	25	0	43 *	54.5	12 * years	NA	6.0 *
Leone et al <sup>23</sup>	68	0	48	20	0	43 *	64.7	13 * years	NA	2.0 †
Cardaioli et al29	39	0	35	4	0	42 *	82.1	9 * years	NA	1.9 *
Imperiale et al <sup>25</sup>	80	0	56	24	0	46 *	64.0	10 † years	63	3.5 †
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>20</sup>	20	0	17	3	0	42 *	65.0	13 * years	90	3.0 †
Baracchini et al <sup>32</sup>	60	0	0	60	0	46 *	55.0	15 * years	NA NA	6.0 *
Costello et al <sup>27</sup>	120	4	86	29	1	46 *	74.1	11 <del>†</del> years	52	2.25 †
Van den Berg <i>et</i>	90	0	59	31	0	47 †	72.2	72 † months	NA	3.0 †
Patti <i>et al</i> <sup>19</sup>	148	20	105	43	0	44 *	62.8	175 * months	84	NA
Baracchini et al <sup>33</sup>	50	50	0	0	0	33 *	70.0	NA	28	1.5 †
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	90	0	52	38	0	47 *	73.3	15 * years	84	3.0 †
Centonze et al <sup>28</sup>	84	0	69	15	0	39 *	61.9	NA	82	NA
Zamboni <i>et al</i> <sup>4</sup>	109	0	69	40	0	40 †	58.7	6 † years	NA	2.0 †
Mancini <i>et al</i> <sup>22</sup>	103	0	41	62	0	42 †	60.2	12 † years	71	4.0†
Marder <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	18	1	6	11	0	55 *	16.7	21 † years	NA	NA
Kantarci <i>et al</i> <sup>24</sup>	62	0	32	30	0	37 *	64.5	112 * months	NA	4.0 †
Blinkenberg <i>et</i> al <sup>β1</sup>	24	0	24	0	0	37 *	67.0	10 * years	s NA	3.2 *
Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>β0</sup>	78	0	42	35	1	53 *	71.8	22 * years	s NA	3.5 †
Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>β4</sup>	15	0	15	0	0	18 †	60.0	6 † years	NA	1.2 †
Note. n = number	r; NA=	= not ap	oplicable	; EDSS	S = Exp	anded [	Disability Stat	us Scale; C	CIS = Clinically is	solated
syndrome; RRM	S = F	Relapsi	ing rem	itting N	1S; SP	MS = s	econdary pro	ogressive	MS; PPMS = p	orimary
progressive MS.										
*: mean.										
†: median.										
·										

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

Study		Selection			Comparability		Exposure		Score (0–9)
	Is the case definition adequate?	Representative ness of the cases	e Selecti on of control s	Definition of controls	Comparabiity of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis	Ascertain ment of exposure	The same method of ascertainme nt for cases and controls	Non- response rate	-
Zivadinov et al16	*			*	**	*	*		6
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>18</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Leone et al <sup>23</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Cardaioli et al <sup>29</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Imperiale et al <sup>25</sup>	*	*		*	**	*	*		7
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>20</sup>	*		*	*	**	*	*		7
Baracchini <i>et al</i> <sup>32</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Costello et al <sup>27</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Van den Berg <i>et</i> al <sup>17</sup>	*		*	*	**	*	*		7
Patti <i>et al</i> <sup>19</sup>	*			*	**	*	*		6
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>63</sup></i>	*	*		*	**	*	*		7
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Centonze et $a^{28}$	*		*	*	*	*	*		6
Zamboni et al <sup>4</sup>	*			*	**	*	*		6
	*		*	*	*	*	*		6
	*		*	*	**	*	*		7
	*		*	*	**	*	*		7
	+		+	+	++	+	+		7
	*		*	*	**	*	*		- 1
	*	*		*	**	*	*		7
									1
37 38									
20									
29									
40									
41									
42									
43									
ΔΔ									
45									
46									
47									
47									
48									
49									
10									
50									
50 51									

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

## 53 Supplementary Appendix 2

Amato et al. 2012			
Baracchini et al. 2011a			
Baracchini et al. 2011b		D	
Blinkenberg et al. 2012			
Caprio et al. 2017			
Cardaioli et al. 2016			
Centonze et al. 2011			
Costello et al. 2014			
Gandhi et al. 2019			
Imperiale et al. 2013			
Kantarci et al. 2012			
Leone et al. 2013		·····	
Mancini et al. 2012		0	
Marder et al. 2011			
Mayer et al. 2011			
Patti et al. 2012			
Tromba et al. 2015	0		
Van den Berg et al. 2013			
Zamboni et al. 2009	0		
Zivadinov et al. 2011			

Figure f1 Sensitivity analysis plot based on the Fill and Trim methods, displaying the estimated pooled effect size regarding the association of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency with multiple sclerosis.

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



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Location where item is reported

2, 3 

2, 3

2, 3

PRISI	MA 20	BMJ Open ed ولا المجارعة BMJ Open by Copyright States of the states of
Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item
TITLE		
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.
ABSTRACT		
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.
INTRODUCTION	•	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.
METHODS	<u> </u>	
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how mage inverse screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each epart, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, detate of automation tools used in the process.
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which gesuits to collect.
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, here were assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing sumpary statistics, or data conversions.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analys, meta-regression).
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting bias b).
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assesse containty (or ophilide open in the body of evidence for an outcome -



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

		BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open	Page 28 of 2
PRIS	MA 20	020 Checklist	
Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment		ng or	
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to t	3
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they we scluded.	3
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	3, 4
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	5
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) are the stimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	5
Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	5,
syntheses	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summar where and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	5, 6
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	6
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	5, 6
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assested.	5
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	5
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	6
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	6,7
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	6,7
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	7
OTHER INFORMA	TION	9 N 10 N 10 N	
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the reserve was not registered.	
protocol	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the view.	7
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	7
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	7

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Page	29	of	28
ruge	~ ~	01	20





136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . cted by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies. de I

# **BMJ Open**

# Association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis

1	BM1 Onen
Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-072319.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Apr-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Jun; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Zhang, Na; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurology Ding, Cong; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery He, Xiuying; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Li, Meihua; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Meng, Wei; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Ouyang, Taohui; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Neurology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Radiology and imaging
Keywords:	Multiple sclerosis < NEUROLOGY, Ultrasound < RADIOLOGY & IMAGING, NEUROSURGERY





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

#### Association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis Jun Yang,<sup>1</sup> Na Zhang,<sup>2</sup> Cong Ding,<sup>1</sup> Xiuying He,<sup>1</sup> Meihua Li,<sup>1</sup> Wei Meng,<sup>1</sup> Taohui Ouyang,<sup>1,\*</sup> Department of Neurosurgery, the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, 330006, China Department of Neurology, the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, 330006, China Correspondence: hustijouyang110@163.com; Tel.: +86(0791) 88698265; Fax: +86(0791)88698265 ABSTRACT **Objectives** Numerous studies have indicated that chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is a potential factor in causing multiple sclerosis in recent years, but this conclusion remains unconfirmed. This meta-analysis examined the correlation between multiple sclerosis and chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. Methods We searched Embase and Medline (Ovid) for publications published from January 1, 2006, to May 1, 2022. The meta-analysis was performed following PRISMA guidelines. **Results** Eligible studies (n = 20) included 3,069 participants from seven countries. Pooled analysis indicated that chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency was more frequent in multiple sclerosis patients than in healthy controls (odds ratio 3.36; 95% confidence interval 1.92 – 5.85; P < 0.001) with remarkable heterogeneity among studies (1<sup>2</sup> = 79%). Results were more strongly correlated in subsequent sensitivity analyses, but heterogeneity was also more substantial. We removed studies that initially proposed a CCSVI team as well as studies by authors involved in or advocating endovascular therapies. **Conclusions** Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is significantly associated with multiple sclerosis and it is more prevalent in MS patients than in healthy individuals, but considerable heterogeneity of results is still observed. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY 1. a comprehensive analysis of the correlation between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis was performed. 2. explored the reasons for the close association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis by means of sensitivity analysis and subgroup analysis. 3. further complements previous studies of this type to provide structured guidance for subsequent clinical trials. KEYWORDS multiple sclerosis; chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency; ultrasound; meta-analysis Number of words 3325 Number of figures 5 (4 in the body and 1 in the supplementary material.) Number of tables 4 (1 in the body and 3 in the supplementary material.) For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory condition of the central nervous system of unknown cause, and most findings suggest that the reason is autoimmune pathology.<sup>1</sup> Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency (CCSVI) is a syndrome characterized by multiple stenosis or obstruction of intracranial and extracranial veins, which results in inadequate cerebral venous drainage.<sup>2</sup> In 2008, Zamboni et al. suggested that CCSVI could potentially cause MS.<sup>3</sup> This hypothesis assumed that multiple stenoses or obstructions of the veins, which in turn affect the extracranial outflow channels of the cerebral venous system (internal jugular and azygous veins), eventually lead to an increase in intracranial pressure, followed by blood-brain barrier rupture, local iron deposition, and triggering of the inflammatory chain in MS.<sup>4-7</sup> This abnormal venous drainage can be diagnosed by Doppler ultrasound, magnetic resonance imaging, cerebral perfusion studies, and catheter venography. However, the so-called Zamboni criterion is the most widely used detection mode, and the operation is non-invasive. Zamboni et al. defined five ultrasound criteria for diagnosing CCSVI by transcranial and extracranial echo color Doppler in a study, which revealed that patients had CCSVI when two or more abnormal ultrasound parameters were 

observed.<sup>4 5</sup> These five ultrasound parameter criteria include (1) Reflux in the internal jugular and/or vertebral veins in the
 supine and sitting positions. (2) Reflux in the deep cerebral veins. (3) High-resolution B-mode evidence of internal jugular
 vein stenoses. (4) Flow is not Doppler-detectable in the internal jugular and/or vertebral veins. (5) Reverted postural control
 of the main cerebral venous outflow route measured in internal jugular veins.

54 Since then, most investigators have used this criterion to diagnose patients with CCSVI, but the evaluation results of the 55 correlation between CCSVI and MS were inconsistent across studies. Coupled with the fact that despite the availability of 56 neuroimaging techniques such as magnetic resonance venogram<sup>8</sup> or selective venography<sup>9</sup> to assess abnormal central 57 system venous drainage, the pathogenic role of CCSVI in MS remains unproven. In addition, the possibility of CCSVI 58 therapy has been a topic of conversation, including intravenous percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (termed "Liberation 59 treatment") proposed by Zamboni *et al.*<sup>10</sup> This treatment has received widespread attention from patients with MS and

60 scientific institutions worldwide.<sup>11 12</sup> Still, there are articles reporting its potential adverse consequences.<sup>13</sup> Although the

follow-up clinical trials showed that venous angioplasty was relatively safe, it did not play an ideal therapeutic effect for
 MS patients.<sup>14-17</sup> The lack of sufficient proof that CCSVI is connected to MS has called into question the idea of intravenous
 percutaneous transluminal angioplasty, especially given the various research results and associated negative side effects.

64 To evaluate whether CCSVI was connected with MS and whether its frequency varied between MS patients and healthy 65 controls, this study did a thorough meta-analysis by pooling studies on the connection of CCSVI with MS. Furthermore, 66 sensitivity analyses were utilized to investigate potential explanations for heterogeneity.

# 32<br/>3367MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 68 Literature search

This meta-analysis was based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Reporting Guidelines.<sup>18</sup> The specific PROSPERO protocol process is placed in the Supplementary Material (PROSPERO). Two authors independently searched the Medline versus Embase databases using the OVID portal, with search dates adjusted from January 1, 2006, to April 1, 2022. Disagreements between the two authors' searches were resolved by a third-party reviewer. The complete search strategy for this study can be found in the supplementary appendix 1. Search terms included: "Multiple Sclerosis" and "Ultrasound". The search findings were restricted to English language articles and human studies. Following that, we critically reviewed all publications that fit these parameters and conducted manual searches of their references and citations of relevant reviews to search for research outside the database. If data were missing or erroneous, the researchers contacted the author again.

# 78 Eligibility

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) English language, (2) use of Doppler ultrasound to detect CCSVI, (3) neurological testing criteria used to identify CCSVI, (4) inclusion of at least one control group, and (5) blinding of study.

Exclusion criteria were: (1) no raw data or incomplete data, (2) overlapping data (the study with the complete data chosen for the series of the same author and pattern), (3) literature of too low quality or literature not available in full text, and (4) less than 10 cases or control subjects.

After deleting duplicates, two researchers independently read the titles and abstracts of all identified papers, read the fulltext versions, compared the results, and resolved discrepancies by consensus.

# 5354 86 Patient and Public Involvement

Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

#### 57 88 Data extraction

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

Two authors extracted data and entered it into a standardized collection form, independently reviewed and confirmed by a third author. The extracted data were as follows: first author, country, publication date, sample size, demographic characteristics of participants (age vs. percentage female), and study characteristics of patients (dis-ease duration, percentage treated, and expanded disability status scale). For some of the missing data, the researchers were also active in obtaining it from the article's authors via email.

## 94 Quality assessment

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

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

All 20 studies used the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale to assess the risk of bias.<sup>19</sup> The scale is based on case-control studies and consists of three domains: selection, comparability, and exposure, with quality ratings ranging from 0 to 9. Four study items are in the selection domain, each given a maximum of one star. Three study items are in the exposure category, each given at least one star. For comparability, only one item is included, and a maximum of two stars is presented. We consider this high-quality literature with low bias if at least seven stars are awarded.

# 1415100Statistical analyses

16 101 STATA 17.0 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, USA) was used to conduct the meta-analysis by the researchers. One 17 102 investigator entered the detailed data into the software. Another investigator reviewed the data for accuracy, generating 103 forest plots and odds ratio (OR) to determine whether there was a statistical relevance between CCSVI and MS. We used 18 either a random or fixed effects model for the meta-analysis. A random-effects model was selected if the results showed 104 19 105 significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 50\%$ ). An OR greater than 1.0 in the results indicated that CCSVI could be a potential risk 20 106 factor for MS. P < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. The origins of heterogeneity in the included studies were 21 107 examined using Cochran's Q and I<sup>2</sup> statistics. 50% to 90% of I<sup>2</sup> values represent substantial heterogeneity, while at least 75% 22 represent considerable heterogeneity.<sup>20</sup> By the Cochrane Review Manager 5.4 version 5.4.1, for publication bias was 108 23 assessed using Egger's test (P < 0.05 indicates significant publication bias). If the results indicated the presence of 109 24 110 publication bias, the fill and trim methods were used to detect publication bias. To determine the effect of individual studies 25 111 in the article on the experimental results, the researchers used a sensitivity analysis by excluding individual studies. In 26 112 addition, we used subgroup analysis to further look for sources of heterogeneity. 27

#### 28 29 113 RESULTS

### **30** 114 **Included studies**

The selection process of the study is shown in Figure 1. During the initial search, 2,544 studies were located, with 1,910 records from the EMBASE database, 634 from the Medline database, and no additional records. After removing 468 duplicate research, 2,076 publications were included in the title and abstract screening, and 58 were selected for full-text filtering. After full-text screening and checking, 38 of these articles were excluded: 10 examined irrelevant focus, 18 assessed veins in other ways, one without a control group, five did not use blinding, one used duplicate data, two used overlapping, and one had incomplete experimental data. Ultimately, 20 studies<sup>5 21-39</sup> met the eligibility criteria (Fig. 1).

#### 121 Study characteristics

122 Of the currently incorporated studies, 11 were conducted in Italy, three in the USA, two in Germany, one in Canada, one 123 in Denmark, one in the Netherlands, and one in Turkey (Table 1). It is noteworthy that the included studies were conducted 124 in Europe or North America. This study included healthy controls (Table 1). All the studies used Doppler ultrasonography 125 to detect CCSVI. Two studies<sup>27 33</sup> did not report an assessment of the five ultrasound parameters of the CCSVI, and three studies<sup>29 32 34</sup> reported only four estimates because the investigators were unable to perform the full five-item neurological 126 protocol. Although eight papers covered ultra-sound technology training, they did not describe in detail the procedures and 127 quality of the training (Table 1). Four ultrasound investigators<sup>5</sup><sup>21</sup><sup>28</sup><sup>39</sup> have participated in CCSVI endovascular treatment 128 129 clinical trials or studies supporting liberation procedures.

In terms of blinding, eight reports explained the blinding poorly but described the process more entirely in 12 studies, expressed it well in two of them, and reported success with blinding (Table 1). Five studies<sup>21 24 28 30 35</sup> described intraobserver variability. Nevertheless, only four studies<sup>21 24 30 35</sup> described good intra-and inter-observer reliability in a run-in period. The experimental group in five studies was not age and gender-matched to the control group (see table e1 in the supplementary appendix 2). Eleven studies did not clearly describe how patients were identified for registration, and nine identified patients in a consecutive sample (Table 1). In the study by Zamboni *et al.*, there was also no separate discussion about the outcome in healthy individuals.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the disease type of MS, relapsing-remitting MS was still dominant, with primary progressive MS and secondary progressive MS in second place (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 2). Six studies reported clinically isolated syndromes in patients, and all patients with MS were Clinically isolated syndrome (CIS) in the survey by Baracchini *et al.* (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 2). Furthermore, most patients received varying degrees of treatment,
2 3

4

5

6

59

60

with acceptance rates ranging from 28% to 90% (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 2). Females were more prevalent in the experimental groups than in the control groups, with percentages ranging from 16.7% to 82.1% in the experimental groups and 36.4% to 75.0% in the control groups. Table e2 in supplementary appendix 2 summarize the data for patients with MS for age, the proportion of females, duration of disease, and Expanded Disability Status Scale scores. These data are typical of patients with MS.

7
 8
 146
 9
 147
 7 able 1 The characteristics of meta-analysis study on the incidence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis and controls.

