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KEY MESSAGES

What is the key question?
For treatment of acute pulmonary embolism (PE), the benefits and risks of the different recanalization procedures (i.e., full-dose systemic thrombolysis, reduced-dose systemic thrombolysis, or catheter-directed thrombolysis) vs. each other lack clarity.

What is the bottom line?
Compared with standard anticoagulation, recanalization procedures had a similar risk of all-cause mortality, and full-dose thrombolysis was associated with an increased risk of major bleeding.

Why read on?
Low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of dying and bleeding.
ABSTRACT

Background: We aimed to review the efficacy and safety of recanalization procedures for the treatment of pulmonary embolism (PE).

Methods: We searched PubMed, the Cochrane Library, EMBASE, EBSCO, Web of Science, and CINAHL databases from inception through July 31, 2015, and included randomized clinical trials that compared the effect of a recanalization procedure vs. each other or anticoagulant therapy in patients diagnosed with PE. We used network meta-analysis and multivariate random-effects meta-regression to estimate pooled differences between each intervention, and meta-regression to assess the association between trial characteristics and the reported effects of recanalization procedures vs. anticoagulation.

Results: For all-cause mortality, there were no significant differences in event rates between any of the recanalization procedures and anticoagulant treatment (full-dose thrombolysis: odds ratio, 0.60; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.36-1.01; low-dose thrombolysis: 0.47; 95% CI, 0.14-1.59; and catheter-associated thrombolysis: 0.31; 95% CI, 0.01-7.96). Full-dose thrombolysis increased the risk of major bleeding (2.00; 95% CI, 1.06-3.78) compared with anticoagulation. Catheter-directed thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of dying (surface under the cumulative ranking curve [SUCRA], 0.67), followed by low-dose thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.66), and full-dose thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.55). Similarly, low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of major bleeding (SUCRA, 0.61), followed by catheter-directed thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.54), and full-dose thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.17). The results were similar in sensitivity analyses based on restricting only to studies in hemodynamically stable PE patients.

Conclusions: In the treatment of PE, recanalization procedures do not seem to offer a clear advantage compared with standard anticoagulation. Low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of dying and bleeding.
**Trial registration**: PROSPERO CRD42015024670.

**Abstract word count**: 260
INTRODUCTION

Although most patients with acute pulmonary embolism (PE) have an uncomplicated clinical course while undergoing standard anticoagulation treatment, the overall short-term mortality rate is still significant (1, 2). Death from acute PE usually occurs before or soon after hospital admission (3, 4).

There have been two main treatments for acute PE, anticoagulant therapy alone or systemic thrombolytic therapy (5). Most patients presenting to the hospital with PE have normal blood pressure, normal right ventricular function, and a low clinical severity score and therefore have a very low short-term mortality with prompt initiation of anticoagulation. Although systemic thrombolysis has angiographic and haemodynamic benefits for patients with acute PE, compared to standard therapy, it markedly increases major bleeding, including intracranial and fatal bleeding (6). Consequently, systemic thrombolytic therapy is usually reserved for PE patients with hemodynamic instability (7). The ability to actively remove emboli in patients with acute PE without increasing bleeding would be an important advance. Low-dose systemic thrombolysis and catheter-based thrombolytic therapy require only a fraction of the systemic fibrinolytic dose, and this dose reduction might improve the safety of thrombolysis for PE. A common problem in evaluating the efficacy of these interventions is the lack of trials (or a paucity of available trials) that directly compare these interventions. As a result, no meta-analysis has comprehensively compared the effect of a recanalization procedure vs. each other in patients diagnosed with acute symptomatic PE.

The primary aim of our study was to perform a network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCT) for treatment of acute PE to obtain a better estimate of the benefits and risks of the different recanalization procedures (i.e., full-dose systemic thrombolysis, reduced-dose systemic thrombolysis, or catheter-directed thrombolysis) vs. each other or anticoagulant therapy.

