

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**

## Skeletal Muscle Relaxants as Adjunctive Pain control following Cardiothoracic Surgery - Systematic Review Protocol

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-079685
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Sep-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Kabir, Shadman; Nova Southeastern University Health Professions Division, College of Osteopathic Medicine Whaley, Quinn; Miami Transplant Institute Fernandez, Melissa; Miami Transplant Institute Murphy, Travis; Miami Transplant Institute; University of Miami School of Medicine, Department of Surgery, Division of Emergency Medicine
Keywords:	SURGERY, Cardiothoracic surgery < SURGERY, Thoracic surgery < SURGERY, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, Adult intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, PAIN MANAGEMENT



Skeletal Muscle Relaxants as Adjunctive Pain control following Cardiothoracic Surgery - Systematic Review Protocol

Shadman Kabir<sup>1</sup>, Quinn Whaley<sup>2</sup>, Melissa Fernandez<sup>2</sup>, Travis W. Murphy,<sup>2,3</sup>

1 Nova Southeastern University – College of Osteopathic Medicine

2 University of Miami/Jackson Memorial Hospital – Miami Transplant Institute

3 University of Miami Department of Surgery, Division of Emergency Medicine, Cardiothoracic Critical Care

Corresponding Author:

Travis W Murphy, MD

1801 NW 9th Ave

Miami, FL 33136

Twm51@miami.edu

Word Count: 2263/4000

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 license), an exclusive license and/or a non-exclusive license for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY license 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 BMJ Open and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>license</u>.

Travis Murphy, MD

## Abstract

## Introduction

Multimodal pain control following cardiothoracic surgery remains a focus in international guidelines. We hypothesize that non-depolarizing skeletal muscle relaxants can prove to be a useful adjunct for this population.

## Methods/analysis

This systematic review will focus on human adult studies of pain control using muscle relaxants following cardiac and thoracic surgery available in PubMed, Web of Science and EMBASE. Target studies will have a primary focus on measured effects on quality of pain control and reduction in opioid usage. Studies that include non-depolarizing skeletal muscle relaxants given during or after cardiothoracic surgery will be included. Study selection will be in keeping with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. If sufficient data involving a given agent are available, a meta-analysis will be conducted and compared to current evidence for therapies recommended in international practice guidelines.

## Ethics and dissemination

Formal ethical approval will not be required as primary data will not be collected. The results will be disseminated through peer-reviewed publication, conference presentation and lay press.

Prospero registration number: International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42023397917

## Article Summary

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies examining the effects of non-paralytic skeletal muscle relaxants following cardiothoracic surgery.
- Focus on a class of medications that is potentially underutilized based on current guidelines.
- Limitation in the number of studies investigating a given therapy may diminish observed effects.
- Potential identification of therapies with positive impact on pain control following cardiothoracic surgery.

## Introduction

Postoperative pain after thoracic surgery can be severe and attributed to a constellation of factors including rib retraction, sternal fracture, prolonged immobility, intercostal nerve stimulation, and pleural irritation from chest tubes. Per current recommendations by the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society (ERAS) and the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons (ESTS), a consistent multimodal analgesic approach is essential to patient comfort, early mobility, avoidance of opioids, and reduced likelihood of pulmonary complications following thoracic and cardiac surgery (1). These guidelines recommend regional anesthesia, scheduled administration of acetaminophen and NSAIDs, ketamine, and dexamethasone. Gabapentinoids also feature heavily in common multimodal anesthetic pathways despite data suggesting limited effects following cardiothoracic procedures (2). Additionally, these guidelines may not provide sufficient guidance for patients with underlying liver or kidney disease, making it important to explore alternative options such as muscle relaxants.

Muscle relaxants as a class are commonly used to treat spasticity and musculoskeletal disorders, with well-documented effectiveness in chronic spastic musculoskeletal pain, multiple sclerosis, and spinal cord injuries (3, 4). Baclofen, tizanidine, and dantrolene are approved to treat spasticity, though baclofen withdrawal can be life-threateningly severe (5). Baclofen and tizanidine are centrally acting and block GABA<sub>B</sub> receptors found in the spinal cord or brainstem (6, 7), while dantrolene directly inhibits muscle contraction by reducing the release of calcium from the skeletal muscle sarcoplasmic reticulum (8). More pertinent to post-operative pain, agents such as carisoprodol, chlorzoxazone, cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, methocarbamol, and orphenadrine are approved for the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders (5). While used in the treatment of acute injuries, we hypothesize that there may be a role for use following cardiothoracic surgery.

This review aims to summarize the current literature on the effectiveness of non-paralytic muscle relaxants in postoperative pain management for cardiac and thoracic surgery patients. The aim is to provide and evidence basis for alternative analgesics beyond those offered by current guidelines.

PROSPERO ID: CRD42023397917

## **Objectives**

The objective of our study is to systematically review the literature for the use of non-paralytic skeletal muscle relaxants as adjuncts for non-opioid pain control following cardiac or thoracic surgery. This will include all human adult studies available in the literature for post-operative pain control.

## Methods and Design

## Population

The systematic review will focus on studies that include patients aged >18 years who have undergone cardiac or thoracic surgery.