Study	Country	MS cases (n)	Controls (n)	Blinding	Receive appropriate training in ultrasound operation	Involved in "Liberation procedure"	The way of patien identified for enrolment
Zivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	US	289	163	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	Yes	Convenience
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	Italy	112	67	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	Italy	68	68	The process of blinding is described and has been achieved	Yes	Yes	Consecutively
Cardaioli <i>et al</i> <sup>34</sup>	Italy	39	18	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Imperiale <i>et al</i> <sup>30</sup>	Italy	80	41	The process of blinding is described and has been achieved	Yes	No	Consecutively
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>25</sup>	Germa- ny	20	20	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Convenience
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>37</sup></i>	Italy	60	60	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Costello <i>et al</i> <sup>32</sup>	Canada	120	60	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Van den Berg <i>et</i> al <sup>22</sup>	Netherl- ands	90	41	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	Yes	No	Convenience
Patti <i>et al</i> ²⁴	Germa- ny	148	172	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	No	Convenience
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>38</sup></i>	Italy	50	110	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>31</sup>	US	90	38	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Centonze et al <sup>33</sup>	Italy	84	56	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate	Yes	No	Convenience

	Zamboni <i>et al</i> <sup>5</sup>	Italy	109	132	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	Yes	Yes	Convenience
	Mancini <i>et al</i> ² <sup>7</sup>	Italy	103	42	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
	Marder <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	US	18	11	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
	Kantarci <i>et al</i> <sup>29</sup>	Turkey	62	54	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Convenience
	Blinkenberg <i>et</i> <i>al</i> <sup>36</sup>	Danish	24	15	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
	Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>35</sup>	Italy	78	28	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	No	Convenience
_	Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>39</sup>	Italy	15	16	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
148	Note. NA = n	ot applica	able; n =	numbe	er; MS = multiple sclerosis.			
10		• /						
149	Risk of qual	lity assess	sment					
149 150	<b>Risk of qual</b> All 20 stud	l <b>ity assess</b> dies were	sment include	d in the	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen	t Scale, and a	ll had a good qu	ality rating result.
149 150 151	<b>Risk of qual</b> All 20 stud Fifteen studi	l <b>ity assess</b> dies were es had a q	<b>ment</b> include juality r	d in the ating of	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen f greater than or equal to seven and we	t Scale, and a re considered	ll had a good qu high-quality st	uality rating result. tudies. <sup>22</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>26</sup> <sup>28-32</sup>
149 150 151 152	<b>Risk of qual</b> All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of	lity assess dies were es had a q `the incor	sment include juality r porated	d in the ating of studies	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen f greater than or equal to seven and we s were categorized as low quality with	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme	nality rating result. rudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in
149 150 151 152 153	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app	<b>ment</b> include juality r porated pendix 2	d in the ating of studies ).	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen f greater than or equal to seven and we s were categorized as low quality with	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme	uality rating result. tudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in
149 150 151 152 153	<b>Risk of qual</b> All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app	sment included juality r porated pendix 2	d in the ating of studies ).	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen f greater than or equal to seven and we s were categorized as low quality with	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme	uality rating result. rudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> nt (see table e3 in
149 150 151 152 153	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of s</b>	lity assess dies were es had a c the incor entary app tudies	sment included uality r porated bendix 2	d in the ating of studies ).	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen f greater than or equal to seven and we s were categorized as low quality with	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme	uality rating result. Eudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in
149 150 151 152 153 154	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of s</b> In further	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F	sment included puality r porated bendix 2 igure 2	d in the ating of studies ). present	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o iation of CCS	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an	uality rating result. Eudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ont (see table e3 in ad the incidence of
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M	lity assess dies were es had a c the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h	included quality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 healthy o	d in the ating of studies ). present controls	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen f greater than or equal to seven and we s were categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidenc	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o iation of CCS e of CCSVI, y	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significar	hality rating result. Audies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ant (see table e3 in and the incidence of ant difference in the
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of	lity assess dies were es had a c the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir	sment includee juality r porated pendix 2 igure 2 nealthy o n MS co	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide	ality rating result. audies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ant (see table e3 in ad the incidence of at difference in the ence of 0, reaching
149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158	Risk of qual All 20 stud <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup>	lity assess dies were es had a q 'the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren	sment included puality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 nealthy of n MS co nained a	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared . wide v	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud ariation in the strength of the association	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o iation of CCS e of CCSVI, v y, three studie on between C	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significat es had an incide CSVI and MS.	ality rating result. rudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> int (see table e3 in ad the incidence of int difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically,
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup> the ORs ran	lity assess dies were es had a c the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from	included puality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 healthy of h MS co hained a 0.32 (9	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the association s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study rariation in the strength of the association ( $10, 0, 1 - 8, 26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, v y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95%	Il had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20	tality rating result. Trudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the the specifically, - 2948755.78) in
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup> the ORs ran Zamboni's re	lity assess dies were es had a of the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A	sment included puality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 healthy of MS co hained a 0.32 (5 ccordin	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud- ariation in the strength of the association ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c	Il had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3	ality rating result. rudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of ht difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup> the ORs ran Zamboni's re – 5.85; P <	lity assess dies were es had a c 'the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I	sment included particle included porated porated porated include mained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 25% CI g to the r, there	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud ariation in the strength of the associati ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk o iation of CCS e of CCSVI, v y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c te studies (I <sup>2</sup> =	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%).	tality rating result. tudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, - 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup> the ORs ran Zamboni's re – 5.85; P <	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from search. A 0.001). I bias	sment included puality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 nealthy of n MS co nained a 0.32 (9 ccordin Howeve	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc a. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study ariation in the strength of the association ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c he studies (I <sup>2</sup> =	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%).	taility rating result. tudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of th difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, - 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup> the ORs ran Zamboni's re – 5.85; P < <b>Publication</b> The Egger	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus F CCSVI ir There ren ged from search. A 0.001). I bias	sment included porated pendix 2 igure 2 healthy of MS co hained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc a. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study ariation in the strength of the association (1: 0.01 – 8.26) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c the studies (I <sup>2</sup> =	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%).	taility rating result. tudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of th difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22,
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> </ul>	Risk of qualAll 20 studFifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None ofthe supplementPooling of stIn furtherCCSVI in Mincidence of100%.25 26 36the ORs ranZamboni's re $-5.85; P <$ PublicationThe Egger $p = 0.241$ ).	lity assess dies were es had a q 'the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias	sment included juality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 healthy of MS co hained a 0.32 (9 ccordin Howeve	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study rariation in the strength of the association ( $10.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the analyze publication bias, and its results s	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studies on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c howed no sign	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significan es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%).	taility rating result. rudies. $^{22}$ $^{23}$ $^{25}$ $^{26}$ $^{28-32}$ ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22,
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> </ul>	<b>Risk of qual</b> All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ran Zamboni's re -5.85; P < <b>Publication</b> The Egger p = 0.241).	lity assess dies were es had a q 'the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias	sment included particle included ported ported include	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 25% CI g to the r, there ed to an	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study ariation in the strength of the associati ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c he studies (I <sup>2</sup> =	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%).	taility rating result. ratios $^{22}$ $^{23}$ $^{25}$ $^{28-32}$ ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22,
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> </ul>	<b>Risk of qual</b> All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup> the ORs ran Zamboni's re -5.85; P < <b>Publication</b> The Egger p = 0.241).	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias test was c	sment included particle included ported ported include	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the association as Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud variation in the strength of the association ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the analyze publication bias, and its results s	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between Co 8035.00 (95% remarkably c he studies (I <sup>2</sup> =	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%).	taility rating result. tudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of th difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 3.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22,
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> <li>166</li> <li>167</li> </ul>	Risk of qualAll 20 studFifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None ofthe supplemePooling of stIn furtherCCSVI in Mincidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ranZamboni's re $-5.85; P <$ PublicationThe Egger $p = 0.241$ ).Sensitivity aThe sensitivity a	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from search. A 0.001). I bias test was malyses ivity anal	sment included porated pendix 2 igure 2 nealthy of nMS co nained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve employed	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud- ariation in the strength of the association ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studio on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c te studies (I <sup>2</sup> = howed no sign	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the ef	taility rating result. rudies. <sup>22</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>26</sup> <sup>28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22, fects of any single
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> <li>166</li> <li>167</li> </ul>	Risk of qualAll 20 studFifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None ofthe suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In furtherCCSVI in Mincidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ranZamboni's re $-5.85; P <$ <b>Publication</b> The Egger $p = 0.241$ ).Sensitivity aThe sensitstudy, sugger	lity assess dies were es had a of the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias test was inalyses ivity analysting good	sment included porated pendix 2 igure 2 healthy of MS co hained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve employed ysis resu	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an allts dem	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc a. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study ariation in the strength of the association (1: $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results such that the combined effect size e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 i	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c howed no sign es were not af n the supplem	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the ef ientary appendi	taility rating result. rudies. $^{22}$ $^{23}$ $^{25}$ $^{26}$ $^{28-32}$ ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22, fects of any single x 3).
149         150         151         152         153         154         155         156         157         158         159         160         161         162         163         164         165         166         167         168	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi <sup>34-39</sup> None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ran Zamboni's re -5.85; P < <b>Publication</b> The Egger p = 0.241). <b>Sensitivity a</b> The sensit study, sugger	lity assess dies were es had a q 'the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias test was ivity analy sting good	sment included uality r porated bendix 2 igure 2 healthy of MS co nained a 0.32 (9 ccordin Howeve employed ysis resu	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an ults den ty of the	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study ariation in the strength of the association to 201 – 8.26) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s nonstrated that the combined effect size e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 i	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studies on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c the studies (I <sup>2</sup> = howed no sign es were not affin n the supplem	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significan es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the efficientary appendi	taility rating result. rudies. <sup>22</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>26</sup> <sup>28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of the difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22, fects of any single x 3).
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> <li>166</li> <li>167</li> <li>168</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ran Zamboni's re -5.85; P < <b>Publication</b> The Egger p = 0.241). <b>Sensitivity a</b> The sensit study, sugger	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias test was ivity analysis	sment included particle included porated porated porated include number of mained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve employed ysis resu	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an alts dem ty of the	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc s. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's study ariation in the strength of the association ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s ponstrated that the combined effect size e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 i	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, v y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c howed no sign es were not af n the supplem	ll had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an with a significan s had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the ef ientary appendi	hality rating result. rudies. <sup>22</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>26</sup> <sup>28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of ht difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 8.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22, fects of any single x 3).
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> <li>166</li> <li>167</li> <li>168</li> <li>169</li> </ul>	Risk of qualAll 20 studFifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None ofthe supplemePooling of stIn furtherCCSVI in Mincidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ranZamboni's re $-5.85; P <$ PublicationThe Egger $p = 0.241$ ).Sensitivity aThe sensitstudy, suggerSubgroup atSince Zam	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from esearch. A 0.001). I bias test was ivity analysis sting good nalysis aboni and	sment included particle included ported ported included i	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an allts den ty of the ues wer	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the associa- to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud- ariation in the strength of the association ( $0.01 - 8.26$ ) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results study to success that the combined effect size e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 in the overly aggressive in their studies on	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c howed no sign es were not af n the supplem	Il had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the eff entary appendi 11), additional s	hality rating result. rudies. <sup>22 23 25 26 28-32</sup> ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of ht difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 3.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22, fects of any single x 3).
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> <li>166</li> <li>167</li> <li>168</li> <li>169</li> <li>170</li> </ul>	Risk of qual All 20 stud Fifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None of the suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In further CCSVI in M incidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ran Zamboni's re -5.85; P < <b>Publication</b> The Egger p = 0.241). <b>Sensitivity a</b> The sensit study, sugges <b>Subgroup at</b> Since Zam were perform	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from search. A 0.001). I bias test was ivity analysis sting good nalysis boni and ned by ren	sment included particle included porated pendix 2 igure 2 healthy of a MS co hained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve employed ysis resu d stabili colleag moving	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an allts den ty of the ues wer studies	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc a. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud- ariation in the strength of the association (10.01 – 8.26) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s nonstrated that the combined effect size e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 i re overly aggressive in their studies on about Zamboni's team and those that	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studie on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c howed no sign es were not af n the supplem CCSVI (n = 1 had previous	Il had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the eff tentary appendi 11), additional s	taility rating result. ratios $^{22}$ $^{23}$ $^{25}$ $^{26}$ $^{28-32}$ ent (see table e3 in ad the incidence of ht difference in the ence of 0, reaching More specifically, – 2948755.78) in 3.36; 95% CI: 1.92 tion bias (t = 1.22, fects of any single x 3). subgroup analyses ted with that team
<ul> <li>149</li> <li>150</li> <li>151</li> <li>152</li> <li>153</li> <li>154</li> <li>155</li> <li>156</li> <li>157</li> <li>158</li> <li>159</li> <li>160</li> <li>161</li> <li>162</li> <li>163</li> <li>164</li> <li>165</li> <li>166</li> <li>167</li> <li>168</li> <li>169</li> <li>170</li> <li>171</li> </ul>	Risk of qualAll 20 studFifteen studi $^{34-39}$ None ofthe suppleme <b>Pooling of st</b> In furtherCCSVI in Mincidence of $100\%.^{252636}$ the ORs ranZamboni's re $-5.85; P <$ <b>Publication</b> The Egger $p = 0.241$ ).Sensitivity aSince Zamwere perform $(n = 7)$ . Alth	lity assess dies were es had a q the incor entary app tudies studies, F S versus h CCSVI ir There ren ged from search. A 0.001). I bias test was ivity analy sting good nalysis aboni and ned by ren ough MS	sment included porated pendix 2 igure 2 healthy of MS co- hained a 0.32 (S ccordin Howeve employed ysis resu d stabilit colleag moving S patien	d in the ating of studies ). present controls mpared wide v 95% CI g to the r, there ed to an allts dem ty of the uses wer studies ts had (	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment f greater than or equal to seven and we swere categorized as low quality with s the meta-analysis results of the assoc a. Twenty studies reported the incidence to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud- ariation in the strength of the association (10.01 – 8.26) in Mayer's study to 5 pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were was extensive heterogeneity among the alyze publication bias, and its results s honstrated that the combined effect size e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 i re overly aggressive in their studies on about Zamboni's team and those that CCSVI at a higher rate than controls,	t Scale, and a re considered a high risk of iation of CCS e of CCSVI, w y, three studies on between C 8035.00 (95% remarkably c te studies (I <sup>2</sup> = howed no sign es were not af n the supplem CCSVI (n = had previousl the correlatio	Il had a good qu high-quality st f bias assessme SVI with MS an vith a significar es had an incide CSVI and MS. 6 CI: 1142.20 orrelated (OR 3 = 79%). hificant publica fected by the effected by the effected the sentary appendiant (1), additional st by been conduction between CC	tion bias (t = 1.22, ffects of any single x 3).

#### **BMJ** Open

173other hand, the correlation between the two was stronger (OR 4.11; 95% CI: 1.62 - 10.39, P0.001; Figure 3), and the174heterogeneity was more pronounced in the seven excluded studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 89.4%).

175 In the following sensitivity analysis, considering the potential conflicts of interest between the studies, we deleted articles 176 by authors involved in CCSVI endovascular treatment clinical trials or studies supporting liberation procedures (n = 4).

6 176 by authors involved in CCSV1 endovascular treatment chinical trials of studies supporting interation procedures (n = 4). 7 177 There was no substantial change in outcome, a diminished correlation (OR 2.87; 95% CI: 1.82 – 4.52; P < 0.05; Figure 4), 8 178 and heterogeneity remained significant ( $I^2 = 54.4\%$ ). In contrast, a more significant correlation was obtained for those

179 studies assessed in support of liberation therapy authors (OR 17.05; 95% CI: 1.27 – 229.53; P < 0.0001; Figure 4), along

10 180 with more significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 96.1\%$ ).

#### 181 DISCUSSION

This meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between CCSVI and MS and a wide range of heterogeneity. In a subsequent sensitivity analysis, the results showed that the combined effect size was not affected by any single study. We also performed subgroup analyses to seek sources of heterogeneity, but none of the results were satisfactory.

The meta-analysis also found that patients with MS had a higher prevalence of CCSVI than healthy groups, but it varied considerably across studies. On the other hand, however, we could not confirm what factors led to the significant differences in incidence between the studies. One of these possibilities is the ultrasound detection aspect. Many studies have shown that the quality level of Doppler ultrasound for diagnosing CCSVI depends on the operator and that trained operators perform better in reproducibility.<sup>4041</sup> This imaging technique is more difficult when testing veins at low-pressure flow, and the dehydrated state of the subject<sup>42</sup> and head rotation<sup>43</sup> contribute to the poor quality of the results. Of all included studies, only eight articles had relevant operator training.<sup>5 21 22 24 28 30 33 35</sup> For consistency of operation, performance was equally poor, where only five included studies were evaluated.<sup>21 24 28 30 35</sup> and four showed good agreement.<sup>21 24 30 35</sup> These data further suggest that the reproducibility of CCSVI diagnostics requires additional studies while emphasizing the importance of relevant operator training in the skills.

Ultrasound detection of the intracranial cerebral venous system is the most challenging part. On the one hand, the cerebral vein detection procedure is complex and usually studied through a transcranial approach, taking either a temporal window or a trans-occipital approach.<sup>4445</sup> Although both provide better information on blood flow, detecting venous abnormalities is difficult. Due to the skull, the intracranial veins are not regulated by the respiratory pump as the extracranial veins usually are.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, 17 of the surveyed studies conducted transcranial testing, 5 21-28 30 31 33 35-39 8 employed a transtemporal window,<sup>5 22 25 30 36-39</sup> while the other two utilized a trans-temporal and trans-occipital approach<sup>23 26</sup> without detailing the modality used for the remaining. On the other hand, all included studies were performed in the context of a potential association between multiple sclerosis and CCSVI. However, when examined from an objective perspective, it seems more accurate to test the validity of a test versus a test using an established gold standard rather than focusing on the presence or absence of MS.<sup>47</sup> This suggests that the five neurological tests proposed by Zamboni are questionable, such as vascular stenosis, internal jugular vein cross-sectional area differences or reflux which are challenging to detect objectively by these criteria.<sup>40</sup> Therefore, the relationship between CCSVI and multiple sclerosis still needs more studies and uniform standards to be validated.

In addition, magnetic resonance imaging, catheter venography, and intravascular ultrasound are noteworthy in detecting
 the true prevalence of CCSVI, although the latter two are invasive procedures. The International Society for Neurovascular
 Disease has recommended a multimodality combination of invasive and noninvasive testing for extracranial venous
 anomalies to achieve optimal detection in patients of interest. Specifically, at least one invasive detection technique and at
 least one noninvasive detection technique should be used.<sup>48</sup>

Although CCSVI is thought to be associated with cerebral venous abnormalities, the etiology of cerebral venous abnormalities and the possible pathophysiologic link to multiple sclerosis and other neurological disorders remain unclear.
 Several studies have suggested that, in the setting of venous flow abnormalities, this potential association is related to the accumulation of leukocytes in the vasculature.<sup>49 50</sup>

Interestingly, this study contradicts a previous meta-analysis<sup>51</sup> that showed reduced heterogeneity after removing publications related to the liberation procedures ( $I^2 = 37.3\%$ ). In contrast, considerable heterogeneity was still observed after the same manipulation in this paper ( $I^2 = 54.4\%$ ), which may be due to inconsistent inclusion criteria for both studies. Although both included studies used neurological criteria, Tsivgoulis et al.<sup>51</sup> included non-blinded studies as well as reports from experimental groups with fewer than 10 cases, leading to a final inclusion of demographics varying widely and inconsistent sensitivity analysis results. On the other hand, prior to the writing of this article, four meta-analyses had discussed the association between CCSVI and MS, but only one had reached a definitive conclusion. We need to be aware that the conclusions of previous meta-analyses influence the methodology and even the results of subsequent clinical trials, which then accumulate to trigger accumulation bias.<sup>52</sup> Overly optimistic initial studies or meta-analyses can inspire 

**BMJ** Open

additional studies, while disappointing results can bring a series of studies to an end. Although we attempted to attenuate the effect of prior studies in our subgroup analysis (removing studies from the Zamboni-related teams), the final results were similar to the initial results. Attempts to eliminate such biases seem unrealistic because new research is continually inspired by previous research and may trigger more unnecessary research waste in the process of elimination. Although

bias elimination is unavoidable, meaningful error control can be performed. One study has shown that the likelihood ratio is a valid test.<sup>52</sup> In future clinical trials or meta-analyses, researchers should be aware of the accumulation bias of previous studies. 