METHODS
Data sources and searches

This systematic review is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement extension for network meta-analysis and was conducted following an a priori–established protocol registered with PROSPERO (8). We searched PubMed, the Cochrane Library, EMBASE, EBSCO, Web of Science, and CINAHL databases. Each database was searched from its inception date to 31 July 2015. Conference abstracts were included in our search. The retrieved articles were examined to eliminate potential duplicates or overlapping data. No limits or language restriction were applied during the search. The RCTs were identified using the Cochrane Collaboration highly sensitive search strategy (sensitivity-maximizing and precision-maximizing version) (9). The search string was: #1. pulmonary embolis*; #2. thrombolysis OR thrombolytic therapy OR streptokinase OR urokinase OR tenecteplase OR alteplase OR desmoteplase OR tissue plasminogen activator OR clot-dissolving medication; #3. #1 AND #2. We also hand searched the references of relevant articles for additional clinical trials not identified by the electronic search and contacted experts. Finally we searched clinicaltrials.gov for information on clinical trials that were terminated but unpublished. The planned analysis was registered at the PROSPERO international prospective register of systematic reviews on July 20, 2015 (CRD42015024670).

Study selection

One reviewer (DJ) performed the database search and initial screening of titles and abstracts. Two investigators (DJ, RM) independently carried out full text screening of all eligible articles. We included a study if participants were patients with acute symptomatic PE objectively diagnosed with standard imaging techniques and received anticoagulant therapy; the intervention was treatment with a recanalization procedure (i.e., full-dose systemic thrombolysis, reduced-dose systemic thrombolysis, or catheter-directed thrombolysis); the comparison group was either treatment with a different recanalization procedure or no recanalization treatment (i.e., the patients received standard anticoagulation); it was a randomised controlled trial; and it reported mortality
outcomes. Observational studies, and trials without a control group were excluded.

**Data extraction and quality assessment**
Two reviewers (DJ and RM) independently extracted data onto a computer spreadsheet, with discrepancies resolved by consensus. Extracted data included first author, year of publication, type of intervention and control group, number of patients, patient characteristics, and duration of follow-up. The primary outcomes were all-cause mortality and major bleeding, as defined by the study protocol. Secondary outcomes were risk of intracranial hemorrhage (ICH) and recurrent embolism. The occurrence of these outcomes was abstracted according to the intention-to-treat population for individual trials. The outcomes data from the first available time point identified as a primary end point from each trial were incorporated into our primary analysis. Each study was graded for potential bias into low, high, and unclear according to the Cochrane Collaboration handbook (10).

**Data synthesis and analysis**
Separate meta-analyses of direct evidence only (pairwise meta-analyses) were performed using DerSimonian and Laird random-effects model to estimate pooled odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) (11). Forest plots were created for each outcome. When there were no events in one treatment group, we used a 0.5 continuity correction. Heterogeneity was assessed using the estimated between-study variance ($\tau^2$), Cochran $\chi^2$ test, and the I² statistic (12).

Because there are few trials making head to head comparisons between recanalization procedures, we performed a network metaanalysis. Unlike traditional meta-analyses, this method has the advantage of allowing trials comparing recanalization procedures with some other common treatment (e.g., placebo) to be incorporated into the analysis, thus increasing power and enabling a better comparison of recanalization therapies to be made (13). We used multivariate, random-effects meta-regressions to perform each analysis using the network family of commands in Stata (14). We evaluated
inconsistency between direct and indirect sources of evidence by comparison of the fit and parsimony of consistency and inconsistency models and by calculation of the difference between direct and indirect estimates of a specific treatment effect (‘loop-specific approach’). The relative ranking of recanalization interventions on primary and secondary outcomes was presented as their surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA) probabilities, which represent their likelihood of being ranked best (15). In this study, higher SUCRA scores reflect lower associated all-cause mortality and bleeding events. We estimated the probability of each treatment being the best by averaging 10,000 Monte Carlo replications. The level of statistical significance was set at \( P < 0.05 \) and all statistical tests were 2-sided.