## Interventions

The interventions to be evaluated include any non-paralyzing muscle relaxant as part of a pain control regimen for cardiac or thoracic surgery. This includes centrally acting muscle relaxants such as cyclobenzaprine and methocarbamol as well as antispastics and antispasmodics such as baclofen. This specifically excludes studies evaluating the role of paralytics in pain control.

#### Comparisons

The quantifiable benefits and side effects of the interventions identified will be compared to current practice guidelines and the pharmacologic agents advocated therein, specifically gabapentinoids and opioids.

#### Outcome

The primary outcomes required of included studies will be one of the following: qualitative and quantitative assessment for pain control, either through patient satisfaction visual analog scale or numeric rating scheme, days of pain control, time to pain control, or measures of effect on functional status. Additional outcome measures may include sedation or other side effects, and comparison in opioid usage. Secondary outcomes will also include effect on length of stay, incidence of falls, anticholinergic side effects and withdrawal episodes upon removal of muscle relaxant.

#### **Study Design**

The systematic review and meta-analysis will include all therapeutic studies investigating the use of a non-paralyzing muscle relaxant for pain control following cardiac or thoracic surgery. This will include systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized control trials, adaptive clinical trials, prospective cohort and observational studies, non-randomized clinical trials, retrospective cohorts, case control studies, case reports, and case series. Studies that compare one intervention to usual practices recommended by ERAS/ ESTS as the control will be included. No minimum number of included subjects will be required. The review will exclude studies without a control group using either placebo or current standard care. Excluded study types include cross sectional studies, editorials, preclinical or animal models, and studies in the outpatient setting. This review has been registered on the International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42023397917.

#### Search Strategy

A three-step process will be used to identify eligible studies, including an initial search, title and abstract screening and full-text manuscript review. A professional systematic review librarian will provide guidance in developing the search criteria with the authors to include all relevant studies pertaining to adult, human studies non-paralyzing muscle relaxants for pain control after thoracic and cardiac surgery. The databases that will be searched are PubMed, Web of Science and EMBASE from inception. No language restrictions will be applied. Figure 1 shows an example search algorithm for PubMed. Initial deduplication will be performed using EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA).[10]

#### **Study Selection**

Literature search results will be uploaded from EndNote and screened through Covidence (*Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*). Study titles and abstracts will be screened for relevance in duplicate, blindly and independently, by the three junior authors (SK, QW, and MF) and adjudicated by the senior author (TM). Eligible studies will then be assessed again for inclusion and for quality in secondary screening through review of full-text manuscripts before data abstraction. This process will be reported using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram. The PRISMA-P Checklist pertaining to this protocol is available as Supplement 1. Any conflicting remarks regarding studies will be adjudicated through discussion before inclusion in the final analysis.

#### **Quality Assessment**

Each article will undergo initial title and abstract screening in parallel by two independent, blinded reviewers to minimize bias. Conflicts will be adjudicated with discussion and involvement of the senior

author as necessary. All selected articles will be reviewed with the senior author during full-text review. Cochrane tools for assessment of study quality (ROBINS-1 and RoB 2.0) will be used to determine appropriateness for inclusion. Two independent authors, one being the senior author, will assess the risks of bias in studies considered for full-text review in order to determine feasibility of a meta-analysis.

## **Data Extraction**

Quantitative data will be extracted from studies meeting inclusion upon full-text review by a professional biostatistician. Data extracted for meta-analysis will be specifically those pertinent to the primary and secondary outcomes specified in the systematic review. This will include demographics of patient populations, types of surgical procedures performed, medications administered, and outcome parameters as well as any data that are available across all included studies. Data extraction will be independently cross-checked by the senior author and discrepancies resolved through discussion with the biostatistician. The raw data for this review including a dataset of articles screened will be published in a data repository.

## Endpoint

Results of the systematic review will be grouped by drug. The primary outcomes will be quality of pain control as measured by patient satisfaction scores, visual analog scale, numeric ratings, days of pain control reported, intensity of pain reported, timing to effective pain control, sedating side effects, seizures or other adverse effects, effect on functional mobility and effect on opioid requirements. We will also include secondary outcomes of effect on length of stay, incidence of falls or injury due to muscle relaxants, anticholinergic reactions, withdrawal events upon cessation. Any follow-up duration will be accepted as there is considerable variability in the existing literature.

## **Patient and Public Involvement**

No patients were involved with the planning of this protocol.

## <u>Analysis</u>

## **Descriptive Analysis**

A narrative synthesis of the final studies included will be written summarizing the different nonparalyzing muscle relaxants identified. The impact of each of these agents on the primary and secondary outcomes will be described in addition to a formal meta-analysis of studies using each pharmacologic agent if sufficient studies are available for a given agent.

## **Statistical Analysis**

The primary focus of this review is to detect evidence for the impact of the pharmacologic agents identified on pain control and opioid usage. 'Pain control' is quantified in different ways that are important to patients including intensity, days of control, improvement from prior pain and whether pain limits functional mobility. As the effects of non-paralyzing muscle relaxants are studies differently, we expect some limitation in the ability to directly compare one agent to standard protocols or to one another. However, when available, pharmacologic agents will be compared as equitably as possible using all available outcome parameters reported in the primary literature. If sufficient data from primary sources is available, subgroup analysis within populations of similar operations and treated with the same pharmacologic agents will also be performed to identify populations most likely to benefit from a given agent.