#### LIMITATION

The current meta-analysis has some limitations that must be taken into account. First, we searched only two databases and may have missed some relevant studies. Although 20 papers were selected based on strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, there were significant differences in sample size, blinding practices, neurological protocols for ultrasound testing, and patient diagnostic criteria. Although studies that did not use blinding were excluded, most included studies had insufficient information on blinding. Furthermore, six studies<sup>5</sup> <sup>21</sup> <sup>24</sup> <sup>30</sup> <sup>38</sup> <sup>39</sup> also included non-MS groups with other neurological disorders. In the current study, we included only healthy controls. We did not acquire the data of the individuals in the study, and there were considerable age and sex differences between the studies, coupled with the fact that five reports did not have controls of the same age and sex as the MS patients, so it was impossible to determine whether demographic factors influenced the morbidity of CCSVI in controls and patients with MS. More critically, the topic of CCSVI versus MS remains controversial. Studies may be published regardless of the examination method or whether they are positively or negatively evaluated. Finally, the inconsistent diagnostic criteria for screening patients with MS across studies and the lack of reliable evidence in the text to determine the diagnosis of subjects made it impossible to judge the accuracy of the experimental versus control groups. 

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

In summary, the present meta-analysis exhibited a strong correlation between CCSVI and MS, while CCSVI was more likely to occur in patients with MS than in healthy controls. CCSVI may be a potential risk factor for MS. Nevertheless, the heterogeneity was highly significant that we cannot draw clear conclusions. Future studies of higher quality, especially in terms of blinded quality and reproducibility of ultrasound diagnosis, are still needed to derive a deeper discussion of the association of CCSVI with MS.

Acknowledgments We are very grateful to Chole Fu and Dr Liu for their support and assis-tance in this study. 

Author Contributions JY was the first author. NZ received funding. TO and JY designed the study. WM and ML collected the data. XH participated in data verification. CD analyzed the data. JY drafted the manuscript. TO and NZ participated in the interpretation of the results and critical revision of important intellectual content of the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript. wM and ML were the guarantors of the studv.

- Funding This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81960247).
- Competing interests None declared.
- Patient consent for publication Not applicable.
- **Ethics approval** This study does not involve human participants and ethical approval was not required.
- Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
- Data Availability Statement All data in this article were available from included studies and were provided by the authors without reservation.

**Supplemental material** This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer- reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise. 

#### REFERENCES

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

# BMJ Open

1		
2	274	1. Baecher-Allan C, Kaskow BJ, Weiner HL. Multiple Sclerosis: Mechanisms and Immunotherapy. Neuron
4	275	2018;97(4):742-68. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2018.01.021
5	276	2. Zamboni P, Consorti G, Galeotti R, et al. Venous collateral circulation of the extracranial cerebrospinal
6 7	277	outflow routes. <i>Current neurovascular research</i> 2009;6(3):204-12. doi:
8	278	10.2174/156720209788970054 [published Online First: 2009/06/19]
9	279	3. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Weinstock-Guttman B, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is
10	280	related to inverted and decreased cerebrospinal fluid flow and greater brain atrophy in patients
12	281	with multiple sclerosis. <i>Multiple Sclerosis</i> 2009;15(9 Suppl. S):S210. doi:
13 14	282	http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1352458509106963
15	283	4. Zamboni P, Galeotti R, Menegatti E, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with
16	284	multiple sclerosis. Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry 2009;80(4):392-9. doi:
17 18	285	https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/innp.2008.157164
19	286	5. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Galeotti R, et al. The value of cerebral Doppler venous haemodynamics in
20 21	287	the assessment of multiple sclerosis. <i>Journal of the Neurological Sciences</i> 2009;282(1-2):21-27.
22	288	doj: http://dx.doj.org/10.1016/i.jns.2008.11.027
23 24	289	6. Zamboni P. Menegatti E. Weinstock-Guttman B. et al. The severity of chronic cerebrospinal venous
24	290	insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis is related to altered cerebrospinal fluid dynamics.
26	291	Functional neurology 2009:24(3):133-8.
27 28	292	7. Zamboni P. The Big Idea: Iron-dependent inflammation in venous disease and proposed parallels in
29	293	multiple sclerosis. Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine 2006;99(11):589-93. doi:
30 31	294	https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014107680609901122
32	295	8. Wattjes MP, van Oosten BW, de Graaf WL, et al. No association of abnormal cranial venous drainage
33 24	296	with multiple sclerosis: a magnetic resonance venography and flow-quantification study. <i>Journal</i>
34 35	297	of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry 2011:82(4):429-35, doi:
36	298	https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/innp.2010.223479
37 38	299	9. Hojnacki D, Zamboni P, Lopez-Soriano A, et al. Use of neck magnetic resonance venography, Doppler
39	300	sonography and selective venography for diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous
40 41	301	insufficiency: a pilot study in multiple sclerosis patients and healthy controls. <i>International</i>
42	302	angiology : a journal of the International Union of Angiology 2010:29(2):127-39.
43	303	10. Zamboni P. Galeotti R. Menegatti E. et al. A prospective open-label study of endovascular treatment
44 45	304	of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. <i>Journal of vascular surgery</i> 2009;50(6):1348-3. doi:
46	305	https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/i.ivs.2009.07.096
47 48	306	11. Reekers JA, Lee MJ, Belli AM, et al. Cardiovascular and interventional radiological society of europe
49	307	commentary on the treatment of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. <i>CardioVascular and</i>
50 51	308	Interventional Radiology 2011;34(1):1-2. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00270-010-0050-5
52	309	12. Chafe R, Born KB, Slutsky AS, et al. The rise of people power. <i>Nature</i> 2011;472(7344):410-11. doi:
53 54	310	http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/472410a
55		
56 57		
58		
59		For poor roviow only http://bmionop/microm/cito/about/cuidolines.yhtml
60		i or peer review only - http://binjopen.binj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Protected by copyright, including for uses related

to text

and

data m

ining, AI training, and similar technologies

://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

#### **BMJ Open**

- 2 13. Tsivgoulis G, Faissner S, Voumvourakis K, et al. "Liberation treatment" for chronic cerebrospinal 311 3 312 venous insufficiency in multiple sclerosis: The truth will set you free. Brain and Behavior 4 5 2015;5(1):3-12. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/brb3.297 313
- 6 14. Zamboni P, Tesio L, Galimberti S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Extracranial Vein Angioplasty in Multiple 314 7 8 315 Sclerosis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA neurology 2018;75(1):35-43. doi. 9 316 10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.3825 [published Online First: 2017/11/19] 10
- 15. Napoli V, Berchiolli R, Carboncini MC, et al. Percutaneous Venous Angioplasty in Patients with 317 11 12 318 Multiple Sclerosis and Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous Insufficiency: A Randomized Wait List 13 Control Study. Annals of vascular surgery 2020;62:275-86. doi: 10.1016/j.avsg.2019.05.018 319 14 15 320 [published Online First: 2019/08/25]
- 16 321 16. Siddigui AH, Zivadinov R, Benedict RH, et al. Prospective randomized trial of venous angioplasty in 17 322 MS (PREMiSe). Neurology 2014;83(5):441-9. doi: 10.1212/wnl.000000000000638 [published 18 19 323 Online First: 2014/07/01] 20
- 17. Traboulsee AL, Machan L, Girard JM, et al. Safety and efficacy of venoplasty in MS: A randomized, 324 21 22 325 double-blind, sham-controlled phase II trial. Neurology 2018;91(18):e1660-e68. doi: 23 326 10.1212/wnl.000000000006423 [published Online First: 2018/09/30] 24
- 25 327 18. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for 26 328 reporting systematic reviews. Syst Rev 2021;10(1):89. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4 27 [published Online First: 2021/03/31] 28 329
- 29 330 19. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell J. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing The Quality of 30 Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-analyses. Ottawa Health Research Institute Web site 2014;7 331 31
- 32 332 20. JPT H, J T, J C, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.3 33 2022). Cochrane; 2022 Available 333 (updated February [updated 2022. from: 34 35 334 www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
- 36 21. Zivadinov R, Marr K, Cutter G, et al. Prevalence, sensitivity, and specificity of chronic cerebrospinal 335 37 336 venous insufficiency in MS. Neurology 2011;77(2):138-44. doi: 38 39 337 https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e318212a901 40
- 22. Van den Berg PJ, Van den Berg GB, Westerhuis LW, et al. Occurrence of CCSVI in patients with MS 338 41 42 339 and its relationship with iron metabolism and varicose veins. European journal of neurology 43 340 2013;20(3):519-26. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ene.12010 44
- 45 341 23. Tromba L, Blasi S, Vestri A, et al. Prevalence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple 46 342 sclerosis: blinded sonographic evaluation. Phlebology 2015;30(1):52-60. doi: а 47 https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0268355513512823 343 48
- 49 344 24. Patti F, Nicoletti A, Leone C, et al. Multiple sclerosis and CCSVI: a population-based case control 50 study. PloS one 2012;7(8):e41227. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041227 345 51
- 52 346 25. Mayer CA, Pfeilschifter W, Lorenz MW, et al. The perfect crime? CCSVI not leaving a trace in MS. 53 neurology, 347 Journal of neurosurgery, and psychiatry 2011;82(4):436-40. doi: 54 55 348 https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2010.231613 56

1



# BMJ Open

249 250	with multiple sclerosis <i>Archives of pourology</i> 2011;68(12):1521 5 doi:
350	https://dv.doi.org/10.1001/archneurol.2011.185
257	27 Mancini M. Morra VB. Di Donato Q. et al. Multiple sclerosis: corebral circulation time. <i>Padiology</i>
252	2012:262(2):947-55_doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1148/radiol.11111229
251	2012,202(3).547-55. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1146/fadioi.11111255</u>
355	with multiple sclerosis and its severity: a blind-verified study. <i>PloS and</i> 2013;8(2):e56031. doi:
356	https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056031
357	29 Kantarci E Albayram S Demirci NO et al Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: does
358	ultrasound really distinguish multiple sclerosis subjects from healthy controls? <i>European</i>
359	radiology 2012:22(5):970-9 doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00330-011-2338-5
360	30 Imperiale D. Melis F. Giaccone C. et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple
361	sclerosis: a sonographer-blinded case-control study. <i>Clinical neurology and neurosurgery</i>
362	2013;115(8):1394-8. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/i.clineuro.2013.01.003
363	31. Gandhi S, Marr K, Mancini M, et al. No association between variations in extracranial venous
364	anatomy and clinical outcomes in multiple sclerosis patients over 5 years. BMC neurology
365	2019;19(1):121. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12883-019-1350-2
366	32. Costello F, Modi J, Lautner D, et al. Validity of the diagnostic criteria for chronic cerebrospinal venous
367	insufficiency and association with multiple sclerosis. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association
368	<i>journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne</i> 2014;186(11):E418-26. doi:
369	https://dx.doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.131431
370	33. Centonze D, Floris R, Stefanini M, et al. Proposed chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency criteria
371	do not predict multiple sclerosis risk or severity. <i>Annals of neurology</i> 2011;70(1):51-8. doi:
372	https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.22436
373	34. Cardaioli G, Di Filippo M, Bianchi A, et al. Extracranial Venous Drainage Pattern in Multiple Sclerosis
374	and Healthy Controls: Application of the 2011 Diagnostic Criteria for Chronic Cerebrospinal
375	Venous Insufficiency. <i>European neurology</i> 2016;76(1-2):62-8. doi:
376	https://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000445540
377	35. Caprio MG, Marr K, Gandhi S, et al. Centralized and Local Color Doppler Ultrasound Reading
378	Agreement for Diagnosis of the Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous Insufficiency in Patients with
379	Multiple Sclerosis. <i>Current Neurovascular Research</i> 2017;14(3):266-73. doi:
380	10.2174/1567202614666170718095203
381	36. Blinkenberg M, Akeson P, Sillesen H, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and venous
382	stenoses in multiple sclerosis. Acta neurologica Scandinavica 2012;126(6):421-7. doi:
383	https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.2012.01671.x
384	37. Baracchini C, Perini P, Causin F, et al. Progressive multiple sclerosis is not associated with chronic
385	cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. <i>Neurology</i> 2011;77(9):844-50. doi:
386	https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31822c6208
	For near review only http://bmionelit.com/site/shout/guidelines.vhtml

**BMJ** Open

38. Baracchini C, Perini P, Calabrese M, et al. No evidence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency Annals of neurology 2011;69(1):90-9. multiple sclerosis onset. doi: at https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.22228 39. Amato MP, Saia V, Hakiki B, et al. No association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and pediatric-onset multiple sclerosis. Multiple sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England) 2012;18(12):1791-6. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1352458512445943 40. Simka M. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: Current perspectives. J Vasc Diagnostics 2014;2:1-13. doi: 10.2147/JVD.S47384 41. Menegatti E, Genova V, Tessari M, et al. The reproducibility of colour Doppler in chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency associated with multiple sclerosis. Int Angiol 2010;29(2):121-26. 42. Diaconu CI, Fox RJ, Grattan A, et al. Hydration status substantially affects chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency assessments. Neurology Clinical practice 2013;3(5):386-91. 43. Farina M, Novelli E, Pagani R. Cross-sectional area variations of internal jugular veins during supine head rotation in multiple sclerosis patients with chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a prospective diagnostic controlled study with duplex ultrasound investigation. BMC Neurol 2013;13:162. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-13-162 44. Baumgartner RW, Nirkko AC, Müri RM, et al. Transoccipital power-based color-coded duplex sonography of cerebral sinuses and veins. Stroke 1997;28(7):1319-23. 45. Baumgartner RW, Gönner F, Arnold M, et al. Transtemporal power- and frequency-based color-coded duplex sonography of cerebral veins and sinuses. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 1997;18(9):1771-81. 46. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Pomidori L, et al. Does thoracic pump influence the cerebral venous return? J Appl Physiol (1985) 2012;112(5):904-10. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00712.2011 47. Simka M, Ludyga T, Latacz P, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of current sonographic criteria for the detection of outflow abnormalities in the internal jugular veins. *Phlebology* 2013;28(6):285-92. doi: 10.1258/phleb.2012.011125 48. Zivadinov R, Bastianello S, Dake MD, et al. Recommendations for multimodal noninvasive and invasive screening for detection of extracranial venous abnormalities indicative of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a position statement of the International Society for Neurovascular Disease. Journal of vascular and interventional radiology : JVIR 2014;25(11):1785-94.e17. doi: 10.1016/j.jvir.2014.07.024 [published Online First: 2014/09/27] 49. Beggs CB. Venous hemodynamics in neurological disorders: an analytical review with hydrodynamic analysis. BMC Medicine 2013;11(1):142. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-11-142 50. Dake MD, Zivadinov R, Haacke EM. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple sclerosis: a historical perspective. Funct Neurol 2011;26(4):181-95. 51. Tsivgoulis G, Sergentanis TN, Chan A, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: A comprehensive meta-analysis of case-control studies. Therapeutic Advances in Neurological Disorders 2014;7(2):114-36. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1756285613499425 

52. Ter Schure J, Grünwald P. Accumulation Bias in meta-analysis: the need to consider time in error

AJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.
---

control. F1000Research 2019;8:962. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.19375.1 [published Online First: 2019/11/19] **Figure legends** Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection. Figure 2 Meta-analysis of the probability of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Figure 3 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni were removed (upper panels); studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (lower panels). Figure 4 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy were removed (upper panels); studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy (lower panels). For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



60



Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection.

131x131mm (600 x 600 DPI)



Figure 2 Meta-analysis of the probability of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls.

157x113mm (300 x 300 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.



Figure 3 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni were removed (upper panels); studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (lower panels).

153x112mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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

1	
2	
3	
4 5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
20	
28	
29	
30	
31	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38 30	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51 52	
52 53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

60



Figure 4 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy were removed (upper panels); studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy (lower panels).

157x120mm (300 x 300 DPI)

# Association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis

#### 4 Supplementary Appendix 1: Detailed literature search

MEDLINE (OVID) Search Strategy			EMBASE (OVID) Search Strategy			
1	Neuromyelitis Optica/	1	Multiple Sclerosis/			
2	Myelitis, Transverse/	2	(multiple adj sclerosis).mp.			
3	Demyelinating Diseases/	3	Myelitis/			
4	(neuromyelitis adj optica).mp.	4	(transverse adj myelitis).mp.			
5	(transverse adj myelitis).mp.	5	Myelooptic Neuropathy/			
6	Multiple Sclerosis/	6	(myelooptic adj neuropath\$).tw.			
7	Multiple Sclerosis, Chronic	7	(neuromyelitis adj optica).mp.			
Progr	essive/	8	Acute Disseminated			
8	Multiple Sclerosis, Relapsing-	Encep	bhalomyelitis/			
Remit	ting/	9	ADEM.tw.			
9	(multiple adj sclerosis).mp.	10	Optic Neuritis/			
10	(demyelinating adj (disease? or	11	(optic adj neuriti\$).tw.			
disord	ler?)).mp.	12	Encephalomyelitis/			
11	Encephalomyelitis, Acute	13	encephalomyelitis.tw.			
Disse	minated/	14	• devic.tw.			
12	encephalomyelitis.tw.	15	clinically isolated syndrome?".tw.			
13	devic.tw.	16	Demyelinating Disease/			
14	"clinically isolated syndrome?".tw.	17	(demyelinating adj (disease? or			
15	Optic Neuritis/	disord	ler?)).tw.			
16	(optic adj neuriti\$).mp.	18	ultrasonogra\$.mp.			
17	ADEM.tw.	19	Ultrasound/			
18	exp Ultrasonography/	20	ultrasound\$.mp.			
19	ultrasonogra\$.mp.	21	Doppler\$.mp.			
20	ultrasound\$.tw.	22	magnetic resonance angiography/			
21	Doppler\$.mp.	23	"magnetic resonance angiogra\$".tw.			
22	Magnetic Resonance Angiography/	24	"magnetic resonance			
23	"magnetic resonance angiogra\$".tw.	arterio	ogra\$".tw.			
24	"magnetic resonance	25	exp brain angiography/			
arterio	ogra\$".tw.	26	(cerebral adj angiogra\$).tw.			
25	Cerebral Angiography/	27	(brain adj angiogra\$).tw.			
26	(cerebral adj angiogra\$).tw.	28	(brain adj arteriogra\$).tw.			
27	(cerebral adj arteriogra\$).tw.	29	(venous adj angiogra\$).tw.			
28	(venous adj angiogra\$).tw.	30	(venous adj arteriogra\$).tw.			
29	(venous adj arteriogra\$).tw.	31	exp Phlebography/			
30	(brain adj angiogra\$).tw.	32	phlebogra\$.mp.			

