

BMJ Open

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 (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

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

BMJ Open

Local anesthetic combined with vasoconstrictor in patients with cardiovascular diseases undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2016-014611 |
| Article Type: | Protocol |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 10-Oct-2016 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Guimaraes, Caio; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Motta, Rogério; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Bergamaschi, Cristiane; University of Sorocaba, Pharmaceutical Science Araújo, Jimmy; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics de Andrade, Natalia Karol; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Figueiró, Mabel; Hospital do Coracao Ramacciato, Juliana ; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Lopes, Luciane; UNISO, Pharmacie Science |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Dentistry and oral medicine |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Anaesthesia, Evidence based practice, Pharmacology and therapeutics |
| Keywords: | Local anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Local anesthetic combined with vasoconstrictor in patients with cardiovascular diseases undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Short title: Local anesthesia in dental patients with cardiovascular diseases

Authors:

Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS*

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

Rogério Heládio Lopes Motta, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
rogerio.motta@slmandic.com.br

Cristiane de Cássia Bergamasch, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Sorocaba, Brazil
cristiane.motta@prof.uniso.br

Jimmy de oliveira Araújo, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
Jimmy_dental@hotmail.com

Natalia Karol de Andrade, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
karol.andrade.odonto@hotmail.com

Mabel Fernandes Figueiró

Librarian, Research Institute, Heart Hospital, São Paulo, Brazil
Mfigueiro@hcor.com.br

Juliana Cama Ramacciato, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Dental
School and Research Center, Brazil
Juliana.ramacciato@slmandic.com.br

Luciane Cruz Lopes, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Brazil
Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de
Mesquita Filho, Araraquara, Brazil
luslopes@terra.com.br

No conflict of interest**Word count:** 2,674**Number of references:** 30**Appendix:** 1**Keywords:** Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular
Disease***Corresponding author:****Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS- Corresponding author**

São Leopoldo Mandic University, Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil
Address: Rua Dr. José rocha Junqueira, 13, Swift,
(55)67984535056
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Use of vasoconstrictors combined with local anesthetics (LAs) in dentistry for patients with cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) is still controversial in the scientific literature. It raises concerns regarding the possibility of transient episodes, triggering negative cardiovascular outcomes.

Method/Design: Trials eligible for our systematic review will enroll CVD patients who have undergone dental treatments that demand the use of LAs by comparing two arms: LA with vasoconstrictor and LA without vasoconstrictor. The research will be conducted in the electronic databases Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), MEDLINE, EMBASE, Healthstar (via Ovid), CINAHL, and Web of Science, without any restrictions in terms of language and status of publication. A team of reviewers will independently assess titles, abstracts, and complete text to determine eligibility. For eligible studies, the same reviewers will perform data extraction and evaluate risk of bias in the selected articles. The selected outcomes comprise death, mortality by specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety, adverse effects, blood pressure changes, changes in heart rate, anxiety, and changes in oximetry. Whenever possible, we will conduct a meta-analysis to establish the effects of LA with and without vasoconstrictor in such patients, and the overall quality of evidence for each of the outcomes will be determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) classification system.

Ethics and Dissemination: Ethics committee approval was not necessary because this is a protocol of systematic review. This systematic review will be submitted for presentation at conferences and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Our review will assess the risks of cardiovascular events when using LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, focusing on important clinical outcomes. The results of this study will be disseminated by publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