## Data synthesis

A PRISMA flow diagram will be used to summarize study selection. Results will be presented in accordance with the PRISMA statement. Tabulated data showing qualitative and quantitative pain control for each pharmacologic agent and surgical intervention will be presented. For secondary outcome variables, we will present synthesized data as available in separate tables but will otherwise provide a separate narrative summary of the data available for each agent. We will produce a hierarchy of pharmacologic agents for each surgical type (cardiac or thoracic) based on the quality of evidence available and degree of effects on outcome variables.

## Meta-analysis

A meta-analysis of the pharmacologic agents will be performed as able based on availability of primary data. The results of this meta-analysis will then be compared to current ERAS and ESTS practice guidelines to provide context and compare relative efficacy.

## **Discussion**

This systematic review and meta-analysis will provide evidence for further use or study of nonparalyzing muscle relaxants as analgesic adjuncts in patients following cardiac or thoracic surgery. The conclusions will be the result of careful accumulation of the highest-quality evidence available and will compare to current practice guidelines to provide clinical context. With a primary focus on the ability of a given medication to improve pain control with a favorable side effect profile while minimizing exposure to opioids, this review and meta-analysis will be unique in identifying agents with the greatest potential.

## Ethics and dissemination

No ethical or safety considerations were considered based on the nature of this review. Dissemination of findings through a peer-reviewed publication upon the conclusion of the meta-analysis.

## Author Contributions

*Travis Murphy:* Conception and design of work, analysis, drafting of work, final approval *Shadman Kabir:* Conception of work, analysis, drafting of work, final approval *Quinn Whaley:* Analysis, drafting of work, final approval *Melissa Fernandez:* Analysis, drafting of work, final approval

## Funding statement

This project did not receive any internal or external funding.

## Competing interest statement

The authors have no competing interests.

## **References**

1. Batchelor TJP, Rasburn NJ, Abdelnour-Berchtold E, Brunelli A, Cerfolio RJ, Gonzalez M, et al. Guidelines for enhanced recovery after lung surgery: recommendations of the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS(R)) Society and the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons (ESTS). Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2019;55(1):91-115.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-079685 on 25 March 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

 Zakkar M, Frazer S, Hunt I. Is there a role for gabapentin in preventing or treating pain following thoracic surgery? Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg. 2013;17(4):716-9.
 Andersson PB, Goodkin DE. Current pharmacologic treatment of multiple sclerosis symptoms. West J Med. 1996;165(5):313-7.

4. Burchiel KJ, Hsu FP. Pain and spasticity after spinal cord injury: mechanisms and treatment. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2001;26(24 Suppl):S146-60.

5. Chou R, Peterson K, Helfand M. Comparative efficacy and safety of skeletal muscle relaxants for spasticity and musculoskeletal conditions: a systematic review. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2004;28(2):140-75.

6. Brogden RN, Speight TM, Avery GS. Baclofen: a preliminary report of its pharmacological properties and therapeutic efficacy in spasticity. Drugs. 1974;8(1):1-14.

7. Davidoff RA. Antispasticity drugs: mechanisms of action. Ann Neurol. 1985;17(2):107-16.

8. Kita M, Goodkin DE. Drugs used to treat spasticity. Drugs. 2000;59(3):487-95.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-079685 on 25 March 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text

#### 

## Figure 1. Example Search Algorithm for PubMed

#### PubMed Search String

#### **Cardiothoracic Surgery:**

("Cardiovascular Surgical Procedures"[MeSH Terms] OR "surgical procedures, operative"[MeSH Terms] OR "Perioperative Care"[MeSH Terms] OR "Thoracic Surgical Procedures"[MeSH Terms])

Results 1: 3,501,498

## AND

## **Muscle Relaxants:**

("centrally acting muscle relaxant"[All Fields] OR "muscle relaxant"[All Fields] OR "methocarbamol"[All Fields] OR "cyclobenzaprine"[All Fields] OR "baclofen"[All Fields] OR "skeletal muscle relaxant"[All Fields] OR "tizanidine"[All Fields] OR "carisoprodol"[All Fields] OR "metaxalone"[All Fields] OR "orphenadrine"[All Fields] OR "chlorzoxazone"[All Fields] OR "dantrolene"[All Fields])

Results 2: 18,392

## Combined Results 1+2: 1,532

Date: April 18, 2023

## **Cardiothoracic Surgery:**

("Cardiovascular Surgical Procedures" [MeSH Terms] OR "surgical procedures, operative" [MeSH Terms] OR "Perioperative Care" [MeSH Terms] OR "Thoracic Surgical Procedures" [MeSH Terms])