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

1 2			
2		31 (brain adi arteriogra <sup>\$</sup> ) tw	23 venogra <sup>¢</sup> mp
4		32 Phlebography/	$a_{\rm or}/1-17$
5		33 phlebogra\$ mp	25 or/18 33
7		34 vonogra¢ mp	86 34 and 35
8		$34$ venogra $\mathfrak{s}$ .mp.	34 and $35$
9		35 01/1-17	
10 11		30 01/18-34 3	
12		37 35 and 36 3	s9 limit 38 to yr="2006 -Current"
13		38 Animais/ not (Animais/ and	
14		Humans/)	
15 16		39 37 not 38	
17		40 limit 39 to yr="2006 -Current"	
18	5		
19	6		
20 21			
22	7		
23	0		
24 25	8		
25 26	g		
27	5		
28	10		
29			
30 31	11		
32			
33	12		
34 25			
35 36	13		
37	11		
38	14		
39 40	15		
40 41	10		
42	16		
43			
44 45	17		
45 46			
47	18		
48	10		
49 50	19		
51	20		
52	20		
53	21		
54 55			
56	22		
57			
58 50	23		
59 60			

	Study	Participants (n)	Age (year)	Female (%)	Controls matched to cas sex and age
Z	ivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	163	50 †	73.1	No
	Γromba <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	67	32 *	49.3	No
	Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	68	40 *	64.7	Yes
C	ardaioli <i>et al</i> β4	18	31 *	66.7	No
Ir	nperiale <i>et al</i> <sup>β0</sup>	41	45 *	56.1	Yes
	Mayer <i>et al</i> ²⁵	20	34 *	50.0	No
Ba	aracchini <i>et al</i> β7	60	46 *	55.0	Yes
(	Costello <i>et aβ</i> <sup>2</sup>	60	45 *	75.0	Yes
Var	i den Berg <i>et al</i> ²²	41	44 †	48.8	Yes
	Patti <i>et al</i> <sup>24</sup>	172	43 *	58.1	Yes
Ba	aracchini <i>et al<sup>38</sup></i>	_			Yes
	Group 1 ‡	50	33 *	70.0	
	Group 2 §	60	63 *	53.3	
	Gandhi <i>et al<sup>a</sup>i</i>	38	45 *	67.0	Yes
С	entonze <i>et al<sup>63</sup></i>	56	42 *	64.3	Yes
Z	Zamboni <i>et al<sup>5</sup></i>				Yes
	Group 1 ‡	60	37 †	53.3	
	Group 2 §	72	58 †	59.7	
1	Mancini <i>et al</i> <sup>27</sup>	42	38 †	54.8	Yes
	Marder et al <sup>26</sup>	11	55 *	36.4	Yes
<u>ا</u>	Kantarci <i>et al</i> <sup>29</sup>	54	37 *	50.0	No
Bli	nkenberg <i>et al</i> <sup>36</sup>	15	37 *	73.0	Yes
	Caprio <i>et al<sup>β5</sup></i>	28	50 *	60.7	Yes
0.0	Amato <i>et al<sup>se</sup></i>	16	18 †	44.0	Yes
26	Note. *: mean.				
27	†: median.				
28	‡: Healthy control	ols in group 1 were r	matched with MS	patients.	
29	§: In the study	by Baracchini et al.	, healthy controls	in group 2 were ma	atched with controls who had
30	neurologic disea	ases other than MS;	in the study by Za	mboni et al., healthy	controls in group 2 were older
31	than the median	age of the Europea	n MS population.		
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
51 20					
30 20					
39					
4()					
40					
41					
40 41 42					

# 24 Supplementary Appendix 2

Study	Patients with MS (n)					Age	Proportion	Duration	Receive	EDSS
-	MS	CIS	RRMS	SPMS/ PPMS	Other	(year)	of female (%)	of MS	treatment (%)	score
Zivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	289	21	191	30	68	48 <sup>†</sup>	76.5	12 † years	89	3.0 †
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	112	9	78	25	0	43 *	54.5	12 * years	s NA	6.0 *
Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	68	0	48	20	0	43 *	64.7	13 * years	s NA	2.0 †
Cardaioli <i>et al</i> <sup>34</sup>	39	0	35	4	0	42 *	82.1	9 * years	NA	1.9 *
Imperiale <i>et al<sup>30</sup></i>	80	0	56	24	0	46 *	64.0	10 † years	63	3.5 †
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>25</sup>	20	0	17	3	0	42 *	65.0	13 * years	90	3.0 †
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>37</sup></i>	60	0	0	60	0	46 *	55.0	15 * years	s NA	6.0 *
Costello <i>et aβ</i> ²	120	4	86	29	1	46 *	74.1	11 † years	52	2.25 †
√an den Berg <i>et</i> al <sup>22</sup>	90	0	59	31	0	47 †	72.2	72 † months	NA	3.0 †
Patti <i>et al</i> ²⁴	148	20	105	43	0	44 *	62.8	175 * months	84	NA
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>38</sup></i>	50	50	0	0	0	33 *	70.0	NA	28	1.5 †
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>β1</sup>	90	0	52	38	0	47 *	73.3	15 * years	84	3.0 †
Centonze <i>et al<sup>β3</sup></i>	84	0	69	15	0	39 *	61.9	NA	82	NA
Zamboni <i>et al<sup>s</sup></i>	109	0	69	40	0	40 †	58.7	6 † years	NA	2.0 †
Mancini <i>et al<sup>27</sup></i>	103	0	41	62	0	42 †	60.2	12 † years	71	4.0 †
Marder <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	18	1	6	11	0	55 *	16.7	21 † years	NA	NA
Kantarci <i>et al</i> 29	62	0	32	30	0	37 *	64.5	112 * months	NA	4.0 †
Blinkenberg <i>et</i> <i>al</i> <sup>β6</sup>	24	0	24	0	0	37 *	67.0	10 * years	s NA	3.2 *
Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>β5</sup>	78	0	42	35	1	53 *	71.8	22 * years	s NA	3.5 †
Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>β9</sup>	15	0	15	0	0	18 †	60.0	6 † years	NA	1.2 †
Note. n = number syndrome; RRM	r; NA=  S =	= not a Relaps	pplicable	e; EDSS itting M	S = Exp IS; SP	oanded [ MS = s	Disability Stat econdary pro	us Scale; C ogressive	CIS = Clinically is MS; PPMS = p	solated orimary
*: mean										
. mean.										
T: median.										

3 Results of quality assessment using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. 60 Table e3 -4 Study Selection Comparability Scores Exposure 5 (0–9) 6 7 Is the case Representativene Selection of Definition Comparability of AscertainThe same method Non-8 definition -ss of the cases controls of cases and controls ment of of ascertainment response 9 adequate? controls on the basis of the exposure for cases and rate 10 design or analysis controls 11  $\frac{12}{\text{Ziyadinov}}$  et al<sup>21</sup> \* \* \*\* \* \* 6 1<del>1</del>fromba *et al*<sup>23</sup> \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* Brotected by copyright, including \_15 16 eone *et al*28 \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* Cardaioli *et aβ*<sup>4</sup> 18 \* \* \* \* \* \* \*\* In Aperiale et al<sup>30</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* <del>-20</del> 2 Mayer *et al*<sup>25</sup> \* \* \* \* \* \*\* Baracchini et als7 \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 23 2 Quostello et al<sup>32</sup> \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \*  $\frac{25}{\sqrt{26}}$  den Berg *et* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* al22 ð 27 27 28<sup>Patti</sup> *et al*<sup>24</sup> Enseignement \$uperieur (ABES) . Uses related to text and data mining. Al training, and similar technologies. \* \* \*\* \* \* Baracchini et al<sup>38</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* -30 3Ģandhi *et al*<sup>β1</sup> \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 22 Centonze *et al*<sup>β3</sup> \* \* \* \* \* \* 32 amboni et al<sup>5</sup> \* \* \*\* \* \* 35 Mancini *et al*<sup>27</sup> \* \* \* \* \* \* 3 Marder et al<sup>26</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 38 Kantarci et al29 \* \* \* \* \* \*\* 49 Iinkenberg et \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 41  $a^{\beta 6}$ 4243 Caprio *et al*<sup>35</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 4Amato et al<sup>β9</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* -45 61 46 47 62 48 63 49 50 64 51 52 65 53 66 54 55 67 56 68 57 58 69

59

60

70

1						
2						
3	71	Supplementary Appendix 3				
4	11	Supplementary Appendix 5				
5			Mata analysia astir	notoo aiyon nomo	d atudu ia amittad	
6			Lower CLLimit	Getimate		it
7			Lower of Linit	Lotinate	Opper of Ein	
8		Amato et al. 2012		0		
9		Baracchini et al. 2011a Baracchini et al. 2011b				
10		Blinkenberg et al. 2012				
10		Caprio et al. 2017				
11		Cardaioli et al. 2016				
12		Centonze et al. 2011				
13		Costello et al. 2014				
14		Imperiale et al. 2013				
15		Kantarci et al. 2012				
16		Leone et al. 2013				
17		Mancini et al. 2012				
18		Marder et al. 2011		••••••		
19		Mayer et al. 2011		0		
20		Tromba et al. 2012				
21		Van den Berg et al. 2013				
		0				

1.7492

Zamboni et al. 2009 Zivadinov et al. 2011

73 Figure f1 Sensitivity analysis of included studies resulted in a display of the estimated pooled

3.36

effect size regarding the association of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency with multiple

75 sclerosis.

Reiez oniz

5.85

6.62

National Institute for Health Research

# **PROSPERO** International prospective register of systematic reviews

UNIVERSITY of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

# Systematic review

Fields that have an asterisk (\*) next to them means that they must be answered. Word limits are provided for each section. You will be unable to submit the form if the word limits are exceeded for any section. Registrant means the person filling out the form.

This record cannot be edited because it has been marked as out of scope

# 1. \* Review title.

Give the title of the review in English

Relevance between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review

and meta-analysis

# 2. Original language title.

For reviews in languages other than English, give the title in the original language. This will be displayed with the English language title.

# 3. \* Anticipated or actual start date.

Give the date the systematic review started or is expected to start.

12/10/2022

# 4. \* Anticipated completion date.

Give the date by which the review is expected to be completed.

# 25/01/2023

# 5. \* Stage of review at time of this submission.

This field uses answers to initial screening questions. It cannot be edited until after registration.

Tick the boxes to show which review tasks have been started and which have been completed.

Update this field each time any amendments are made to a published record.

 **PROSPERO** 

The review has not yet started: No

Review stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

Provide any other relevant information about the stage of the review here.

International prospective register of systematic reviews

#### 6. \* Named contact.

The named contact is the guarantor for the accuracy of the information in the register record. This may be any member of the review team.

Jun Yang

# Email salutation (e.g. "Dr Smith" or "Joanne") for correspondence:

Mr Yang

#### 7. \* Named contact email.

Give the electronic email address of the named contact.

1191815774@qq.com

#### 8. Named contact address

Give the full institutional/organisational postal address for the named contact.

the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, China

#### 9. Named contact phone number.

Give the telephone number for the named contact, including international dialling code.

# National Institute for Health Research

#### 

# PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

# 10. \* Organisational affiliation of the review.

Full title of the organisational affiliations for this review and website address if available. This field may be completed as 'None' if the review is not affiliated to any organisation.

The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University

# Organisation web address:

# 11. \* Review team members and their organisational affiliations.

Give the personal details and the organisational affiliations of each member of the review team. Affiliation refers to groups or organisations to which review team members belong. NOTE: email and country now MUST be entered for each person, unless you are amending a published record.

Mr Jun Yang. The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University

### 12. \* Funding sources/sponsors.

Details of the individuals, organizations, groups, companies or other legal entities who have funded or sponsored the review.

the National Natural Science Foundation of China

Grant number(s)

State the funder, grant or award number and the date of award

#### 

### 13. \* Conflicts of interest.

List actual or perceived conflicts of interest (financial or academic).

None

### 14. Collaborators.

Give the name and affiliation of any individuals or organisations who are working on the review but who are not listed as review team members. **NOTE: email and country must be completed for each person, unless you are amending a published record.** 

# 15. \* Review question.

State the review question(s) clearly and precisely. It may be appropriate to break very broad questions down into a series of related more specific questions. Questions may be framed or refined using PI(E)COS or similar where relevant.

Is the prevalence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency higher in patients with MS compared to

healthy individuals? Is there an association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and MS?

# International prospective register of systematic reviews

# 16. \* Searches.

State the sources that will be searched (e.g. Medline). Give the search dates, and any restrictions (e.g. language or publication date). Do NOT enter the full search strategy (it may be provided as a link or attachment below.)

The following bibliographic databases were searched the MEDLINE versus Embase databases using the

OVID portal, with search dates adjusted from January 1, 2006, to April 1, 2022.

# 17. URL to search strategy.

Upload a file with your search strategy, or an example of a search strategy for a specific database, (including the keywords) in pdf or word format. In doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible. Or provide a URL or link to the strategy. Do NOT provide links to your search **results**.

"Multiple Sclerosis," "multiple adj sclerosis," "Neuromyelitis Optica," "neuromyelitis adj optica," "Myelitis, Transverse," "transverse adj myelitis," "Demyelinating Diseases," "demyelinating adj (disease? or disorder?)", "Encephalomyelitis, Acute Disseminated," "ADEM," "encephalomyelitis," "Optic Neuritis," "optic adj neuriti\$," "devic," "clinically isolated syndrome?" AND "Ultrasound," "exp Ultrasonography," "ultrasonogra\$," "ul-trasound\$," "Doppler\$," "Magnetic Resonance Angiography," "magnetic resonance angiogra\$," "magnetic resonance arteriogra\$," "Cerebral Angiography," "cerebral adj an-giogra\$," "cerebral adj arteriogra\$," "venous adj angiogra\$," "venous adj arteriogra\$," "brain adj angiogra\$," "brain adj arteriogra\$," "exp Phlebography," "phlebogra\$," "venogra\$."

Alternatively, upload your search strategy to CRD in pdf format. Please note that by doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

Do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

# 18. \* Condition or domain being studied.

Give a short description of the disease, condition or healthcare domain being studied in your systematic review. Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is a chronic neurological disease that primarily affects the central nervous system (which includes the brain and spinal cord). The cause is unknown, and it is characterized by demyelination in pathology. Common symptoms include muscle paralysis, motor impairment, sensory impairment, vision problems, fatigue, etc. Currently, there is no cure and common treatment methods include Chromiosappbesspintalared inuscificital agains a long-term and incomplete recovery of brain and spinal cord function disorder. This state may be caused by various reasons, including brain and spinal cord injury,

infection, inflammation, malnutrition, metabolic disorders, toxic exposure, etc. Common symptoms include muscle atrophy, sensory impairment, motor impairment, language impairment, cognitive impairment, etc.

# National Institute for Health Research

Treatment methods vary depending on the cause, including physical therapy, medication, rehabilitation,

nutritional therapy, etc.

# 19. \* Participants/population.

Specify the participants or populations being studied in the review. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The trial included patients of any age with multiple sclerosis.

# 20. \* Intervention(s), exposure(s).

Give full and clear descriptions or definitions of the interventions or the exposures to be reviewed. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

use of Doppler ultrasound to detect chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency?

# 21. \* Comparator(s)/control.

Where relevant, give details of the alternatives against which the intervention/exposure will be compared (e.g. another intervention or a non-exposed control group). The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

use of Doppler ultrasound to detect chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency?

# 22. \* Types of study to be included.

Give details of the study designs (e.g. RCT) that are eligible for inclusion in the review. The preferred format includes both inclusion and exclusion criteria. If there are no restrictions on the types of study, this should be stated.

We have no restrictions on the types of study designs eligible for inclusion.

# 23. Context.

Give summary details of the setting or other relevant characteristics, which help define the inclusion or exclusion criteria.

# 24. \* Main outcome(s).

Give the pre-specified main (most important) outcomes of the review, including details of how the outcome is defined and measured and when these measurement are made, if these are part of the review inclusion criteria.

There is a correlation between xx and multiple sclerosis.

# Measures of effect

Please specify the effect measure(s) for you main outcome(s) e.g. relative risks, odds ratios, risk difference, and/or 'number needed to treat.

# 25. \* Additional outcome(s).

List the pre-specified additional outcomes of the review, with a similar level of detail to that required for main

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

#### **PROSPERO**

#### International prospective register of systematic reviews

outcomes. Where there are no additional outcomes please state 'None' or 'Not applicable' as appropriate to the review

chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is more prevalent in patients with multiple sclerosis than in

healthy individuals.

Measures of effect

Please specify the effect measure(s) for you additional outcome(s) e.g. relative risks, odds ratios, risk difference, and/or 'number needed to treat.

#### 26. \* Data extraction (selection and coding).

Describe how studies will be selected for inclusion. State what data will be extracted or obtained. State how this will be done and recorded. Two authors extracted data and entered it into a standardized collection form, independently reviewed and confirmed by a third author. The extracted data were as follows: first author, country, publication date, sample size, demographic characteristics of participants (age vs. percentage female), and study characteristics of patients (dis-ease duration, percentage treated, and expanded disability status scale). For some of the missing data, the researchers were also active in obtaining it from the article's authors via email.

# 27. \* Risk of bias (quality) assessment.

State which characteristics of the studies will be assessed and/or any formal risk of bias/quality assessment tools that will be used.

Two reviewers will independently assess risk of bias based on the following domains from recommendations from the Cochrane handbook: 1. Adequate sequence generation; 2. Allocation concealment; 3. Blinding; 4. Incomplete outcome data and how it was addressed; 5. Selective reporting of the outcome; 6. Any other biases. results of bias assessment will be presented in a figure and a graph indicating low, high or unclear risk of bias for each of the 6 items in each trial. Sensitivity analysis will be conducted based on the bias assessment to assess robustness of results.

# 28. \* Strategy for data synthesis.

Describe the methods you plan to use to synthesise data. This **must not be generic text** but should be **specific to your review** and describe how the proposed approach will be applied to your data. If metaanalysis is planned, describe the models to be used, methods to explore statistical heterogeneity, and software package to be used.

STATA 17.0 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, USA) was used to conduct the meta-analysis by the researchers. One investigator entered the detailed data into the software. Another investigator reviewed the data for accuracy, generating forest plots and odds ratios (ORs) to determine whether there was a statistical relevance between CCSVI and MS. The pooled ORs for this study were derived using a random-effects model. An OR greater than 1.0 indicates that at least two ultrasound diagnostic criteria were met and displayed a positive correlation between CCSVI and MS, with p 0.05, indicating a statistically significant

# National Institute for Health Research

#### PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

difference. The origins of heterogeneity in the included studies were examined using Cochran's Q and I<sup>2</sup> statistics. I<sup>2</sup> values of at least 50% are usually considered to represent substantial heterogeneity, while values of at least 75% indicate considerable heterogeneity. By the Cochrane Review Manager 5.4 version 5.4.1. for publication bias was assessed using the Egger test, p 0.05 indicates significant publication bias. Meanwhile, the Fill and Trim methods were used to correct for publication bias. To determine the effect of individual studies in the article on the experimental results, the researchers used a sensitivity analysis by excluding individual studies. In addition, we used subgroup analysis to further look for sources of heterogeneity.