We performed some sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the findings. These were based on (1) restricting only to studies in patients with hemodynamically stable PE; (2) restricting only to trials where the mean age of participants in the thrombolytic group was > 65 years; and (3) alternative statistical model (frequentist approach using a random-effects inconsistency model).

**RESULTS**

From a total of 930 unique studies identified using the search strategy, 22 RCTs (2,494 patients) were included in the network meta-analysis (eFigure 1). These included 16 trials comparing full-dose thrombolysis to no thrombolysis (2,016 patients) (6, 16-30), 1 comparing low-dose thrombolysis to no thrombolysis (121 patients) (31), 1 comparing ultrasound-assisted catheter-directed thrombolysis with no thrombolysis (59 patients) (32), and 4 comparing full-dose thrombolysis with low-dose thrombolysis (298 patients) (33-36). The available direct comparisons and network of trials is shown in Figure 1 and eFigures 2-4 in the Supplement.

**Characteristics of included studies**
The RCTs included in the network meta-analysis are summarized in Table 1. Overall, these 22 trials were reported between 1970 and 2014 and included 2,494 participants. The mean study sample size was 113 participants, ranging from 8 to 1,005 patients. The baseline characteristics of patients included in these trials are described in Table 1. The primary outcome (all-cause mortality) was reported in all studies.

**Direct meta-analysis**

Results of direct pairwise meta-analysis are summarized in Table 2 and eFigures 5-8 in the Supplement. All interventions were associated with a nonsignificant reduction of all-cause mortality (full-dose thrombolysis: odds ratio [OR], 0.64; 95% CI, 0.37 to 1.09; low-dose thrombolysis: 0.32, 0.03 to 3.13; catheter-directed thrombolysis: 0.31, 0.01 to 7.96); full-dose thrombolysis was not superior to low-dose thrombolysis (1.04, 0.24 to 4.41). Full-dose thrombolytic therapy was significantly associated with a greater risk of major bleeding (2.39, 1.44 to 3.95) and intracranial haemorrhage (ICH) (3.66, 1.13 to 11.86) compared with anticoagulant therapy (eFigures 6 and 7 in the Supplement), whereas low-dose thrombolysis showed a nonsignificant benefit in terms of major bleeding and ICH compared with full-dose thrombolysis (Table 2). All outcomes were associated with negligible heterogeneity ($I^2 < 12\%$).

**Network meta-analysis – primary outcomes**

In network meta-analysis, compared with anticoagulation alone, full-dose thrombolysis was associated with an OR of 0.60 (95% CI, 0.36-1.01), low-dose thrombolysis with an OR of 0.47 (95% CI, 0.14-1.59), and catheter-directed thrombolysis with an OR of 0.31 (95% CI, 0.01-7.96) for dying (Figure 2). When recanalization treatments were compared, none of comparisons reached conventional level of statistical significance (Figure 2). In network meta-analysis, compared with anticoagulation alone, full-dose thrombolysis was associated with an OR of 2.00 (95% CI, 1.06-3.78), low-dose thrombolysis with an OR of 0.90 (95% CI, 0.25-3.21), and catheter-directed thrombolysis with an OR of 0.97 (95% CI, 0.02-56.03) for bleeding (Figure 2). Again, when recanalization treatments were compared for bleeding, none of comparisons reached conventional level of statistical significance (Figure 2).
Network meta-analysis suggested that catheter-directed thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of dying (SUCRA, 0.67), followed by low-dose thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.66), and full-dose thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.55) (Figure 3). Similarly, low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of major bleeding (SUCRA, 0.61), followed by catheter-directed thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.54), and full-dose thrombolysis (SUCRA, 0.17) (Figure 3).