## Results 1: 3,501,498

## AND

## **Muscle Relaxants:**

("centrally acting muscle relaxant" [All Fields] OR "muscle relaxant" [All Fields] OR "methocarbamol" [All Fields] OR "cyclobenzaprine" [All Fields] OR "baclofen" [All Fields] OR "skeletal muscle relaxant" [All Fields] OR "tizanidine" [All Fields] OR "carisoprodol" [All Fields] OR "metaxalone" [All Fields] OR "orphenadrine"[All Fields] OR "chlorzoxazone"[All Fields] OR "dantrolene"[All Fields]) 

Results 2: 18,388

Combined Results 1+2: 1,529

Section and topic	Item No	c review protocol*	
ADMINISTRATIVI	E INFO		
Title:		DRMATION       s signature         Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review       to the systematic review         If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such       to the systematic review         If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number       and registration number	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	P.1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	n/a
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	P.2
Authors:		ndec	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mathing address of corresponding author Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	P.1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	P.6
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list	N/a
Support:		tra bio	
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	P.6
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	N/a
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments       Image: Comparison of the support for the review         Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review       Image: Comparison of the review funder and/or sponsor         Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor       Image: Comparison of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol         Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol       Image: Comparison of the support for the review of the support for the support for the review of the support for the review of the support for the support for the review of the support for the support for the review of the support for the support	N/a
INTRODUCTION		nilar J	
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	P.3
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	P.3
METHODS		yies.	
Eligibility criteria	ibility criteria 8 Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review		P.3
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, that registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	P.4
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits such that it could be repeated	P.8

## d by copyright, in mjopen-2023-079 to

3

		BMJ Open BMJ Open 2023-0	
		right, in	
Study records:		C 868	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review $\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 5 \\ 9 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	P.4
Selection process	11b	the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	P.4
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independent of a second planned any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	P.5
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources) bay bre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	P.4
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a definal outcomes, with rationale	P.4
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the bias of the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	P.6
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	P.6
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods $\vec{g}$ $\vec{g}$ $\vec{g}$ ding data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as 1 k condall's $\tau$ )	P.6
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression	P.6
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	P.7
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	P.5
•••		d that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for imp	
		review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) 🕏 he	-P Group and
distributed under a Cr	eative	Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.	
		D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for s RISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	systematic re
		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
		O	
		ap h	
		e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	

# **BMJ Open**

## Skeletal Muscle Relaxants as Adjunctive Pain control following Cardiothoracic Surgery - Systematic Review Protocol

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-079685.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Feb-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Kabir, Shadman; Nova Southeastern University Health Professions Division, College of Osteopathic Medicine Whaley, Quinn; Miami Transplant Institute Fernandez, Melissa; Miami Transplant Institute Murphy, Travis; Miami Transplant Institute; University of Miami School of Medicine, Department of Surgery, Division of Emergency Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Surgery, Pharmacology and therapeutics, Intensive care, Anaesthesia, Cardiovascular medicine
Keywords:	SURGERY, Cardiothoracic surgery < SURGERY, Thoracic surgery < SURGERY, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, Adult intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, PAIN MANAGEMENT



Skeletal Muscle Relaxants as Adjunctive Pain control following Cardiothoracic Surgery - Systematic Review Protocol

Shadman Kabir<sup>1</sup>, Quinn Whaley<sup>2</sup>, Melissa Fernandez<sup>2</sup>, Travis W. Murphy,<sup>2,3</sup>

1 Nova Southeastern University – College of Osteopathic Medicine

2 University of Miami/Jackson Memorial Hospital – Miami Transplant Institute

3 University of Miami Department of Surgery, Division of Emergency Medicine, Cardiothoracic Critical Care

Corresponding Author:

Travis W Murphy, MD

1801 NW 9th Ave

Miami, FL 33136

Twm51@miami.edu

Word Count: 2340/4000

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 license), an exclusive license and/or a non-exclusive license for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY license 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 BMJ Open and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>license</u>.

Travis Murphy, MD

## Abstract

## Introduction

Multimodal pain control following cardiothoracic surgery remains a focus in international guidelines. We hypothesize that non-depolarizing skeletal muscle relaxants can prove to be a useful adjunct for this population.

## Methods/analysis

This systematic review will focus on human adult studies of pain control using muscle relaxants within one week following cardiac and thoracic surgery available in PubMed, Cochrane Central, Web of Science and EMBASE. Target studies will have a primary focus on measured effects on quality of pain control and reduction in opioid usage. Studies that include non-depolarizing skeletal muscle relaxants given during cardiothoracic surgery or in the week after will be included. Study selection will be in keeping with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. Procedures and agents used will be analyzed together, and a meta-analysis will be conducted then compared to current therapies recommended in international practice guidelines.

## Ethics and dissemination

Formal ethical approval will not be required as primary data will not be collected. The results will be disseminated through peer-reviewed publication, conference presentation and lay press.

**Prospero registration number**: International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42023397917

## Article Summary

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies examining the effects of non-paralytic skeletal muscle relaxants following cardiothoracic surgery.
- Focus on a class of medications that is potentially underutilized based on current guidelines.
- Limitation in the number of studies investigating a given therapy may diminish observed effects.
- Potential identification of therapies with positive impact on pain control following cardiothoracic surgery.