# 29. \* Analysis of subgroups or subsets.

State any planned investigation of 'subgroups'. Be clear and specific about which type of study or participant will be included in each group or covariate investigated. State the planned analytic approach. Sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the results and subgroup analyses to determine whether the summary effects are related to the clinical characteristics of the included trials are pre-specified. In addition, sensitivity analyses will be performed to include only those trials that do not have any assessment bias. Two subgroup analyses will also be performed. The first one assesses whether studies by authors associated with the Zamboni team have an impact on the results; the second one examines whether liberation therapy has an impact on the relevance of the results.

# 30. \* Type and method of review.

Select the type of review, review method and health area from the lists below.

### Type of review

Cost effectiveness No	
Diagnostic No	
Epidemiologic No	
Individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis No	s
Intervention No	
Living systematic review No	
Meta-analysis	

Yes

No

Page 31	l of 37	BMJ Open
1 2	PROSPERO International prospective register of	of systematic reviews
2 3 4 5	Methodology No	
6 7 8	Narrative synthesis No	
9 10 11 12	Network meta-analysis No	
12 13 14 15	Pre-clinical No	
16 17 18	Prevention No	
19 20 21	Prognostic No	
22 23 24	Prospective meta-analysis (PMA) No	
25 26 27	Review of reviews	
28 29 30	Service delivery No	
31 32 33 24	Synthesis of qualitative studies No	
34 35 36 37	Systematic review Yes	
38 39 40 41 42	Other No	
43 44 45 46 47	Health area of the review Alcohol/substance misuse/abuse No	
48 49 50	Blood and immune system No	
51 52 53	Cancer No	
54 55 56	Cardiovascular No	
57 58	Care of the elderly	

BMJ Open	Pa
PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews	National Institute for Health Research
Child health No	
Complementary therapies No	
COVID-19 No	
Crime and justice No	
Dental No	
Digestive system No	
Ear, nose and throat No	
Education No	
Endocrine and metabolic disorders No	
Eye disorders No	
General interest No	
Genetics No	
Health inequalities/health equity No	
Infections and infestations No	
International development No	
Mental health and behavioural conditions No	
Musculoskeletal	

No

Nursing

PROSPERO International prospective regis	ster of systematic reviews
No	
Obstetrics and gynaecology No	
Oral health No	
Palliative care No	
Perioperative care No	
Physiotherapy No	
Pregnancy and childbirth	
Public health (including social detern	minants of health)
Rehabilitation No	
Respiratory disorders No	
Service delivery No	
Skin disorders No	
Social care No	
Surgery No	
Tropical Medicine No	
Jrological No	
Nounds, injuries and accidents No	
violence and abuse	

# PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

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

National Institute for Health Research

# 31. Language.

Select each language individually to add it to the list below, use the bin icon to remove any added in error. English

There is not an English language summary

# 32. \* Country.

Select the country in which the review is being carried out. For multi-national collaborations select all the countries involved.

#### China

# 33. Other registration details.

Name any other organisation where the systematic review title or protocol is registered (e.g. Campbell, or The Joanna Briggs Institute) together with any unique identification number assigned by them. If extracted data will be stored and made available through a repository such as the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR), details and a link should be included here. If none, leave blank.

# 34. Reference and/or URL for published protocol.

If the protocol for this review is published provide details (authors, title and journal details, preferably in Vancouver format)

Add web link to the published protocol.

Or, upload your published protocol here in pdf format. Note that the upload will be publicly accessible. No I do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

Please note that the information required in the PROSPERO registration form must be completed in full even if access to a protocol is given.

### 35. Dissemination plans.

Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

#### No

Give brief details of plans for communicating review findings.?

# 36. Keywords.

Give words or phrases that best describe the review. Separate keywords with a semicolon or new line. Keywords help PROSPERO users find your review (keywords do not appear in the public record but are

#### PROSPERO

#### International prospective register of systematic reviews

included in searches). Be as specific and precise as possible. Avoid acronyms and abbreviations unless these are in wide use.

multiple sclerosis; chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency; ultrasound; meta-analysis

# 37. Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors.

If you are registering an update of an existing review give details of the earlier versions and include a full bibliographic reference, if available.

#### 38. \* Current review status.

Update review status when the review is completed and when it is published.New registrations must be ongoing so this field is not editable for initial submission.

Please provide anticipated publication date

Review\_Ongoing

#### 39. Any additional information.

Provide any other information relevant to the registration of this review.

# 40. Details of final report/publication(s) or preprints if available.

Leave empty until publication details are available OR you have a link to a preprint (NOTE: this field is not editable for initial submission). List authors, title and journal details preferably in Vancouver format.

Give the link to the published review or preprint.



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

			BMJ Open BMJ Open by j	Page 36 of 37
1	PRISM	<b>/A</b> 20	)20 Checklist	
3 4 5	Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
6	TITLE			
7	Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
8	ABSTRACT			
9 10	Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	1
11	INTRODUCTION			
12	Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	2
13	Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	2
14	METHODS			
15	Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	2
16 17	Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	2
18 19	Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used	2
20 21	Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how may diverse screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	2
22 23 24	Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each epot, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, detate of automation tools used in the process.	2
25 26	Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with act outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which as to collect.	2
27 28		10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, and g sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	2
29 30	Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	3
31	Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	3
32 33	Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the studies were eligible for each synthes tabulating the studies were eligible for each synthes tabulating the studies were eligible for each synthes tabulating the synthes tabulating tabu	3
34 35 26		13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing sumpary statistics, or data conversions.	2
30 37		13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	3
38 39		13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was permormed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used	3
40		13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	3
41		13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	3
42 43	Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting bias ).	3
44 45	Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to asseste certainty (or contride oce) in the body of evidence for lan jourcement -	3
	-			1

# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Page 37 of 37		BMJ Open	
	MA 20	)20 Checklist	
Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment		ng or	
RESULTS	-		
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to t	3
1	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they ward cluded.	3
2 Study 3 characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	3, 4
4 Risk of bias in 5 studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	5
6 Results of 7 individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) are the stimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	5
8 Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	5,
9 syntheses 0	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summar where and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	5
1	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	5
2	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	5
4 Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis a second	5
5 Certainty of 6 evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	5
7 DISCUSSION			
8 Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	6
0	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	6,7
1	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	6,7
2	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	7
OTHER INFORMA	OTHER INFORMATION		
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the reserved was not registered.	
6	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
7	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	
8 Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the Byview.	7
<sup>9</sup> Competing 0 interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	7
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	2
4 5 <i>From:</i> Page MJ, McK	enzie JE,	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml – Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10	.1136/bmj.n71



**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

# Association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-072319.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Jun-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Jun; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Zhang, Na; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurology Ding, Cong; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery He, Xiuying; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Li, Meihua; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Meng, Wei; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery Ouyang, Taohui; First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Department of Neurosurgery
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Neurology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Radiology and imaging
Keywords:	Multiple sclerosis < NEUROLOGY, Ultrasound < RADIOLOGY & IMAGING, NEUROSURGERY





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
Association between chronic cerebrospinal venous

#### insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis Jun Yang,<sup>1</sup> Na Zhang,<sup>2</sup> Cong Ding,<sup>1</sup> Xiuying He,<sup>1</sup> Meihua Li,<sup>1</sup> Wei Meng,<sup>1</sup> Taohui Ouyang,<sup>1,\*</sup> Department of Neurosurgery, the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, 330006, China Department of Neurology, the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, 330006, China Correspondence: hustijouyang110@163.com; Tel.: +86(0791) 88698265; Fax: +86(0791)88698265 ABSTRACT **Objectives** Numerous studies have indicated that chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is a potential factor in causing multiple sclerosis in recent years, but this conclusion remains unconfirmed. This meta-analysis examined the correlation between multiple sclerosis and chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. Methods We searched Embase and Medline (Ovid) for publications published from January 1, 2006, to May 1, 2022. The meta-analysis was performed following PRISMA guidelines. **Results** Eligible studies (n = 20) included 3,069 participants from seven countries. Pooled analysis indicated that chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency was more frequent in multiple sclerosis patients than in healthy controls (odds ratio 3.36: 95% confidence interval 1.92 - 5.85; P < 0.001) with remarkable heterogeneity among studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 79%). Results were more strongly correlated in subsequent sensitivity analyses, but heterogeneity was also more substantial. We removed studies that initially proposed a CCSVI team as well as studies by authors involved in or advocating endovascular therapies. **Conclusions** Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is significantly associated with multiple sclerosis and it is more prevalent in MS patients than in healthy individuals, but considerable heterogeneity of results is still observed. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY 1. a comprehensive analysis of the correlation between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis was performed. 2. explored the reasons for the close association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis by means of sensitivity analysis and subgroup analysis. 3. further complements previous studies of this type to provide structured guidance for subsequent clinical trials. **KEYWORDS** multiple sclerosis; chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency; ultrasound; meta-analysis Number of words 3311 Number of figures 5 (4 in the body and 1 in the supplementary material.) Number of tables 4 (1 in the body and 3 in the supplementary material.) 1/12For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory condition of the central nervous system of unknown cause, and most findings suggest that the reason is autoimmune pathology.<sup>1</sup> Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency (CCSVI) is a syndrome characterized by multiple stenosis or obstruction of intracranial and extracranial veins, which results in inadequate cerebral venous drainage.<sup>2</sup> In 2008, Zamboni et al. suggested that CCSVI could potentially cause MS.<sup>3</sup> This hypothesis assumed that multiple stenoses or obstructions of the veins, which in turn affect the extracranial outflow channels of the cerebral venous system (internal jugular and azygous veins), eventually lead to an increase in intracranial pressure, followed by blood-brain barrier rupture, local iron deposition, and triggering of the inflammatory chain in MS.<sup>4-7</sup> This abnormal venous drainage can be diagnosed by Doppler ultrasound, magnetic resonance imaging, cerebral perfusion studies, and catheter venography. However, the so-called Zamboni criterion is the most widely used detection mode, and the operation is non-invasive. Zamboni et al. defined five ultrasound criteria for diagnosing CCSVI by transcranial and extracranial echo color Doppler in a study, which revealed that patients had CCSVI when two or more abnormal ultrasound parameters were 

observed.<sup>45</sup> These five ultrasound parameter criteria include (1) Reflux in the internal jugular and/or vertebral veins in the supine and sitting positions. (2) Reflux in the deep cerebral veins. (3) High-resolution B-mode evidence of internal jugular vein stenoses. (4) Flow is not Doppler-detectable in the internal jugular and/or vertebral veins. (5) Reverted postural control of the main cerebral venous outflow route measured in internal jugular veins.
 Since then, most investigators have used this criterion to diagness patients with CCSVL but the evaluation results of the

54 Since then, most investigators have used this criterion to diagnose patients with CCSVI, but the evaluation results of the 55 correlation between CCSVI and MS were inconsistent across studies. Coupled with the fact that despite the availability of 56 neuroimaging techniques such as magnetic resonance venogram<sup>8</sup> or selective venography<sup>9</sup> to assess abnormal central 57 system venous drainage, the pathogenic role of CCSVI in MS remains unproven. In addition, the possibility of CCSVI 58 therapy has been a topic of conversation, including intravenous percutaneous transluminal angioplasty (termed "Liberation 59 treatment") proposed by Zamboni *et al.*<sup>10</sup> This treatment has received widespread attention from patients with MS and

scientific institutions worldwide.<sup>11 12</sup> Still, there are articles reporting its potential adverse consequences.<sup>13</sup> Although the
 follow-up clinical trials showed that venous angioplasty was relatively safe, it did not play an ideal therapeutic effect for
 MS patients.<sup>14-17</sup> The lack of sufficient proof that CCSVI is connected to MS has called into question the idea of intravenous
 percutaneous transluminal angioplasty, especially given the various research results and associated negative side effects.

To evaluate whether CCSVI was connected with MS and whether its frequency varied between MS patients and healthy
 controls, this study did a thorough meta-analysis by pooling studies on the connection of CCSVI with MS. Furthermore,
 sensitivity analyses were utilized to investigate potential explanations for heterogeneity.

## 67 MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 68 Literature search

This meta-analysis was based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Reporting Guidelines.<sup>18</sup> The specific PROSPERO protocol process is placed in the Supplementary Material (PROSPERO). Two authors independently searched the Medline versus Embase databases using the OVID portal, with search dates adjusted from January 1, 2006, to April 1, 2022. Disagreements between the two authors' searches were resolved by a third-party reviewer. The complete search strategy for this study can be found in the supplementary appendix 1. Search terms included: "Multiple Sclerosis" and "Ultrasound". The search findings were restricted to English language articles and human studies. Following that, we critically reviewed all publications that fit these parameters and conducted manual searches of their references and citations of relevant reviews to search for research outside the database. If data were missing or erroneous, the researchers contacted the author again.

#### 45 78 Eligibility

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) English language, (2) use of Doppler ultrasound to detect CCSVI, (3)
 neurological testing criteria used to identify CCSVI, (4) inclusion of at least one control group, and (5) blinding of study.

Exclusion criteria were: (1) no raw data or incomplete data, (2) overlapping data (the study with the complete data chosen for the series of the same author and pattern), (3) literature of too low quality or literature not available in full text, and (4) less than 10 cases or control subjects.

After deleting duplicates, two researchers independently read the titles and abstracts of all identified papers, read the fulltext versions, compared the results, and resolved discrepancies by consensus.

## 54 86 Patient and Public Involvement

Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

57 88 Data extraction 58

**BMJ** Open

89 Two authors extracted data and entered it into a standardized collection form, independently reviewed and confirmed by 90 a third author. The extracted data were as follows: first author, country, publication date, sample size, demographic 91 characteristics of participants (age vs. percentage female), and study characteristics of patients (dis-ease duration, 92 percentage treated, and expanded disability status scale). For some of the missing data, the researchers were also active in 93 obtaining it from the article's authors via email.

#### 94 Quality assessment

 All 20 studies used the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale to assess the risk of bias.<sup>19</sup> The scale is based on
 case-control studies and consists of three domains: selection, comparability, and exposure, with quality ratings ranging
 from 0 to 9. Four study items are in the selection domain, each given a maximum of one star. Three study items are in the
 exposure category, each given at least one star. For comparability, only one item is included, and a maximum of two stars
 is presented. We consider this high-quality literature with low bias if at least seven stars are awarded.

#### 15 100 Statistical analyses

STATA 17.0 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, USA) was used to conduct the meta-analysis by the researchers. One investigator entered the detailed data into the software. Another investigator reviewed the data for accuracy, generating forest plots and odds ratio (OR) to determine whether there was a statistical relevance between CCSVI and MS. We used either a random or fixed effects model for the meta-analysis. A random-effects model was selected if the results showed significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 50\%$ ). An OR greater than 1.0 in the results indicated that CCSVI could be a potential risk factor for MS. P < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. The origins of heterogeneity in the included studies were examined using Cochran's Q and I<sup>2</sup> statistics. 50% to 90% of I<sup>2</sup> values represent substantial heterogeneity, while at least 75% represent considerable heterogeneity.<sup>20</sup> By the Cochrane Review Manager 5.4 version 5.4.1, for publication bias was assessed using Egger's test (P < 0.05 indicates significant publication bias). If the results indicated the presence of publication bias, the fill and trim methods were used to detect publication bias. To determine the effect of individual studies in the article on the experimental results, the researchers used a sensitivity analysis by excluding individual studies. In addition, we used subgroup analysis to further look for sources of heterogeneity.

# <sup>28</sup> 113 **RESULTS**

#### 114 Included studies

The selection process of the study is shown in Figure 1. During the initial search, 2,544 studies were located, with 1,910 records from the EMBASE database, 634 from the Medline database, and no additional records. After removing 468 duplicate research, 2,076 publications were included in the title and abstract screening, and 58 were selected for full-text filtering. After full-text screening and checking, 38 of these articles were excluded: 10 examined irrelevant focus, 18 assessed veins in other ways, one without a control group, five did not use blinding, one used duplicate data, two used overlapping, and one had incomplete experimental data. Ultimately, 20 studies<sup>5 21-39</sup> met the eligibility criteria (Fig. 1).

#### 121 Study characteristics

Of the currently incorporated studies, 11 were conducted in Italy, three in the USA, two in Germany, one in Canada, one in Denmark, one in the Netherlands, and one in Turkey (Table 1). It is noteworthy that the included studies were conducted in Europe or North America. This study included healthy controls (Table 1). All the studies used Doppler ultrasonography to detect CCSVI. Two studies<sup>27 33</sup> did not report an assessment of the five ultrasound parameters of the CCSVI, and three studies<sup>29 32 34</sup> reported only four estimates because the investigators were unable to perform the full five-item neurological protocol. Although eight papers covered ultra-sound technology training, they did not describe in detail the procedures and quality of the training (Table 1). Four ultrasound investigators<sup>5</sup> <sup>21</sup> <sup>28</sup> <sup>39</sup> have participated in CCSVI endovascular treatment clinical trials or studies supporting liberation procedures.

In terms of blinding, eight reports explained the blinding poorly but described the process more entirely in 12 studies, expressed it well in two of them, and reported success with blinding (Table 1). Five studies<sup>21 24 28 30 35</sup> described intraobserver variability. Nevertheless, only four studies<sup>21 24 30 35</sup> described good intra-and inter-observer reliability in a run-in period. The experimental group in five studies was not age and gender-matched to the control group (see table e1 in the supplementary appendix 2). Eleven studies did not clearly describe how patients were identified for registration, and nine identified patients in a consecutive sample (Table 1). In the study by Zamboni *et al.*, there was also no separate discussion about the outcome in healthy individuals.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the disease type of MS, relapsing-remitting MS was still dominant, with primary progressive MS and
 secondary progressive MS in second place (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 2). Six studies reported clinically
 isolated syndromes in patients, and all patients with MS were Clinically isolated syndrome (CIS) in the survey by Baracchini
 (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 2). Furthermore, most patients received varying degrees of treatment,

2 3

4

5

6

60

141 with acceptance rates ranging from 28% to 90% (see table e2 in the supplementary appendix 2). Females were more 142 prevalent in the experimental groups than in the control groups, with percentages ranging from 16.7% to 82.1% in the 143 experimental groups and 36.4% to 75.0% in the control groups. Table e2 in supplementary appendix 2 summarize the data 144 for patients with MS for age, the proportion of females, duration of disease, and Expanded Disability Status Scale scores. 145 These data are typical of patients with MS.