**Network meta-analysis – secondary outcomes**
In network meta-analysis, compared with anticoagulation, all procedures had 0.48 to 2.07 odds of being associated with ICH (eFigure 9). Compared with anticoagulant therapy, low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest odds of ICH (OR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.07-3.14; SUCRA, 0.78), whereas full-dose thrombolysis (OR, 2.07; 95% CI, 0.86-5.02; SUCRA, 0.16) was associated with the highest odds of ICH (eFigure 10).

Compared with anticoagulation, all procedures had 0.34 to 0.97 lower odds of being associated with recurrent embolism (eFigure 9). Compared with anticoagulant therapy, low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest odds of recurrent embolism (OR, 0.34; 95% CI, 0.09-1.25; SUCRA, 0.81), whereas catheter-directed thrombolysis (OR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.02-50.36; SUCRA, 0.40) was associated with the highest odds of recurrent embolism (eFigure 10).

**Sensitivity analysis**
Results from sensitivity analyses are reported in eTable 1 in the Supplement. Overall, the results were similar to the main analysis for the primary outcome in sensitivity analyses based on (1) restricting only to studies in patients with hemodynamically stable PE; (2) restricting only to trials where the mean age of participants in the thrombolytic group was > 65 years; and (3) alternative statistical model (frequentist approach using a random-effects inconsistency model).
Publication bias and network consistency
There was no evidence of publication bias, either qualitatively based on funnel-plot asymmetry (eFigure 11 in the Supplement) or quantitatively (Egger regression test, P > 0.05 for all comparisons), although the number of studies included in each comparison was small. There were significant differences between direct and indirect estimates in the only closed loop that allowed assessment of network consistency (anticoagulation-full-dose thrombolysis-low-dose thrombolysis).

Quality of evidence
The risk of bias summary and figure for included studies are listed in eFigure 12 and eTable 2 in the Supplement. Some studies did not present details for randomization, allocation concealment, and blinding. No more than 4 of the included trials (< 20%) were deemed to be at high risk of bias in only 3 domains (randomization, allocation concealment, blinding) of the Cochrane Collaboration risk of bias tool. In most domains, the majority of trials were at low risk, except for the allocation concealment and blinding categories in which most trials were at an unclear risk due to inadequate reporting of methods.

DISCUSSION
To our knowledge, this is the first network meta-analysis comparing full-dose thrombolysis, low-dose thrombolysis, catheter-directed thrombolysis and inactive controls on mortality and other adverse outcomes in patients with acute symptomatic PE. The study has several key findings. First, full-dose thrombolysis, low-dose thrombolysis, and catheter-directed thrombolysis showed a non-significant trend toward lower risk of all-cause death compared with anticoagulation. Second, full-dose thrombolysis was associated with higher odds of major bleeding compared with anticoagulant treatment, with moderate confidence in estimates, but was associated with lower odds of recurrences. Third, low-dose thrombolysis was the treatment that performed best in terms of efficacy (all-cause mortality) and safety (major bleeding). However, the clinical interpretation of these findings is limited not only by the uncertainty around
these estimates, but also by the potential bias due to the small number of trials in each node.

Traditional pairwise meta-analyses are limited in helping to summarise the most effective treatment among different kinds of recanalization procedures. Other than comparisons between full-dose thrombolysis and anticoagulant therapy (37, 38), the number of studies that analysed each particular pair of treatments is still relatively small. Furthermore, for some procedures (i.e., full-dose vs. catheter-directed thrombolysis) there was no direct comparative research. The ability to estimate effectiveness in this work using network meta-analysis allows for more comprehensive assessment of treatment options than has been previously possible. Additionally, in contrast to separate pairwise analyses, we have been able to rank each treatment based on the strength of its association with mortality and bleeding. Even though the results of the pairwise and network meta-analyses were mostly similar, the biggest difference was seen in the comparison of full-dose with anticoagulation on intracranial haemorrhage with the pairwise meta-analysis estimating a larger association than the network model. This was most likely because to the large amount of between-study variation observed in the indirect comparisons being incorporated into the analysis.