#### Introduction

Postoperative pain after cardiothoracic surgery can be severe and attributed to a constellation of factors including rib retraction, sternal fracture, prolonged immobility, intercostal nerve stimulation, and pleural irritation from chest tubes. Per current recommendations by the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society (ERAS), a consistent multimodal analgesic approach is essential to patient comfort, early mobility, avoidance of opioids, and reduced likelihood of pulmonary complications following thoracic and cardiac surgery (1). These guidelines recommend regional anesthesia, scheduled administration of acetaminophen and NSAIDs, ketamine, and dexamethasone. Gabapentinoids also feature heavily in common multimodal anesthetic pathways despite data suggesting limited effects following cardiothoracic procedures (2). Additionally, these guidelines may not provide sufficient guidance for patients with underlying liver or kidney disease, making it important to explore alternative options such as muscle relaxants.

Muscle relaxants as a class are commonly used to treat spasticity and musculoskeletal disorders, with well-documented effectiveness in chronic spastic musculoskeletal pain, multiple sclerosis, and spinal cord injuries (3, 4). Baclofen, tizanidine, and dantrolene are approved to treat spasticity, though baclofen withdrawal can be life-threateningly severe (5). Baclofen and tizanidine are centrally acting and block GABA<sub>B</sub> receptors found in the spinal cord or brainstem (6, 7), while dantrolene directly inhibits muscle contraction by reducing the release of calcium from the skeletal muscle sarcoplasmic reticulum (8). More pertinent to post-operative pain, agents such as carisoprodol, chlorzoxazone, cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, methocarbamol, and orphenadrine are approved for the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders (5). While used in the treatment of acute injuries, we hypothesize that there may be a role for use following cardiothoracic surgery.

This review aims to summarize the current literature on the effectiveness of non-paralytic muscle relaxants in postoperative pain management for cardiac and thoracic surgery patients. The aim is to provide and evidence basis for alternative analgesics beyond those offered by current guidelines.

PROSPERO ID: CRD42023397917

## **Objectives**

The objective of our study is to systematically review the literature for the use of non-paralytic skeletal muscle relaxants as adjuncts for non-opioid pain control following cardiac or thoracic surgery. This will include all human adult studies available in the literature for post-operative pain control.

#### **Methods and Design**

#### Population

The systematic review will focus on studies that include patients aged >18 years who have undergone cardiac or thoracic surgery.

## Interventions

The interventions to be evaluated include any non-paralyzing muscle relaxant as part of a pain control regimen for cardiac or thoracic surgery. This includes centrally acting muscle relaxants such as cyclobenzaprine and methocarbamol as well as antispastics and antispasmodics such as baclofen. This specifically excludes studies evaluating the role of paralytics in pain control.

#### Comparisons

We will compare adult patients undergoing cardiac and thoracic surgery and receiving standard multimodal analgesia (acetaminophen, gabapentin, and others) with those receiving non-depolarizing skeletal muscle relaxants.

#### Outcome

The primary outcomes required of included studies will be one of the following: qualitative and quantitative assessment for pain control, either through patient satisfaction visual analog scale or numeric rating scheme, days of pain control, time to pain control, or measures of effect on functional status. Additional outcome measures may include sedation or other side effects, and comparison in opioid usage. Secondary outcomes will also include effect on length of stay, incidence of falls, anticholinergic side effects and withdrawal episodes upon removal of muscle relaxant in addition to any other reported adverse events.

#### Time

The outlined outcomes will be reported from the post-operative phase through to hospital discharge.

#### **Study Design**

The systematic review and meta-analysis will include all therapeutic studies investigating the use of a non-paralyzing muscle relaxant for pain control following cardiac or thoracic surgery within a week of surgery and following outcomes up until hospital discharge. This will include systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized control trials, adaptive clinical trials, prospective cohort and observational studies, non-randomized clinical trials, retrospective cohorts, case control studies, case reports, and case series. Studies that compare one intervention to usual practices recommended by ERAS as the control will be included. No minimum number of included subjects will be required. The review will exclude studies without a control group using either placebo or current standard care. Excluded study types include cross sectional studies, editorials, preclinical or animal models, and studies in the outpatient setting. Finally, grey literature shall be omitted from consideration. This review has been registered on the International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42023397917.

#### Search Strategy

A three-step process will be used to identify eligible studies, including an initial search, title and abstract screening and full-text manuscript review. A professional systematic review librarian will provide guidance in developing the search criteria with the authors to include all relevant studies pertaining to adult, human studies non-paralyzing muscle relaxants for pain control after thoracic and cardiac surgery. The databases that will be searched are PubMed, Web of Science, Cochrane Central and EMBASE from inception. No language restrictions will be applied. Figure 1 shows an example search algorithm for PubMed. Initial deduplication will be performed using EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA).[10]

## **Study Selection**

Literature search results will be uploaded from EndNote and screened through Covidence (*Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*). Study titles and abstracts will be screened for relevance in duplicate, blindly and independently, by the three junior authors (SK, QW, and MF) and adjudicated by the senior author (TM). Eligible studies will then be assessed again for inclusion and for quality in secondary screening through review of full-text manuscripts before data abstraction. This process will be reported using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram. The PRISMA-P

Checklist pertaining to this protocol is available as Supplement 1. Any conflicting remarks regarding studies will be adjudicated through discussion before inclusion in the final analysis.