Study	Country	MS cases (n)	Controls (n)	Blinding	Receive appropriate training in ultrasound operation	Involved in "Liberation procedure"	The way of patien identified for enrolment
Zivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	US	289	163	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	Yes	Convenience
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	Italy	112	67	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	Italy	68	68	The process of blinding is described and has been achieved	Yes	Yes	Consecutively
Cardaioli <i>et al</i> <sup>34</sup>	Italy	39	18	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Imperiale <i>et al</i> <sup>30</sup>	Italy	80	41	The process of blinding is described and has been achieved	Yes	No	Consecutively
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>25</sup>	Germa- ny	20	20	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Convenience
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>37</sup></i>	Italy	60	60	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Costello <i>et al</i> <sup>32</sup>	Canada	120	60	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Van den Berg <i>et</i> <i>al</i> <sup>22</sup>	Netherl- ands	90	41	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	Yes	No	Convenience
Patti <i>et al</i> ²⁴	Germa- ny	148	172	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	No	Convenience
Baracchini <i>et al</i> <sup>38</sup>	Italy	50	110	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Consecutively
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>31</sup>	US	90	38	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
Centonze et al <sup>33</sup>	Italy	84	56	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate	Yes	No	Convenience

	Zamboni <i>et al</i> ⁵	Italy	109	132	Described as blind only, but the	Yes	Yes	Convenience
					process is not described or confirmed as blind			
	Mancini <i>et al</i> ² <sup>7</sup>	Italy	103	42	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
)	Marder <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	US	18	11	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
2 3 1	Kantarci <i>et al</i> <sup>29</sup>	Turkey	62	54	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Convenience
; ; 7	Blinkenberg <i>et</i> <i>al</i> <sup>36</sup>	Danish	24	15	Described as blind only, but the process is not described or confirmed as blind	No	No	Convenience
> ) ) 1	Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>35</sup>	Italy	78	28	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	Yes	No	Convenience
2 3 4	Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>39</sup>	Italy	15	16	Describes the process of blinding, but does not demonstrate whether it was achieved	No	No	Consecutively
<sup>5</sup> 14	8 Note. NA = r	not applica	able; n =	numbe	er; MS = multiple sclerosis.			
; , ,	<b>.</b>							
<u>,</u> 14	9 Risk of qua	lity asses	sment					
3 15	0 All 20 stu	dies were	include	d in the	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessmen	t Scale, and a	ll had a good qu	ality rating result.
15) 15	1 Fifteen stud	les had a c	quality r	ating of	greater than or equal to seven and we	re considered	high-quality st	udles. $22 23 23 20 28-32$
15	$2 \qquad \frac{34-39}{1000} \text{ None } 0$	t the incol	rporated	studies	s were categorized as low quality with	a high risk o	f bias assessme	nt (see table e3 in
2 15	5 the supplem	entary app	pendix 2	2).				
<sup>3</sup> 15	4 Pooling of s	tudies						
<sup>1</sup> 15	5 In further	studies. F	igure 2	present	s the meta-analysis results of the assoc	iation of CCS	SVI with MS an	d the incidence of
15	6 CCSVI in M	[S versus]	healthy	controls	Twenty studies reported the incidence	e of CCSVL y	with a significar	t difference in the
, 15	7 incidence of	CCSVI in	n MS co	mpared	to healthy controls. In Zamboni's stud	v, three studi	es had an incide	nce of 0, reaching
15	<b>8</b> 100%. <sup>25 26 36</sup>	There rer	nained a	a wide v	ariation in the strength of the association	on between C	CSVI and MS.	More specifically.
15	9 the ORs rar	nged from	0.32 (	95% CI	(0.01 - 8.26) in Mayer's study to 5	8035.00 (95%	6 CI: 1142.20	- 2948755.78) in
16	0 Zamboni's r	esearch. A	ccordin	ig to the	pooled analysis, CCSVI and MS were	remarkably c	orrelated (OR 3	.36; 95% CI: 1.92
) 16	1 – 5.85; P <	0.001).	Howeve	er, there	was extensive heterogeneity among th	e studies (I <sup>2</sup> =	= 79%).	
2 16	2 Publication	bias						
16	3 The Egge	r test was	employ	ed to an	alvze publication bias and its results s	howed no sig	nificant publica	tion bias ( $t = 1.22$
; 16	p = 0.241).	Therefore,	there is	s no nee	d to use the fill and trim methods for f	urther analysi	s.	lion olus (t 1.22,
, 16	5 Sensitivity	analyses						
3 16	6 The sensi	tivity anal	ysis res	ults den	nonstrated that the combined effect size	es were not af	fected by the ef	fects of any single
) 16 )	7 study, sugge	esting goo	d stabili	ty of th	e meta-analysis results (see Figure f1 i	n the supplem	nentary appendi	x 3).
16	8 Subgroup a	nalysis						
16	9 Since Zar	nboni and	colleag	gues wei	re overly aggressive in their studies on	CCSVI (n =	11), additional	subgroup analyses
17	0 were perform	ned by re	moving	studies	about Zamboni's team and those that	had previous	ly been conduc	ted with that team
17	1 $(n = 7)$ . Alt	hough MS	S patien	its had	CCSVI at a higher rate than controls,	the correlation	on between CC	SVI and MS was
2 17: 5 7	2 diminished (	(OR 2.83;	95% Cl	I: 1.46 -	- 5.48, P < 0.05; Figure 3) and remain	ned strongly	heterogeneous (	$I^2 = 56\%$ ). On the
3					- / / -			
)					5 / 12			

#### **BMJ** Open

173other hand, the correlation between the two was stronger (OR 4.11; 95% CI: 1.62 - 10.39, P < 0.001; Figure 3), and the</th>174heterogeneity was more pronounced in the seven excluded studies (I<sup>2</sup> = 89.4%).

In the following sensitivity analysis, considering the potential conflicts of interest between the studies, we deleted articles by authors involved in CCSVI endovascular treatment clinical trials or studies supporting liberation procedures (n = 4). There was no substantial change in outcome, a diminished correlation (OR 2.87; 95% CI: 1.82 – 4.52; P < 0.05; Figure 4). and heterogeneity remained significant ( $I^2 = 54.4\%$ ). In contrast, a more significant correlation was obtained for those studies assessed in support of liberation therapy authors (OR 17.05; 95% CI: 1.27 - 229.53; P < 0.0001; Figure 4), along 

10 180 with more significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 96.1\%$ ).

### 181 DISCUSSION

182 This meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between CCSVI and MS and a wide range of 183 heterogeneity. In a subsequent sensitivity analysis, the results showed that the combined effect size was not affected by any 184 single study. We also performed subgroup analyses to seek sources of heterogeneity, but none of the results were 185 satisfactory.

The meta-analysis also found that patients with MS had a higher prevalence of CCSVI than healthy groups, but it varied considerably across studies. On the other hand, however, we could not confirm what factors led to the significant differences in incidence between the studies. One of these possibilities is the ultrasound detection aspect. Many studies have shown that the quality level of Doppler ultrasound for diagnosing CCSVI depends on the operator and that trained operators perform better in reproducibility.<sup>4041</sup> This imaging technique is more difficult when testing veins at low-pressure flow, and the dehydrated state of the subject<sup>42</sup> and head rotation<sup>43</sup> contribute to the poor quality of the results. Of all included studies, only eight articles had relevant operator training.<sup>5 21 22 24 28 30 33 35</sup> For consistency of operation, performance was equally poor, where only five included studies were evaluated.<sup>21 24 28 30 35</sup> and four showed good agreement.<sup>21 24 30 35</sup> These data further suggest that the reproducibility of CCSVI diagnostics requires additional studies while emphasizing the importance of relevant operator training in the skills.

Ultrasound detection of the intracranial cerebral venous system is the most challenging part. On the one hand, the cerebral vein detection procedure is complex and usually studied through a transcranial approach, taking either a temporal window or a trans-occipital approach.<sup>44 45</sup> Although both provide better information on blood flow, detecting venous abnormalities is difficult. Due to the skull, the intracranial veins are not regulated by the respiratory pump as the extracranial veins usually are.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, 17 of the surveyed studies conducted transcranial testing,<sup>5 21-28 30 31 33 35-39</sup> 8 employed a transtemporal window,<sup>5 22 25 30 36-39</sup> while the other two utilized a trans-temporal and trans-occipital approach<sup>23 26</sup> without detailing the modality used for the remaining. On the other hand, all included studies were performed in the context of a potential association between multiple sclerosis and CCSVI. However, when examined from an objective perspective, it seems more accurate to test the validity of a test versus a test using an established gold standard rather than focusing on the presence or absence of MS.<sup>47</sup> This suggests that the five neurological tests proposed by Zamboni are questionable, such as vascular stenosis, internal jugular vein cross-sectional area differences or reflux which are challenging to detect objectively by these criteria.<sup>40</sup> Therefore, the relationship between CCSVI and multiple sclerosis still needs more studies and uniform standards to be validated.

In addition, magnetic resonance imaging, catheter venography, and intravascular ultrasound are noteworthy in detecting
 the true prevalence of CCSVI, although the latter two are invasive procedures. The International Society for Neurovascular
 Disease has recommended a multimodality combination of invasive and noninvasive testing for extracranial venous
 anomalies to achieve optimal detection in patients of interest. Specifically, at least one invasive detection technique and at
 least one noninvasive detection technique should be used.<sup>48</sup>

Although CCSVI is thought to be associated with cerebral venous abnormalities, the etiology of cerebral venous abnormalities and the possible pathophysiologic link to multiple sclerosis and other neurological disorders remain unclear. Several studies have suggested that, in the setting of venous flow abnormalities, this potential association is related to the accumulation of leukocytes in the vasculature.<sup>49 50</sup>

Interestingly, this study contradicts a previous meta-analysis<sup>51</sup> that showed reduced heterogeneity after removing publications related to the liberation procedures ( $I^2 = 37.3\%$ ). In contrast, considerable heterogeneity was still observed after the same manipulation in this paper ( $I^2 = 54.4\%$ ), which may be due to inconsistent inclusion criteria for both studies. Although both included studies used neurological criteria, Tsivgoulis et al.<sup>51</sup> included non-blinded studies as well as reports from experimental groups with fewer than 10 cases, leading to a final inclusion of demographics varying widely and inconsistent sensitivity analysis results. On the other hand, prior to the writing of this article, four meta-analyses had discussed the association between CCSVI and MS, but only one had reached a definitive conclusion. We need to be aware that the conclusions of previous meta-analyses influence the methodology and even the results of subsequent clinical trials, which then accumulate to trigger accumulation bias.<sup>52</sup> Overly optimistic initial studies or meta-analyses can inspire 

BMJ Open

1 227 2 additional studies, while disappointing results can bring a series of studies to an end. Although we attempted to attenuate 228 the effect of prior studies in our subgroup analysis (removing studies from the Zamboni-related teams), the final results 3 229 were similar to the initial results. Attempts to eliminate such biases seem unrealistic because new research is continually 4 230 5 inspired by previous research and may trigger more unnecessary research waste in the process of elimination. Although 231 bias elimination is unavoidable, meaningful error control can be performed. One study has shown that the likelihood ratio 6 232 is a valid test.<sup>52</sup> In future clinical trials or meta-analyses, researchers should be aware of the accumulation bias of previous 7 233 studies. 8

#### 9 10 234 LIMITATION

235 The current meta-analysis has some limitations that must be taken into account. First, we searched only two databases in 11 236 this analysis; a lack of access to more databases and a lack of high-quality literature limited our further analysis. Second, 12 237 some of the included studies had inferior descriptions of blinding and limited descriptions of ultrasonography, so we could 13 238 not explore whether inconsistencies in blinding or differences in ultrasound protocols between studies contributed to the 14 heterogeneity in the studies. Furthermore, six studies<sup>5 21 24 30 38 39</sup> also included non-MS groups with other neurological 239 15 240 disorders. In the current study, we included only healthy controls. We did not acquire the data of the individuals in the 16 241 study, and there were considerable age and sex differences between the studies, coupled with the fact that five reports did 17 242 not have controls of the same age and sex as the MS patients, so it was impossible to determine whether demographic 18 243 factors influenced the morbidity of CCSVI in controls and patients with MS. More critically, the topic of CCSVI versus 19 244 MS remains controversial. Studies may be published regardless of the examination method or whether they are positively 20 245 or negatively evaluated. Finally, the inconsistent diagnostic criteria for screening patients with MS across studies and the 21 246 lack of reliable evidence in the text to determine the diagnosis of subjects made it impossible to judge the accuracy of the 22 247 experimental versus control groups. 23

## 248 CONCLUSIONS

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

33

34

35

36

37

In summary, the present meta-analysis exhibited a strong correlation between CCSVI and MS, while CCSVI was more likely to occur in patients with MS than in healthy controls. CCSVI may be a potential risk factor for MS. Nevertheless, the heterogeneity was highly significant that we cannot draw clear conclusions. Future studies of higher quality, especially in terms of blinded quality and reproducibility of ultrasound diagnosis, are still needed to derive a deeper discussion of the association of CCSVI with MS.

Acknowledgments We are very grateful to Chole Fu and Dr Liu for their support and assis-tance in this study.

Author Contributions JY was the first author. NZ received funding. TO and JY designed the study. WM and ML collected the data. XH participated in data verification. CD analyzed the data. JY drafted the manuscript. TO and NZ participated in the interpretation of the results and critical revision of important intellectual content of the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript. wM and ML were the guarantors of the study.

- Funding This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81960247).
- 40 261 **Competing interests** None declared.
- 42 262 Patient consent for publication Not applicable.
  43
- 44 263 **Ethics approval** This study does not involve human participants and ethical approval was not required. 45
- 46 264 **Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

50 267 **Supplemental material** This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group 51 268 Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer- reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the 52 269 author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the 53 270 content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the 271 translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), 54 272 and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise. 55

#### 56 57 273 REFERENCES

- 58 59
- 60

3

4

## BMJ Open

- BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.
- Baecher-Allan C, Kaskow BJ, Weiner HL. Multiple Sclerosis: Mechanisms and Immunotherapy. *Neuron* 2018;97(4):742-68. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2018.01.021
   2018 (2018) (20
- 276 2. Zamboni P, Consorti G, Galeotti R, et al. Venous collateral circulation of the extracranial cerebrospinal outflow
   277 routes. *Current neurovascular research* 2009;6(3):204-12. doi: 10.2174/156720209788970054
   278 [published Online First: 2009/06/19]
- 9 279 3. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Weinstock-Guttman B, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is related 10 280 to inverted and decreased cerebrospinal fluid flow and greater brain atrophy in patients with multiple 11 12 281 Sclerosis 2009;15(9 S):S210. doi: sclerosis. Multiple Suppl. 13 282 http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1352458509106963 14
- 4. Zamboni P, Galeotti R, Menegatti E, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple
   sclerosis. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry* 2009;80(4):392-9. doi:
   https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2008.157164
- 286 5. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Galeotti R, et al. The value of cerebral Doppler venous haemodynamics in the
   287 assessment of multiple sclerosis. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2009;282(1-2):21-27. doi:
   288 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2008.11.027</u>
- 24 289
   25 290
   290
   291
   6. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Weinstock-Guttman B, et al. The severity of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis is related to altered cerebrospinal fluid dynamics.
   27 291
   *Functional neurology* 2009;24(3):133-8.
- 28 292 7. Zamboni P. The Big Idea: Iron-dependent inflammation in venous disease and proposed parallels in multiple 29 293 Roval Society doi: sclerosis. Journal of the of Medicine 2006;99(11):589-93. 30 31 294 https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014107680609901122 32
  - 8. Wattjes MP, van Oosten BW, de Graaf WL, et al. No association of abnormal cranial venous drainage with
     multiple sclerosis: a magnetic resonance venography and flow-quantification study. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry* 2011;82(4):429-35. doi: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2010.223479">https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2010.223479</a>
- P. Hojnacki D, Zamboni P, Lopez-Soriano A, et al. Use of neck magnetic resonance venography, Doppler sonography and selective venography for diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a pilot study in multiple sclerosis patients and healthy controls. *International angiology : a journal of the International Union of Angiology* 2010;29(2):127-39.
- 43 302
   43 302
   44 303
   45 46 304
   45 46 304
   46 302
   46 304
   47 40 10. Zamboni P, Galeotti R, Menegatti E, et al. A prospective open-label study of endovascular treatment of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. *Journal of vascular surgery* 2009;50(6):1348-3. doi: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvs.2009.07.096">https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvs.2009.07.096</a>
- 47 305
   48 306
   49 306
   50 307
   11. Reekers JA, Lee MJ, Belli AM, et al. Cardiovascular and interventional radiological society of europe commentary on the treatment of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. *CardioVascular and Interventional Radiology* 2011;34(1):1-2. doi: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00270-010-0050-5">http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00270-010-0050-5</a>
- <sup>51</sup> 308
   <sup>52</sup> 308
   <sup>53</sup> 309
   <sup>54</sup> 12. Chafe R, Born KB, Slutsky AS, et al. The rise of people power. *Nature* 2011;472(7344):410-11. doi: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/472410a">http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/472410a</a>

59 60

33 34

35

#### **BMJ** Open

1

2 310 13. Tsivgoulis G, Faissner S, Voumvourakis K, et al. "Liberation treatment" for chronic cerebrospinal venous 3 311 insufficiency in multiple sclerosis: The truth will set you free. Brain and Behavior 2015;5(1):3-12. doi: 4 5 312 http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/brb3.297 6 313 14. Zamboni P, Tesio L, Galimberti S, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Extracranial Vein Angioplasty in Multiple 7 8 314 Sclerosis: А Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA neuroloav 2018:75(1):35-43. doi: 9 315 10.1001/jamaneurol.2017.3825 [published Online First: 2017/11/19] 10 316 15. Napoli V, Berchiolli R, Carboncini MC, et al. Percutaneous Venous Angioplasty in Patients with Multiple 11 12 317 Sclerosis and Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous Insufficiency: A Randomized Wait List Control Study. 13 318 Annals of vascular surgery 2020:62:275-86. doi: 10.1016/j.avsg.2019.05.018 [published Online First: 14 15 319 2019/08/251 16 320 16. Siddigui AH, Zivadinov R, Benedict RH, et al. Prospective randomized trial of venous angioplasty in MS 17 18 321 (PREMiSe). Neurology 2014;83(5):441-9. doi: 10.1212/wnl.00000000000638 [published Online First: 19 322 2014/07/01] 20 21 323 17. Traboulsee AL, Machan L, Girard JM, et al. Safety and efficacy of venoplasty in MS: A randomized, double-22 324 blind. sham-controlled phase Ш trial. Neurology 2018;91(18):e1660-e68. doi: 23 24 325 10.1212/wnl.000000000006423 [published Online First: 2018/09/30] 25 326 18. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting 26 27 327 systematic reviews. Syst Rev 2021;10(1):89. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4 [published Online First: 28 328 2021/03/311 29 329 19. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell J. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing The Quality of 30 31 330 Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-analyses. Ottawa Health Research Institute Web site 2014;7 32 331 20. JPT H, J T, J C, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.3 (updated 33 34 332 February 2022). Cochrane; 2022 [updated 2022. Available from: www.training.cochrane.org/handbook. 35 333 21. Zivadinov R, Marr K, Cutter G, et al. Prevalence, sensitivity, and specificity of chronic cerebrospinal venous 36 37 334 insufficiency in MS. 2011;77(2):138-44. doi: Neurology 38 335 https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e318212a901 39 40 336 22. Van den Berg PJ, Van den Berg GB, Westerhuis LW, et al. Occurrence of CCSVI in patients with MS and 41 337 its relationship with iron metabolism and varicose veins. European journal of neurology 2013;20(3):519-42 338 26. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ene.12010 43 44 339 23. Tromba L, Blasi S, Vestri A, et al. Prevalence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple 45 Phlebology 340 sclerosis: evaluation. 2015;30(1):52-60. doi: а blinded sonographic 46 47 341 https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0268355513512823 48 24. Patti F, Nicoletti A, Leone C, et al. Multiple sclerosis and CCSVI: a population-based case control study. 342 49 50 343 *PloS one* 2012;7(8):e41227. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041227 51 344 25. Mayer CA, Pfeilschifter W, Lorenz MW, et al. The perfect crime? CCSVI not leaving a trace in MS. Journal 52 neurology, 53 345 of neurosurgery, psychiatry 2011;82(4):436-40. doi: and 54 346 https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2010.231613 55 56 57 58 9/12 59 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 60