Some previous pairwise meta-analyses showed significantly lower associated mortality with full-dose systemic thrombolytic use in PE (37, 38). In our study, we did not find a significant reduction in all-cause mortality with full-dose thrombolytic therapy. This discrepancy between the studies may be explained at least in part by the use of different methodological and statistical techniques. For low-dose systemic thrombolysis and catheter-directed thrombolysis, lack of statistical power might account for the nonsignificant results, as suggested by the wider confidence intervals. Alternatively, full-dose systemic thrombolysis showed a significant association with major bleeding, a finding consistent with previous meta-analyses (37-39). While low-dose and catheter-directed thrombolysis have the potential to offer benefits of full-dose systemic thrombolysis while minimizing bleeding risk attributable to a lower dose of the thrombolytic agent, limited randomized clinical trial data might be the main
obstacle for providing a definitive conclusion on the comparison of the effect of different reperfusion therapies on major bleeding and ICH. On balance, our results show that low-dose and catheter-directed thrombolysis seem the most highly ranked treatment across the two primary outcomes. Since catheter-directed thrombolysis requires rapid access to the cardiac catheterization or interventional radiology laboratory (5), low-dose thrombolysis is appealing for PE patients when early recanalization procedures are indicated. However, it should be kept in mind that in patients with such presentations, particularly when PE is associated with hemodynamic instability, there are relatively few data for any approaches other than standard-dose systemic thrombolysis.

Ultimately, given the differences in safety, efficacy, and response to therapy, from a clinical perspective, the clinician should always consider the overall clinical picture, and patient management plans need to balance the risks and benefits. There is also a need for randomized trials that compare low-dose thrombolytic therapy in with anticoagulation alone in stable patients who have intermediate-high risk PE. Evidence from such studies would place the role of this procedure for PE on a firmer footing.

This study has limitations. First, there was a paucity of head-to-head trials. Second, the biggest threat to validity of the results of any meta-analysis is conceptual heterogeneity (i.e., considerable differences among trials in patient characteristics, studied interventions, outcome assessment, or study design), which can limit the comparability of trials. Strategies to limit the effect of conceptual heterogeneity included strict inclusion and exclusion criteria and the use of various sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the results. Third, we found inconsistency for efficacy, which was mainly determined by the loop of anticoagulation-full-dose thrombolysis-low-dose thrombolysis. Since some evidence suggests that quality of thrombolytic clinical trials has substantially changed in the past 30 years, we believe that this inconsistency might be a consequence of a cohort effect that relates to different methods used in the older studies compared with those done more recently (40). Fourth, ranking probabilities may be affected by unequal numbers of trials per comparison, sample size of individual studies, network configuration, and effect
sizes among treatments and should be interpreted with caution. Finally, some included trials had an unclear or high rate of selection and performance bias, and there are unaddressed concerns regarding the effect of recanalization procedures in a clinical setting.