#### **Quality Assessment**

Each article will undergo initial title and abstract screening in parallel by two independent, blinded reviewers to minimize bias. Conflicts will be adjudicated with discussion and involvement of the senior author as necessary. All selected articles will be reviewed with the senior author during full-text review. Cochrane tools for assessment of study quality (ROBINS-1 and RoB 2.0) will be used to determine appropriateness for inclusion. Two independent authors, one being the senior author, will assess the risks of bias in studies considered for full-text review in order to determine feasibility of a meta-analysis.

#### **Data Extraction**

Quantitative data will be extracted from studies meeting inclusion upon full-text review by a professional biostatistician. Data extracted for meta-analysis will be specifically those pertinent to the primary and secondary outcomes specified in the systematic review. This will include demographics of patient populations, types of surgical procedures performed, medications administered, and outcome parameters as well as any data that are available across all included studies. Data extraction will be independently cross-checked by the senior author and discrepancies resolved through discussion with the biostatistician. The raw data for this review including a dataset of articles screened will be published in a data repository.

#### Endpoint

Results of the systematic review will be grouped by pharmacologic agent. The primary outcomes will be quality of pain control as measured by patient satisfaction scores, visual analog scale, numeric ratings, days of pain control reported, intensity of pain reported, timing to effective pain control, sedating side effects, seizures or other adverse effects, effect on functional mobility and effect on opioid requirements. We will also include secondary outcomes of effect on length of stay, incidence of falls or injury due to muscle relaxants, anticholinergic reactions, withdrawal events upon cessation. Any follow-up duration will be accepted as there is considerable variability in the existing literature.

#### **Certainty of Cumulative Evidence**

We will assess the certainty of evidence for each outcome using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) framework in reporting the endpoints discussed above. As there may not be sufficient data for a meta-analysis, the overall certainty will be communicated using the narrative statements recommended by the framework.

#### **Patient and Public Involvement**

No patients were involved with the planning of this protocol.

#### **Analysis**

#### **Descriptive Analysis**

A narrative synthesis of the final studies included will be written summarizing the different nonparalyzing muscle relaxants identified. The impact of each of these agents on the primary and secondary outcomes will be described in addition to a formal meta-analysis of studies using each pharmacologic agent. Included studies will be evaluated for statistical heterogeneity before formal analysis.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

The primary focus of this review is to detect evidence for the impact of the pharmacologic agents identified on pain control and opioid usage. 'Pain control' is quantified in different ways that are important to patients including intensity, days of control, improvement from prior pain and whether pain limits functional mobility. As the effects of non-paralyzing muscle relaxants are studied differently, we expect some limitation in the ability to directly compare one agent to standard protocols or to one another. However, when available, pharmacologic agents will be compared as equitably as possible using all available outcome parameters reported in the primary literature. Subgroup analysis within populations of similar operations and treated with the same pharmacologic agents will be performed to identify populations most likely to benefit from a given agent. We will use the risk ratio with 95% confidence interval to express the effect estimate for dichotomous outcomes. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) will be utilized for comparing clusters treated with agents and procedures as the baseline characteristics of groups in different studies are likely to be different.

#### Data synthesis

A PRISMA flow diagram will be used to summarize study selection. Results will be presented in accordance with the PRISMA statement. Tabulated data showing qualitative and quantitative pain control for each pharmacologic agent and surgical intervention will be presented. For secondary outcome variables, we will present synthesized data as available in separate tables but will otherwise provide a separate narrative summary of the data available for each agent. We will cluster studies of each pharmacologic agent for each surgical type (cardiac or thoracic) based on the quality of evidence available and outcome variables included.

#### **Meta-analysis**

We anticipate clinical and methodological heterogeneity of the included studies and will plan for a qualitative synthesis of data in narrative form and to the extent possible, a quantitative synthesis of the pharmacologic agents. The results of this meta-analysis will then be compared to current ERAS practice guidelines to provide context and compare relative efficacy.

## **Ethics and dissemination**

No ethical or safety considerations were considered based on the nature of this review. Dissemination of findings through a peer-reviewed publication upon the conclusion of the meta-analysis.

## **Author Contributions**

*Travis Murphy:* Conception and design of work, analysis, drafting of work, final approval *Shadman Kabir:* Conception of work, analysis, drafting of work, final approval *Quinn Whaley:* Analysis, drafting of work, final approval *Melissa Fernandez:* Analysis, drafting of work, final approval

#### Funding statement

This project did not receive any internal or external funding.

## **Competing interest statement**

The authors have no competing interests.

## Figure 1. Example Search Algorithm for PubMed

#### **References**

1. Echeverria-Villalobos M, Stoicea N, Todeschini AB, Fiorda-Diaz J, Uribe AA, Weaver T, et al. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS): A Perspective Review of Postoperative Pain Management Under ERAS Pathways and Its Role on Opioid Crisis in the United States. Clin J Pain. 2020;36(3):219-26.

2. Zakkar M, Frazer S, Hunt I. Is there a role for gabapentin in preventing or treating pain following thoracic surgery? Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg. 2013;17(4):716-9.