## BMJ Open

1 2	0.47	
3	347	26. Marder E, Gupta P, Greenberg BM, et al. No cerebral or cervical venous insufficiency in US veterans with
4	348	multiple sclerosis. <i>Archives of neurology</i> 2011;68(12):1521-5. doi:
5 6	349	https://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archneurol.2011.185
7	350	27. Mancini M, Morra VB, Di Donato O, et al. Multiple sclerosis: cerebral circulation time. <i>Radiology</i>
8 9	351	2012;262(3):947-55. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1148/radiol.11111239</u>
10	352	28. Leone MA, Raymkulova O, Naldi P, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is not associated with
11 12	353	multiple sclerosis and its severity: a blind-verified study. <i>PloS one</i> 2013;8(2):e56031. doi:
13	354	https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056031
14	355	29. Kantarci F, Albayram S, Demirci NO, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: does ultrasound
15 16	356	really distinguish multiple sclerosis subjects from healthy controls? <i>European radiology</i> 2012;22(5):970-
17	357	9. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00330-011-2338-5</u>
18 19	358	30. Imperiale D, Melis F, Giaccone C, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple sclerosis: a
20	359	sonographer-blinded case-control study. <i>Clinical neurology and neurosurgery</i> 2013;115(8):1394-8. doi:
21 22	360	https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2013.01.003
23	361	31. Gandhi S, Marr K, Mancini M, et al. No association between variations in extracranial venous anatomy and
24 25	362	clinical outcomes in multiple sclerosis patients over 5 years. BMC neurology 2019;19(1):121. doi:
25 26	363	https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12883-019-1350-2
27	364	32. Costello F, Modi J, Lautner D, et al. Validity of the diagnostic criteria for chronic cerebrospinal venous
28 29	365	insufficiency and association with multiple sclerosis. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal =
30	366	<i>journal de l'Association medicale canadienne</i> 2014;186(11):E418-26. doi:
31 32	367	https://dx.doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.131431
33	368	33. Centonze D, Floris R, Stefanini M, et al. Proposed chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency criteria do not
34 25	369	predict multiple sclerosis risk or severity. <i>Annals of neurology</i> 2011;70(1):51-8. doi:
35 36	370	https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.22436
37	371	34. Cardaioli G, Di Filippo M, Bianchi A, et al. Extracranial Venous Drainage Pattern in Multiple Sclerosis and
38 39	372	Healthy Controls: Application of the 2011 Diagnostic Criteria for Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous
40	373	Insufficiency. <i>European neurology</i> 2016;76(1-2):62-8. doi: <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000445540</u>
41 42	374	35. Caprio MG, Marr K, Gandhi S, et al. Centralized and Local Color Doppler Ultrasound Reading Agreement
43	375	for Diagnosis of the Chronic Cerebrospinal Venous Insufficiency in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis.
44 45	376	Current Neurovascular Research 2017;14(3):266-73. doi: 10.2174/1567202614666170718095203
46	377	36. Blinkenberg M, Akeson P, Sillesen H, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and venous stenoses
47	378	in multiple sclerosis. <i>Acta neurologica Scandinavica</i> 2012;126(6):421-7. doi:
48 49	379	https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.2012.01671.x
50	380	37. Baracchini C, Perini P, Causin F, et al. Progressive multiple sclerosis is not associated with chronic
51 52	381	cerebrospinal venous insufficiency. <i>Neurology</i> 2011;77(9):844-50. doi:
53	382	https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e31822c6208
54 55	383	38. Baracchini C, Perini P, Calabrese M, et al. No evidence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency at
56	384	multiple sclerosis onset. Annals of neurology 2011;69(1):90-9. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.22228
57 59		
58 59		10 / 12
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### **BMJ** Open

39. Amato MP, Saia V, Hakiki B, et al. No association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and pediatric-onset multiple sclerosis. Multiple sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England) 2012;18(12):1791-6. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1352458512445943 40. Simka M. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: Current perspectives. J Vasc Diagnostics 2014;2:1-13. doi: 10.2147/JVD.S47384 41. Menegatti E, Genova V, Tessari M, et al. The reproducibility of colour Doppler in chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency associated with multiple sclerosis. Int Angiol 2010;29(2):121-26. 42. Diaconu CI, Fox RJ, Grattan A, et al. Hydration status substantially affects chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency assessments. Neurology Clinical practice 2013;3(5):386-91. 43. Farina M, Novelli E, Pagani R. Cross-sectional area variations of internal jugular veins during supine head rotation in multiple sclerosis patients with chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a prospective diagnostic controlled study with duplex ultrasound investigation. BMC Neurol 2013;13:162. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-13-162 44. Baumgartner RW, Nirkko AC, Müri RM, et al. Transoccipital power-based color-coded duplex sonography of cerebral sinuses and veins. Stroke 1997;28(7):1319-23. 45. Baumgartner RW, Gönner F, Arnold M, et al. Transtemporal power- and frequency-based color-coded duplex sonography of cerebral veins and sinuses. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 1997;18(9):1771-81. 46. Zamboni P, Menegatti E, Pomidori L, et al. Does thoracic pump influence the cerebral venous return? J Appl Physiol (1985) 2012;112(5):904-10. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00712.2011 47. Simka M, Ludyga T, Latacz P, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of current sonographic criteria for the detection of outflow abnormalities in the internal jugular veins. *Phlebology* 2013;28(6):285-92. doi: 10.1258/phleb.2012.011125 48. Zivadinov R, Bastianello S, Dake MD, et al. Recommendations for multimodal noninvasive and invasive screening for detection of extracranial venous abnormalities indicative of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency: a position statement of the International Society for Neurovascular Disease. Journal of vascular and interventional radiology : JVIR 2014;25(11):1785-94.e17. doi: 10.1016/j.jvir.2014.07.024 [published Online First: 2014/09/27] 49. Beggs CB. Venous hemodynamics in neurological disorders: an analytical review with hydrodynamic analysis. BMC Medicine 2013;11(1):142. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-11-142 50. Dake MD, Zivadinov R, Haacke EM. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in multiple sclerosis: a historical perspective. Funct Neurol 2011;26(4):181-95. 51. Tsivgoulis G, Sergentanis TN, Chan A, et al. Chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: A comprehensive meta-analysis of case-control studies. Therapeutic Advances in Neurological Disorders 2014;7(2):114-36. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1756285613499425 52. Ter Schure J, Grünwald P. Accumulation Bias in meta-analysis: the need to consider time in error control. F1000Research 2019;8:962. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.19375.1 [published Online First: 2019/11/19] 11/12For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 

$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\2\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\9\\21\\22\\34\\25\\26\\27\\28\\9\\31\\32\\33\\4\\5\\36\\37\\38\\9\\0\\41\\2\\3\\4\\4\\5\end{array}$	424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 451 452 453 454 455 456	Figure legends Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection. Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection. Figure 2 Meta-analysis of the probability of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (were removed (upper panels); studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (were panels). Figure 4 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (were removed (upper panels); studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy were removed (upper panels); studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy (lower panels).
42 43	456	
44 45		
45 46		
47 48		
49		
50 51		
52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57		
58 50		12 / 12
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
- •		



60



Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search and study selection.

131x131mm (768 x 768 DPI)



Figure 2 Meta-analysis of the probability of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls.

157x113mm (300 x 300 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-072319 on 28 June 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.



Figure 3 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni were removed (upper panels); studies by the Zamboni group or group authors who have collaborated with Zamboni (lower panels).

153x112mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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

1	
2	
3	
4 5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
20	
28	
29	
30	
31	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38 30	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51 52	
52 53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

60



Figure 4 Subgroup analysis of the diagnosis of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency in patients with multiple sclerosis versus healthy controls. Studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy were removed (upper panels); studies participating in or supporting emancipation therapy (lower panels).

157x120mm (300 x 300 DPI)

# Association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis

## 4 Supplementary Appendix 1: Detailed literature search

MEDLINE (OVID) Search Strategy			EMBASE (OVID) Search Strategy			
1	Neuromyelitis Optica/	1	Multiple Sclerosis/			
2	Myelitis, Transverse/	2	(multiple adj sclerosis).mp.			
3	Demyelinating Diseases/	3	Myelitis/			
4	(neuromyelitis adj optica).mp.	4	(transverse adj myelitis).mp.			
5	(transverse adj myelitis).mp.	5	Myelooptic Neuropathy/			
6	Multiple Sclerosis/	6	(myelooptic adj neuropath\$).tw.			
7	Multiple Sclerosis, Chronic	7	(neuromyelitis adj optica).mp.			
Progr	essive/	8	Acute Disseminated			
8	Multiple Sclerosis, Relapsing-	Encep	bhalomyelitis/			
Remit	ting/	9	ADEM.tw.			
9	(multiple adj sclerosis).mp.	10	Optic Neuritis/			
10	(demyelinating adj (disease? or	11	(optic adj neuriti\$).tw.			
disord	ler?)).mp.	12	Encephalomyelitis/			
11	Encephalomyelitis, Acute	13	encephalomyelitis.tw.			
Disse	minated/	14	• devic.tw.			
12	encephalomyelitis.tw.	15	clinically isolated syndrome?".tw.			
13	devic.tw.	16	Demyelinating Disease/			
14	"clinically isolated syndrome?".tw.	17	(demyelinating adj (disease? or			
15	Optic Neuritis/	disord	ler?)).tw.			
16	(optic adj neuriti\$).mp.	18	ultrasonogra\$.mp.			
17	ADEM.tw.	19	Ultrasound/			
18	exp Ultrasonography/	20	ultrasound\$.mp.			
19	ultrasonogra\$.mp.	21	Doppler\$.mp.			
20	ultrasound\$.tw.	22	magnetic resonance angiography/			
21	Doppler\$.mp.	23	"magnetic resonance angiogra\$".tw.			
22	Magnetic Resonance Angiography/	24	"magnetic resonance			
23	"magnetic resonance angiogra\$".tw.	arterio	ogra\$".tw.			
24	"magnetic resonance	25	exp brain angiography/			
arterio	ogra\$".tw.	26	(cerebral adj angiogra\$).tw.			
25	Cerebral Angiography/	27	(brain adj angiogra\$).tw.			
26	(cerebral adj angiogra\$).tw.	28	(brain adj arteriogra\$).tw.			
27	(cerebral adj arteriogra\$).tw.	29	(venous adj angiogra\$).tw.			
28	(venous adj angiogra\$).tw.	30	(venous adj arteriogra\$).tw.			
29	(venous adj arteriogra\$).tw.	31	exp Phlebography/			
30	(brain adj angiogra\$).tw.	32	phlebogra\$.mp.			

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

1 2			
2		31 (brain adi arteriogra <sup>\$</sup> ) tw	23 venogra <sup>¢</sup> mp
4		32 Phlebography/	$a_{\rm or}/1-17$
5		33 phlebogra\$ mp	r = 0/18 33
7		34 vonogra¢ mp	86 34 and 35
8		$34$ venogra $\mathfrak{s}$ .mp.	34 and $35$
9		35 01/1-17	
10 11		30 01/18-34 3	
12		37 35 and 36 3	s9 limit 38 to yr="2006 -Current"
13		38 Animais/ not (Animais/ and	
14		Humans/)	
15 16		39 37 not 38	
17		40 limit 39 to yr="2006 -Current"	
18	5		
19	6		
20 21			
22	7		
23	0		
24 25	8		
25 26	g		
27	5		
28	10		
29			
30 31	11		
32			
33	12		
34 25			
35 36	13		
37	11		
38	14		
39 40	15		
40 41	10		
42	16		
43			
44 45	17		
45 46			
47	18		
48	10		
49 50	19		
51	20		
52	20		
53	21		
54 55			
56	22		
57			
58 50	23		
59 60			

	Study	Participants (n)	Age (year)	Female (%)	Controls matched to cas sex and age
Z	ivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	163	50 †	73.1	No
	Γromba <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	67	32 *	49.3	No
	Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	68	40 *	64.7	Yes
C	ardaioli <i>et al</i> β4	18	31 *	66.7	No
Ir	nperiale <i>et al</i> <sup>β0</sup>	41	45 *	56.1	Yes
	Mayer <i>et al</i> ²⁵	20	34 *	50.0	No
Ba	aracchini <i>et al</i> β7	60	46 *	55.0	Yes
(	Costello <i>et aβ</i> <sup>2</sup>	60	45 *	75.0	Yes
Var	i den Berg <i>et al</i> ²²	41	44 †	48.8	Yes
	Patti <i>et al</i> <sup>24</sup>	172	43 *	58.1	Yes
Ba	aracchini <i>et al<sup>38</sup></i>	_			Yes
	Group 1 ‡	50	33 *	70.0	
	Group 2 §	60	63 *	53.3	
	Gandhi <i>et al<sup>a</sup>i</i>	38	45 *	67.0	Yes
С	entonze <i>et al<sup>63</sup></i>	56	42 *	64.3	Yes
Z	Zamboni <i>et al<sup>5</sup></i>				Yes
	Group 1 ‡	60	37 †	53.3	
	Group 2 §	72	58 †	59.7	
1	Mancini <i>et al</i> <sup>27</sup>	42	38 †	54.8	Yes
	Marder et al <sup>26</sup>	11	55 *	36.4	Yes
<u>ا</u>	Kantarci et al <sup>29</sup>	54	37 *	50.0	No
Bli	nkenberg <i>et al</i> <sup>36</sup>	15	37 *	73.0	Yes
	Caprio <i>et al<sup>β5</sup></i>	28	50 *	60.7	Yes
0.0	Amato <i>et al<sup>se</sup></i>	16	18 †	44.0	Yes
26	Note. *: mean.				
27	†: median.				
28	‡: Healthy control	ols in group 1 were r	matched with MS	patients.	
29	§: In the study	by Baracchini et al.	, healthy controls	in group 2 were ma	atched with controls who had
30	neurologic disea	ases other than MS;	in the study by Za	mboni et al., healthy	controls in group 2 were older
31	than the median	age of the Europea	n MS population.		
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
51 20					
30 20					
39					
4()					
40					
41					
40 41 42					

## 24 Supplementary Appendix 2

Study		Patie	nts with	MS (n)	)	Age	Proportion	Duration	Receive	EDSS
-	MS	CIS	RRMS	SPMS/ PPMS	Other	(year)	of female (%)	of MS	treatment (%)	score
Zivadinov <i>et al</i> <sup>21</sup>	289	21	191	30	68	48 <sup>†</sup>	76.5	12 † years	89	3.0 †
Tromba <i>et al</i> <sup>23</sup>	112	9	78	25	0	43 *	54.5	12 * years	s NA	6.0 *
Leone <i>et al</i> <sup>28</sup>	68	0	48	20	0	43 *	64.7	13 * years	s NA	2.0 †
Cardaioli <i>et al</i> <sup>34</sup>	39	0	35	4	0	42 *	82.1	9 * years	NA	1.9 *
Imperiale <i>et al<sup>30</sup></i>	80	0	56	24	0	46 *	64.0	10 † years	63	3.5 †
Mayer <i>et al</i> <sup>25</sup>	20	0	17	3	0	42 *	65.0	13 * years	90	3.0 †
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>37</sup></i>	60	0	0	60	0	46 *	55.0	15 * years	s NA	6.0 *
Costello <i>et aβ</i> ²	120	4	86	29	1	46 *	74.1	11 † years	52	2.25 †
√an den Berg <i>et</i> al <sup>22</sup>	90	0	59	31	0	47 †	72.2	72 † months	NA	3.0 †
Patti <i>et al</i> ²⁴	148	20	105	43	0	44 *	62.8	175 * months	84	NA
Baracchini <i>et al<sup>38</sup></i>	50	50	0	0	0	33 *	70.0	NA	28	1.5 †
Gandhi <i>et al</i> <sup>β1</sup>	90	0	52	38	0	47 *	73.3	15 * years	84	3.0 †
Centonze <i>et al<sup>β3</sup></i>	84	0	69	15	0	39 *	61.9	NA	82	NA
Zamboni <i>et al<sup>s</sup></i>	109	0	69	40	0	40 †	58.7	6 † years	NA	2.0 †
Mancini <i>et al<sup>27</sup></i>	103	0	41	62	0	42 †	60.2	12 † years	71	4.0 †
Marder <i>et al</i> <sup>26</sup>	18	1	6	11	0	55 *	16.7	21 † years	NA	NA
Kantarci <i>et al</i> 29	62	0	32	30	0	37 *	64.5	112 * months	NA	4.0 †
Blinkenberg <i>et</i> <i>al</i> <sup>β6</sup>	24	0	24	0	0	37 *	67.0	10 * years	s NA	3.2 *
Caprio <i>et al</i> <sup>β5</sup>	78	0	42	35	1	53 *	71.8	22 * years	s NA	3.5 †
Amato <i>et al</i> <sup>β9</sup>	15	0	15	0	0	18 †	60.0	6 † years	NA	1.2 †
Note. n = number syndrome; RRM	r; NA=  S =	= not a Relaps	pplicable	e; EDSS itting M	S = Exp IS; SP	oanded [ MS = s	Disability Stat econdary pro	us Scale; C ogressive	CIS = Clinically is MS; PPMS = p	solated orimary
*: mean										
. mean.										
T: median.										