In conclusion, compared with standard anticoagulation, recanalization procedures had a similar risk of all-cause mortality, though full-dose thrombolysis was associated with an increased risk of major bleeding. This network metaanalysis did not identify a statistically significant difference between the outcomes associated with these therapies, but low-dose thrombolysis was associated with the lowest probability of dying and bleeding. The current body of evidence is limited and further conclusive studies are needed to establish the role of each of the recanalization procedures.
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Table 1. Characteristics of included randomized clinical trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Intervention*</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>High-risk PE included</th>
<th>Age, Mean (range or SD), y</th>
<th>Follow-up, d</th>
<th>Male, N° (%)</th>
<th>All-cause mortality</th>
<th>Major bleeding</th>
<th>ICH</th>
<th>Recurrent VTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meyer et al (6), 2014</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Tenecteplase</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.2 (15.3)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline et al (16), 2014</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Tenecteplase</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.4 (14)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becattini et al (17), 2010</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Tenecteplase</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.1 (1.9)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinides et al (18), 2002</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Alteplase</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.1 (10.5)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldhaber et al (19), 1993</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>rt-PA</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58.5 (17)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalla-Volta et al (20), 1992</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Alteplase</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.7 (12.5)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>Treatment 1</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Death Rate</td>
<td>MVA</td>
<td>MTHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine et al (21), 1990</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Alteplase (0.6 mg/Kg of ideal body weight)</td>
<td>Placebo No</td>
<td>61.5 (2.7)</td>
<td>10 29 Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIOPED (22), 1990</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alteplase (40-80 mg)</td>
<td>Placebo No</td>
<td>58.5 (15.8)</td>
<td>7 9 Yes Yes Yes No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marini et al (23), 1988</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Urokinase (800 000 IU for 12h/d for 3d or 3 300 000 IU for 12h)</td>
<td>Placebo No</td>
<td>53 (23-72)</td>
<td>11 Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ly et al (24), 1978</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Streptokinase (250 000 IU loading dose, then 100 000 IU/h for 72h)</td>
<td>Placebo Yes</td>
<td>53.2 (23-70)</td>
<td>10 11 Yes Yes No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbutt et al (25), 1974</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Streptokinase (600 000 IU over 30m through PA catheter followed by 100 000U/h IV for 72h)</td>
<td>Placebo Yes</td>
<td>48.7 (25-71)</td>
<td>3 15 Yes Yes No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPET (26), 1970</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Urokinase (2 000 U/lb, then 2 000 U/lb/h for 12h)</td>
<td>Placebo Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 92 Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasullo et al (27), 2011</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Alteplase (100 mg)</td>
<td>Placebo No</td>
<td>56.0 (16.1)</td>
<td>180 41 Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>Treatment 1</td>
<td>Treatment 2</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerjes et al (28), 1995</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Streptokinase (1 500 000 IU)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51 (22.9)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dotter et al (29), 1979</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Streptokinase (2 000 000 to 11 000 000 IU)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taherkahni et al (30), 2014</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Alteplase (100 mg) or streptokinase (1 500 000 IU)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.7 (12.4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharifi et al (31), 2012</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>t-PA (50 mg)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Intervention: 58 (9)</td>
<td>Control: 59 (10)</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucher et al (32), 2014</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>rt-PA (10 to 20 mg through PA catheter)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63 (14)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldhaber et al (33), 1994</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>rt-PA (100 mg) rt-PA (0.6 mg/Kg with a maximum dose of 50 mg)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Intervention: 53 (17)</td>
<td>Control: 58 (16)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sors et al (34), 1994</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Alteplase (100 mg)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Intervention: 69 (12)</td>
<td>Hospital stay: 23 (43.4)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al (35), 2010</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>rt-PA (100 mg) rt-PA (50 mg)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Intervention: 51.9 (13.5)</td>
<td>Control: 55.3 (14.1)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Treatment 1</td>
<td>Treatment 2</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Ye</td>
<td>Ye</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdelsamad et al (36), 2011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Streptokinase (1 000 000 IU over 1 hour)</td>
<td>Streptokinase (250 000 IU over 30 min, then 100 000 IU/h over 24 h)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Patients also received standard anticoagulation.

*b* Precise ages of patients not provided; 50.6% of patients were younger than 50 years and 49.4% of patients 50 years or older.

*c* Unspecified.

**Abbreviations:** PE, pulmonary embolism; ICH, intracranial haemorrhage; VTE, venous thromboembolism; rt-PA, recombinant tissue plasminogen activator; IU, international units.
Table 2. Summary of direct meta-analysis for all-cause mortality and adverse event outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Active intervention&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Control (Placebo unless otherwise noted)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of studies</td>
<td>No. with event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All-cause mortality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catheter-directed thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis vs. low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major bleeding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catheter-directed thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis vs. low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intracranial haemorrhage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catheter-directed thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis vs. low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrent VTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catheter-directed thrombolysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-dose thrombolysis vs. low-dose thrombolysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Patients also received standard anticoagulation

**Abbreviations**: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; VTE, venous thromboembolism.