3. Andersson PB, Goodkin DE. Current pharmacologic treatment of multiple sclerosis symptoms. West J Med. 1996;165(5):313-7.

4. Burchiel KJ, Hsu FP. Pain and spasticity after spinal cord injury: mechanisms and treatment. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2001;26(24 Suppl):S146-60.

5. Chou R, Peterson K, Helfand M. Comparative efficacy and safety of skeletal muscle relaxants for spasticity and musculoskeletal conditions: a systematic review. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2004;28(2):140-75.

6. Brogden RN, Speight TM, Avery GS. Baclofen: a preliminary report of its pharmacological properties and therapeutic efficacy in spasticity. Drugs. 1974;8(1):1-14.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-079685 on 25 March 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 13, 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

7. Davidoff RA. Antispasticity drugs: mechanisms of action. Ann Neurol. 1985;17(2):107-16.

8. Kita M, Goodkin DE. Drugs used to treat spasticity. Drugs. 2000;59(3):487-95.

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

## Figure 1. Example Search Algorithm for PubMed

## PubMed Search String

(thoracic surgical procedures[MeSH Terms]) OR (cardiovascular surgery[Title/Abstract]) OR (thoracic surgery[Title/Abstract])

## AND

(pain post operative[MeSH Terms]) OR (pain management[MeSH Terms]) OR (pain perception[MeSH Terms]) OR (pain measurement[MeSH Terms]) OR (length of stay[MeSH Terms]) OR (accidental falls[MeSH Terms]) OR (substance withdrawal syndrome[MeSH Terms]) OR (post operative pain[Title/Abstract]) OR (pain management[Title/Abstract]) OR (length of stay[Title/Abstract]) OR (hospital stay[Title/Abstract]) OR (accidental falls[Title/Abstract]) OR (pain perception[Title/Abstract]) OR (pain measurement[Title/Abstract]) OR (withdrawal[Title/Abstract]) OR (pain perception[Title/Abstract]) OR (pain measurement[Title/Abstract]) OR (withdrawal[Title/Abstract])

## AND

(muscle relaxants, central[MeSH Terms]) OR (methocarbamol[MeSH Terms]) OR (baclofen[MeSH Terms]) OR (carisoprodol[MeSH Terms]) OR (orphenadrine[MeSH Terms]) OR (Chlorzoxazone[MeSH Terms]) OR (dantrolene[MeSH Terms]) OR (cyclobenzaprine[Supplementary Concept])
OR (tizanidine[Supplementary Concept]) OR (metaxalone[Supplementary Concept]) OR (orphenadrine[MeSH Terms]) OR (dantrolene[MeSH Terms]) OR (muscle relaxant[Title/Abstract]) OR (methocarbamol[Text Word]) OR (cyclobenzaprine[Text Word]) OR (baclofen[Text Word]) OR (orphenadrine[Text Word]) OR (metaxalone[Text Word]) OR (metax

3 4

44 45

PRISMA-P (Pref address in a syste	ferrec emati	BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open Constructio	nded ite
Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item of B	
ADMINISTRATIV	E INFO		
Title:		Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review, identify as such	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	P.1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	n/a
Registration	2	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mathematical address of	P.2
Authors:		nd ed	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mathematides of corresponding author Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	P.1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	P.6
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identities as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	N/a
Support:		traj jop	
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	P.6
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	N/a
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	N/a
INTRODUCTION		on J nilar	
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Р.3
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	P.3
METHODS		yies.	
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	P.3
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, treal registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	P.4
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limited such that it could be repeated	Р.8