3 Results of quality assessment using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. 60 Table e3 -4 Study Selection Comparability Scores Exposure 5 (0–9) 6 7 Is the case Representativene Selection of Definition Comparability of AscertainThe same method Non-8 definition -ss of the cases controls of cases and controls ment of of ascertainment response 9 adequate? controls on the basis of the exposure for cases and rate 10 design or analysis controls 11  $\frac{12}{\text{Ziyadinov}}$  et al<sup>21</sup> \* \* \*\* \* \* 6 1<del>1</del>fromba *et al*<sup>23</sup> \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* Brotected by copyright, including \_15 16 eone *et al*28 \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* Cardaioli *et aβ*<sup>4</sup> 18 \* \* \* \* \* \* \*\* In Aperiale et al<sup>30</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* <del>-20</del> 2 Mayer *et al*<sup>25</sup> \* \* \* \* \* \*\* Baracchini et als7 \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 23 2 Quostello et al<sup>32</sup> \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \*  $\frac{25}{\sqrt{26}}$  den Berg *et* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* al22 ð 27 27 28<sup>Patti</sup> *et al*<sup>24</sup> Enseignement \$uperieur (ABES) . Uses related to text and data mining. Al training, and similar technologies. \* \* \*\* \* \* Baracchini et al<sup>38</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* -30 3Ģandhi *et al*<sup>β1</sup> \* \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 22 Centonze *et al*<sup>β3</sup> \* \* \* \* \* \* 32 amboni et al<sup>5</sup> \* \* \*\* \* \* 35 Mancini *et al*27 \* \* \* \* \* \* 3 Marder et al<sup>26</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 38 Kantarci et al29 \* \* \* \* \* \*\* 49 Iinkenberg et \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 41  $a^{\beta 6}$ 4243 Caprio *et al*<sup>35</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* 4Amato et al<sup>β9</sup> \* \* \* \*\* \* \* -45 61 46 47 62 48 63 49 50 64 51 52 65 53 66 54 55 67 56 68 57 58 69

59

60

70

1						
2						
3	71	Supplementary Appendix 3				
4	11	Supplementary Appendix 5				
5			Mata analysia astir	notoo aiyan nomo	d atudu ia amittad	
6			Lower CLLimit	Getimate		it
7			Lower of Linit	Lotinate	Opper of Ein	
8		Amato et al. 2012		0		
9		Baracchini et al. 2011a Baracchini et al. 2011b				
10		Blinkenberg et al. 2012				
10		Caprio et al. 2017				
11		Cardaioli et al. 2016				
12		Centonze et al. 2011				
13		Costello et al. 2014				
14		Imperiale et al. 2013				
15		Kantarci et al. 2012				
16		Leone et al. 2013				
17		Mancini et al. 2012				
18		Marder et al. 2011		••••••		
19		Mayer et al. 2011		0		
20		Tromba et al. 2012				
21		Van den Berg et al. 2013				
		0				

1.7492

Zamboni et al. 2009 Zivadinov et al. 2011

73 Figure f1 Sensitivity analysis of included studies resulted in a display of the estimated pooled

3.36

effect size regarding the association of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency with multiple

75 sclerosis.

Reiez oniz

5.85

6.62

National Institute for Health Research

# **PROSPERO** International prospective register of systematic reviews

UNIVERSITY of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

# Systematic review

Fields that have an asterisk (\*) next to them means that they must be answered. Word limits are provided for each section. You will be unable to submit the form if the word limits are exceeded for any section. Registrant means the person filling out the form.

This record cannot be edited because it has been marked as out of scope

# 1. \* Review title.

Give the title of the review in English

Relevance between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and multiple sclerosis: a systematic review

and meta-analysis

# 2. Original language title.

For reviews in languages other than English, give the title in the original language. This will be displayed with the English language title.

# 3. \* Anticipated or actual start date.

Give the date the systematic review started or is expected to start.

12/10/2022

# 4. \* Anticipated completion date.

Give the date by which the review is expected to be completed.

# 25/01/2023

# 5. \* Stage of review at time of this submission.

This field uses answers to initial screening questions. It cannot be edited until after registration.

Tick the boxes to show which review tasks have been started and which have been completed.

Update this field each time any amendments are made to a published record.

 **PROSPERO** 

The review has not yet started: No

Review stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

Provide any other relevant information about the stage of the review here.

International prospective register of systematic reviews

## 6. \* Named contact.

The named contact is the guarantor for the accuracy of the information in the register record. This may be any member of the review team.

Jun Yang

# Email salutation (e.g. "Dr Smith" or "Joanne") for correspondence:

Mr Yang

## 7. \* Named contact email.

Give the electronic email address of the named contact.

1191815774@qq.com

## 8. Named contact address

Give the full institutional/organisational postal address for the named contact.

the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Jiangxi Province, China

## 9. Named contact phone number.

Give the telephone number for the named contact, including international dialling code.

# National Institute for Health Research

#### 

# PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

# 10. \* Organisational affiliation of the review.

Full title of the organisational affiliations for this review and website address if available. This field may be completed as 'None' if the review is not affiliated to any organisation.

The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University

## Organisation web address:

# 11. \* Review team members and their organisational affiliations.

Give the personal details and the organisational affiliations of each member of the review team. Affiliation refers to groups or organisations to which review team members belong. NOTE: email and country now MUST be entered for each person, unless you are amending a published record.

Mr Jun Yang. The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University

## 12. \* Funding sources/sponsors.

Details of the individuals, organizations, groups, companies or other legal entities who have funded or sponsored the review.

the National Natural Science Foundation of China

Grant number(s)

State the funder, grant or award number and the date of award

#### 

## 13. \* Conflicts of interest.

List actual or perceived conflicts of interest (financial or academic).

None

## 14. Collaborators.

Give the name and affiliation of any individuals or organisations who are working on the review but who are not listed as review team members. **NOTE: email and country must be completed for each person, unless you are amending a published record.** 

# 15. \* Review question.

State the review question(s) clearly and precisely. It may be appropriate to break very broad questions down into a series of related more specific questions. Questions may be framed or refined using PI(E)COS or similar where relevant.

Is the prevalence of chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency higher in patients with MS compared to

healthy individuals? Is there an association between chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency and MS?

# International prospective register of systematic reviews

# 16. \* Searches.

State the sources that will be searched (e.g. Medline). Give the search dates, and any restrictions (e.g. language or publication date). Do NOT enter the full search strategy (it may be provided as a link or attachment below.)

The following bibliographic databases were searched the MEDLINE versus Embase databases using the

OVID portal, with search dates adjusted from January 1, 2006, to April 1, 2022.

# 17. URL to search strategy.

Upload a file with your search strategy, or an example of a search strategy for a specific database, (including the keywords) in pdf or word format. In doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible. Or provide a URL or link to the strategy. Do NOT provide links to your search **results**.

"Multiple Sclerosis," "multiple adj sclerosis," "Neuromyelitis Optica," "neuromyelitis adj optica," "Myelitis, Transverse," "transverse adj myelitis," "Demyelinating Diseases," "demyelinating adj (disease? or disorder?)", "Encephalomyelitis, Acute Disseminated," "ADEM," "encephalomyelitis," "Optic Neuritis," "optic adj neuriti\$," "devic," "clinically isolated syndrome?" AND "Ultrasound," "exp Ultrasonography," "ultrasonogra\$," "ul-trasound\$," "Doppler\$," "Magnetic Resonance Angiography," "magnetic resonance angiogra\$," "magnetic resonance arteriogra\$," "Cerebral Angiography," "cerebral adj an-giogra\$," "cerebral adj arteriogra\$," "venous adj angiogra\$," "venous adj arteriogra\$," "brain adj angiogra\$," "brain adj arteriogra\$," "exp Phlebography," "phlebogra\$," "venogra\$."

Alternatively, upload your search strategy to CRD in pdf format. Please note that by doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

Do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

# 18. \* Condition or domain being studied.

Give a short description of the disease, condition or healthcare domain being studied in your systematic review. Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is a chronic neurological disease that primarily affects the central nervous system (which includes the brain and spinal cord). The cause is unknown, and it is characterized by demyelination in pathology. Common symptoms include muscle paralysis, motor impairment, sensory impairment, vision problems, fatigue, etc. Currently, there is no cure and common treatment methods include Chromiosappbesspintalared inuscificital agains a long-term and incomplete recovery of brain and spinal cord function disorder. This state may be caused by various reasons, including brain and spinal cord injury,

infection, inflammation, malnutrition, metabolic disorders, toxic exposure, etc. Common symptoms include muscle atrophy, sensory impairment, motor impairment, language impairment, cognitive impairment, etc.

# National Institute for Health Research

Treatment methods vary depending on the cause, including physical therapy, medication, rehabilitation,

nutritional therapy, etc.

# 19. \* Participants/population.

Specify the participants or populations being studied in the review. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The trial included patients of any age with multiple sclerosis.

# 20. \* Intervention(s), exposure(s).

Give full and clear descriptions or definitions of the interventions or the exposures to be reviewed. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

use of Doppler ultrasound to detect chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency?

# 21. \* Comparator(s)/control.

Where relevant, give details of the alternatives against which the intervention/exposure will be compared (e.g. another intervention or a non-exposed control group). The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

use of Doppler ultrasound to detect chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency?

# 22. \* Types of study to be included.

Give details of the study designs (e.g. RCT) that are eligible for inclusion in the review. The preferred format includes both inclusion and exclusion criteria. If there are no restrictions on the types of study, this should be stated.

We have no restrictions on the types of study designs eligible for inclusion.

# 23. Context.

Give summary details of the setting or other relevant characteristics, which help define the inclusion or exclusion criteria.

# 24. \* Main outcome(s).

Give the pre-specified main (most important) outcomes of the review, including details of how the outcome is defined and measured and when these measurement are made, if these are part of the review inclusion criteria.

There is a correlation between xx and multiple sclerosis.

# Measures of effect

Please specify the effect measure(s) for you main outcome(s) e.g. relative risks, odds ratios, risk difference, and/or 'number needed to treat.

# 25. \* Additional outcome(s).

List the pre-specified additional outcomes of the review, with a similar level of detail to that required for main

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

#### **PROSPERO**

## International prospective register of systematic reviews

outcomes. Where there are no additional outcomes please state 'None' or 'Not applicable' as appropriate to the review

chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency is more prevalent in patients with multiple sclerosis than in

healthy individuals.

Measures of effect

Please specify the effect measure(s) for you additional outcome(s) e.g. relative risks, odds ratios, risk difference, and/or 'number needed to treat.

## 26. \* Data extraction (selection and coding).

Describe how studies will be selected for inclusion. State what data will be extracted or obtained. State how this will be done and recorded. Two authors extracted data and entered it into a standardized collection form, independently reviewed and confirmed by a third author. The extracted data were as follows: first author, country, publication date, sample size, demographic characteristics of participants (age vs. percentage female), and study characteristics of patients (dis-ease duration, percentage treated, and expanded disability status scale). For some of the missing data, the researchers were also active in obtaining it from the article's authors via email.

## 27. \* Risk of bias (quality) assessment.

State which characteristics of the studies will be assessed and/or any formal risk of bias/quality assessment tools that will be used.

Two reviewers will independently assess risk of bias based on the following domains from recommendations from the Cochrane handbook: 1. Adequate sequence generation; 2. Allocation concealment; 3. Blinding; 4. Incomplete outcome data and how it was addressed; 5. Selective reporting of the outcome; 6. Any other biases. results of bias assessment will be presented in a figure and a graph indicating low, high or unclear risk of bias for each of the 6 items in each trial. Sensitivity analysis will be conducted based on the bias assessment to assess robustness of results.

# 28. \* Strategy for data synthesis.

Describe the methods you plan to use to synthesise data. This **must not be generic text** but should be **specific to your review** and describe how the proposed approach will be applied to your data. If metaanalysis is planned, describe the models to be used, methods to explore statistical heterogeneity, and software package to be used.

STATA 17.0 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, USA) was used to conduct the meta-analysis by the researchers. One investigator entered the detailed data into the software. Another investigator reviewed the data for accuracy, generating forest plots and odds ratios (ORs) to determine whether there was a statistical relevance between CCSVI and MS. The pooled ORs for this study were derived using a random-effects model. An OR greater than 1.0 indicates that at least two ultrasound diagnostic criteria were met and displayed a positive correlation between CCSVI and MS, with p 0.05, indicating a statistically significant

# National Institute for Health Research

#### PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

difference. The origins of heterogeneity in the included studies were examined using Cochran's Q and I<sup>2</sup> statistics. I<sup>2</sup> values of at least 50% are usually considered to represent substantial heterogeneity, while values of at least 75% indicate considerable heterogeneity. By the Cochrane Review Manager 5.4 version 5.4.1. for publication bias was assessed using the Egger test, p 0.05 indicates significant publication bias. Meanwhile, the Fill and Trim methods were used to correct for publication bias. To determine the effect of individual studies in the article on the experimental results, the researchers used a sensitivity analysis by excluding individual studies. In addition, we used subgroup analysis to further look for sources of heterogeneity.

## 29. \* Analysis of subgroups or subsets.

State any planned investigation of 'subgroups'. Be clear and specific about which type of study or participant will be included in each group or covariate investigated. State the planned analytic approach. Sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the results and subgroup analyses to determine whether the summary effects are related to the clinical characteristics of the included trials are pre-specified. In addition, sensitivity analyses will be performed to include only those trials that do not have any assessment bias. Two subgroup analyses will also be performed. The first one assesses whether studies by authors associated with the Zamboni team have an impact on the results; the second one examines whether liberation therapy has an impact on the relevance of the results.

# 30. \* Type and method of review.

Select the type of review, review method and health area from the lists below.

## Type of review

Cost effectiveness No	
Diagnostic No	
Epidemiologic No	
Individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis No	s
Intervention No	
Living systematic review No	
Meta-analysis	

Yes

No

Page 31	l of 37	BMJ Open
1 2	PROSPERO International prospective register of	of systematic reviews
2 3 4 5	Methodology No	
6 7 8	Narrative synthesis No	
9 10 11 12	Network meta-analysis No	
12 13 14 15	Pre-clinical No	
16 17 18	Prevention No	
19 20 21	Prognostic No	
22 23 24	Prospective meta-analysis (PMA) No	
25 26 27	Review of reviews	
28 29 30	Service delivery No	
31 32 33 24	Synthesis of qualitative studies No	
34 35 36 37	Systematic review Yes	
38 39 40 41 42	Other No	
43 44 45 46 47	Health area of the review Alcohol/substance misuse/abuse No	
48 49 50	Blood and immune system No	
51 52 53	Cancer No	
54 55 56	Cardiovascular No	
57 58	Care of the elderly	

BMJ Open	Pa
PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews	National Institute for Health Research
Child health No	
Complementary therapies No	
COVID-19 No	
Crime and justice No	
Dental No	
Digestive system No	
Ear, nose and throat No	
Education No	
Endocrine and metabolic disorders No	
Eye disorders No	
General interest No	
Genetics No	
Health inequalities/health equity No	
Infections and infestations No	
International development No	
Mental health and behavioural conditions No	
Musculoskeletal	

No

Nursing

PROSPERO	ter of systematic reviews
No	
Obstetrics and gynaecology No	
Oral health No	
Palliative care No	
Perioperative care No	
Physiotherapy No	
Pregnancy and childbirth	
Public health (including social detern	ninants of health)
Rehabilitation No	
Respiratory disorders No	
Service delivery No	
Skin disorders No	
Social care No	
Surgery No	
Tropical Medicine No	
Urological No	
Wounds, injuries and accidents No	
Violence and abuse	

# PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

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

National Institute for Health Research

## 31. Language.

Select each language individually to add it to the list below, use the bin icon to remove any added in error. English

There is not an English language summary

## 32. \* Country.

Select the country in which the review is being carried out. For multi-national collaborations select all the countries involved.

## China

## 33. Other registration details.

Name any other organisation where the systematic review title or protocol is registered (e.g. Campbell, or The Joanna Briggs Institute) together with any unique identification number assigned by them. If extracted data will be stored and made available through a repository such as the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR), details and a link should be included here. If none, leave blank.

# 34. Reference and/or URL for published protocol.

If the protocol for this review is published provide details (authors, title and journal details, preferably in Vancouver format)

Add web link to the published protocol.

Or, upload your published protocol here in pdf format. Note that the upload will be publicly accessible. No I do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

Please note that the information required in the PROSPERO registration form must be completed in full even if access to a protocol is given.

## 35. Dissemination plans.

Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

#### No

Give brief details of plans for communicating review findings.?

# 36. Keywords.

Give words or phrases that best describe the review. Separate keywords with a semicolon or new line. Keywords help PROSPERO users find your review (keywords do not appear in the public record but are

## PROSPERO

#### International prospective register of systematic reviews

included in searches). Be as specific and precise as possible. Avoid acronyms and abbreviations unless these are in wide use.

multiple sclerosis; chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency; ultrasound; meta-analysis

## 37. Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors.

If you are registering an update of an existing review give details of the earlier versions and include a full bibliographic reference, if available.

## 38. \* Current review status.

Update review status when the review is completed and when it is published.New registrations must be ongoing so this field is not editable for initial submission.

Please provide anticipated publication date

Review\_Ongoing

## 39. Any additional information.

Provide any other information relevant to the registration of this review.

# 40. Details of final report/publication(s) or preprints if available.

Leave empty until publication details are available OR you have a link to a preprint (NOTE: this field is not editable for initial submission). List authors, title and journal details preferably in Vancouver format.

Give the link to the published review or preprint.



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

			BMJ Open BMJ Open by j	Page 36 of 37
1	PRISM	)20 Checklist		
3 4 5	Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
6	TITLE			
7	Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
8	ABSTRACT			
9 10	Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	1
11	INTRODUCTION			
12	Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	2
13	Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	2
14	METHODS			
15	Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	2
16 17	Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	2
18 19	Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used	2
20 21	Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how may diverse screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	2
22 23 24	Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each epot, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, detate of automation tools used in the process.	2
25 26	Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with act outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which as to collect.	2
27 28		10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, and g sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	2
29 30	Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	3
31	Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	3
32 33	Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the studies were eligible for each synthes tabulating the studies were eligible for each synthes tabulating the studies were eligible for each synthes tabulating the synthes tabulating tabu	3
34 35 26		13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing sumpary statistics, or data conversions.	2
30 37		13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	3
38 39		13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was permormed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used	3
40		13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	3
41		13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	3
42 43	Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting bias ).	3
44 45	Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to asseste certainty (or contride oce) in the body of evidence for lan jourcement -	3
	-			1

# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Page 37 of 37		BMJ Open				
	PRISMA 2020 Checklist					
Section and Topic	ltem #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported			
assessment		ng or				
RESULTS	-					
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to t	3			
1	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they ward cluded.	3			
2 Study 3 characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	3, 4			
4 Risk of bias in 5 studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	5			
6 Results of 7 individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) are the stimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	5			
8 Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	5,			
9 syntheses 0	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summar where and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	5			
1	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	5			
2	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	5			
4 Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis a second	5			
5 Certainty of 6 evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	5			
7 DISCUSSION						
8 Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	6			
0	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	6,7			
1	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	6,7			
2	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	7			
OTHER INFORMA						
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the reserved was not registered.				
6	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.				
7	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.				
8 Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the Byview.	7			
<sup>9</sup> Competing 0 interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	7			
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	2			
4 5 <i>From:</i> Page MJ, McK	enzie JE,	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml – Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10	.1136/bmj.n71			