Data management11aDescribe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review managementSo of processP.4Selection process11bState the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)P.4Data collection process11cDescribe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independent reviewers) through the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)P.5Data collection process12List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources)P.4Vutcomes and rioritization13List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a strength of the all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a strength of the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesisP.6the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesisP.6tota synthesis15aDescribe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesisedP.615bIf data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned exploration of consistency (such as Is Kendall's τ)P.615bIf quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary plannedP.615cDescribe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regrestion of studies)P.615dIf quantitative synthesis is			BMJ Open Coper	
Data       11a       Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review       P.4         Selection       11b       State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)       P.4         Data collection       11c       Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independent reviewers) through each phase of any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators       P.4         tata items       12       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources) and simplifications       P.4         totational       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and any dividual studies, including whether the data will be used in data synthesis       P.6         totat as suppropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of the data and P.6       Methods of combining data from studies, including my planned exploration of consistency (such as PICO items, funding sources)       P.6         15c       Describe antirepresed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regressione)       P.6         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, studies)       P.6         15c       Describe now the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE) <th></th> <th></th> <th>n-2023-07 pyright, ii</th> <th></th>			n-2023-07 pyright, ii	
Data       11a       Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review       P.4         Selection       11b       State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)       P.4         Data collection       11c       Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independent reviewers) through each phase of any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators       P.4         tata items       12       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources) and simplifications       P.4         totational       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and any dividual studies, including whether the data will be used in data synthesis       P.6         totat as suppropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of the data and P.6       Methods of combining data from studies, including my planned exploration of consistency (such as PICO items, funding sources)       P.6         15c       Describe antirepresed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regressione)       P.6         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, studies)       P.6         15c       Describe now the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE) <th>Study records:</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Study records:			
process       the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)       Image: State and State Collection       The review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)       Image: State and State Collection       P.5         Data collection       11c       Describe planned method of extracting data from investigators       P.5         and receives (that is, screening, eligibility and confirming data from investigators       P.4       P.4         data assumptions and simplifications       P.4       P.4         butcomes and       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and an with rationale       P.4         with rationale       with rationale       P.6       P.6         tax synthesis       15a       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whitesised       P.6         tax synthesis       15a       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of summary measures, methods of consistency (such as publication)       P.6         tax synthesis       15b       If data are appropriate for quanitative synthesis, describe the type of summary measures, methods of combining data from studies, including any planned syloration of consistency (such as lighting and second structure)       P.6         15b       If a unantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       P.6         154		11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review $\frac{di}{ds}$ $\frac{5}{9}$	P.4
ata items       12       List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources)       ata items       P.4         ata items       13       List and define all variables for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a sources.       P.4         intromes and       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a sources.       P.4         isk of bias in       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether       P.6         isk of bias in       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including any planed synthesised       P.6         isk of bias in       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including any planed synthesised       P.6         ist as synthesis       15a       Describe relation studies, including any planed summary measures, methods of combining data from studies, including any planed summary planed       F.6         15b       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planed       F.6         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planed       F.6         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate (secribe the type of summary planed)       F.6         infudue       No       Specify any		11b	the review (that is screening eligibility and inclusion in meta analysis) $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$	P.4
data assumptions and simplifications       Image: Comparison of the sought, including prioritization of main and a simplifications of which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a simplification in the automes of an extension of the outcomes of the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis is the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis is the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis       P.4         atta synthesis       15       Describe enticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis       P.6         15       Describe enticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis       P.6         15       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (suctRes Fixendall's t)       P.6         15       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regree for a studies)       P.6         15       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       P.6         16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selecting regorting within P.7       studies)         omfidence in       17       Describe how the strength of the body		11c	any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	P.5
ionitization       with rationale       production         isk of bias in dividual studies       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis       Production         hata synthesis       15a       Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesis.       Production         15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned exploration of consistency (suclets) strength and from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (suclets) strength of the post of methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (suclets) strength of the top of summary planned       Productive Productive Productive Strength of the post of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selecting reporting within P.7         feta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selecting within P.7       Productive Studies)         onfidence in 17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       0       Productive Studies)         It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite Theravallable) for important clarificative is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.       15         row: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferrid of reporting item	Data items	12	data assumptions and simplifications	P.4
Idividual studies       the outcome or study level, or both, state how this information will be used in data synthesis       P.6         iata synthesis       15a       Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised       P.6         15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (sucfast Is Kendall's T)       P.6         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression       P.6         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       P.6         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       P.7         feta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective regression       P.7         onfidence in       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       B       B         umulative evidence       It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (citte Whetawailable) for important clarification is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.       F       F         rom: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred referring items for systematic review te	Outcomes and prioritization	13	with rationale	P.4
15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (suches IF Kendall's r)       P.6         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression in the sensitivity or subgroup and sensitivity or subgroup and sensitivity evidence         If tea-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication and Elaboration (cite senset available) for important clarification is stributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. <td>Risk of bias in individual studies</td> <td>14</td> <td></td> <td>P.6</td>	Risk of bias in individual studies	14		P.6
15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (suches IF Kendall's r)       P.6         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression in the sensitivity or subgroup and sensitivity or subgroup and sensitivity evidence         If tea-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication and Elaboration (cite senset available) for important clarification is stributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. <td>Data synthesis</td> <td>15a</td> <td>Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised</td> <td>P.6</td>	Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	P.6
15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned         feta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selecting reporting within       P.7         studies)       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       0       P.5         amulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       0       P.5         It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite where available) for important clarification are items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist))       The feat by the PRISMA-P Group and is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.         rrom: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review leta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.       Toporting items for systematic review		15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods <b>G G G d d d d d a d d d d a a d d d d a a d d d d a a d d d d a a d d d d d d d d d d</b>	P.6
Idea-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selecting reporting within P.7 studies)         Indication       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       16       9       9.5         It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite where available) for important clarification is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.       16       5       5         It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite where available) for important clarification is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.       16       5       5         It is strongly protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.       16       5       5         It is strongly protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.       17       10		15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regrestion).	P.6
studies)       Studies)         ionfidence in 17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)         imulative evidence       It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite Their available) for important clarification are items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist)         is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.         irom: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reforming items for systematic review leta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.		15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	
It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite with available) for important clarification are items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is here by the PRISMA-P Group and is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.	Meta-bias(es)	16		P.7
he items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is here by the PRISMA-P Group and is istributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.	Confidence in cumulative evidence	17		P.5
neta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	the items. Amendmer distributed under a Cr	nts to a reative	review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) $\vec{k}$ he $\vec{k}$ by the PRISM Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.	IA-P Group and is
For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	meta-analysis protoco	ols (PI	(gence	
			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	