Protocol registration: PROSPERO- CRD42016045421

Keywords: Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Transient cardiovascular episodes during or after dental interventions are negative outcomes in dentistry, which generate uncertainties regarding the use of LAs combined with vasoconstrictors. Estimating the risk rate of such episodes in patients with cardiovascular diseases may contribute to an adequate use of LAs in such patients.
- The use of GRADE will evaluate the strength and quality of evidence body on the effect estimate for each of the outcomes, including the independent analysis of bias risk, accuracy, consistency, publication bias, and indirect evidence.
- This review method includes explicit eligibility criteria, comprehensive and extensive database research, and independent assessment of quality and eligibility of studies by a pair of reviewers.
- Quality of the primary studies to be included in this review may be a limiting factor owing to each study design and measures of outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) are the primary cause of death worldwide. It is estimated that 17.5 million people died from CVD in 2012, representing 31% of all deaths worldwide. Over three-fourths of deaths from CVD were reported in low- or middle-income countries.¹ In Brazil, CVD mortality accounted for one-third of all causes of deaths in 2002.² CVD comprises arterial hypertension, rheumatic heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, heart inflammatory diseases, and so on.³

In dentistry, attending patients with CVD should be differentiated to minimize the stress associated with completion of dental procedures. Besides lowering anxiety, pain control is fundamental to minimize transient episodes that may trigger negative cardiovascular outcomes, primarily in such patients.⁴

1
2
3 Anxiety and pain control techniques in dentistry may be psychological
4 as well as pharmacological. Psychological techniques may involve not only
5 simple relaxing techniques used in anxious patients but also understanding
6 behavior for pain control. Pharmacological techniques comprise drugs such
7 as local anesthetics (LAs), sedatives, and pain killers.⁵

8
9
10
11 Local anesthesia is the basis for pain control in dentistry. There is a
12 long history of safe use of LAs, not only in healthy patients but also in patients
13 with complex medical situations.^{5,6}

14
15
16 Clinical anesthetic agents are combined with vasoconstrictors to
17 increase the duration of anesthetic effect, to reduce systemic toxicity, and to
18 optimize soft tissue hemostasis.^{7,8}

19
20
21 Despite the beneficial properties of vasoconstrictors, there is some
22 concern regarding the systemic absorption and induction of adverse cardiac
23 effects, primarily in patients with CVD;^{9,10} on the other hand, deficiency in pain
24 control, stress, fear, and anxiety during dental treatment are responsible for
25 systematic endogenous release of catecholamines, which may lead to
26 autonomic responses such as arrhythmias.^{5,8,11} Endogenously released
27 epinephrine may reach higher concentrations than that used in dental
28 LAs.^{5,12,13}

29
30
31 However, the occurrence of most alterations may be attributed to
32 inappropriate applications such as injections of high doses, intravascular
33 accidental application, and drug interactions.^{4,8,14,15}

34
35
36 Certain studies have shown that most complications that arise while
37 using LA with vasoconstrictors are clinically insignificant arrhythmias and that
38 the use of the anesthetic agent lidocaine associated with epinephrine in the
39 recommended dosage seems to be relatively safe for CVD patients.¹¹
40 However, certain studies have advised against or limit the use of
41 vasoconstrictors in certain CVDs, which brings uncertainties in their use.¹⁵

42
43
44 Scientific evidence demonstrating safe use of LAs combined with
45 vasoconstrictors in CVD patients is scarce and contradictory.^{10,15} Thus, this
46 systematic review was aimed to determine the risk of cardiovascular events in
47 using Las combined with vasoconstrictors in CVD patients, both during and
48 immediately after dental procedures.

METHODS AND ANALYSES

The systematic review will be performed according to the recommendations specified in the Cochrane Handbook for Interventional Reviews and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-P) statement.¹⁶

Protocol and Registration

Our review protocol is registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO-CRD42016045421).

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria

Patients: adult CVD patients: arterial hypertension, rheumatic heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, and heart inflammatory diseases³

Interventions: one arm wherein patients received LAs with vasoconstrictor compared to an arm wherein patients received LAs without vasoconstrictor

Procedures: patients who undergo tooth extraction, dental restorations, treatment and periodontal surgery, implants, oral surgery, root canal treatments, and prosthetic procedures

Type of study: randomized clinical studies (RCTs): we will include two types of RCT designs. In the first type, the same patients are randomized to receive either LA with vasoconstrictors during the first dental procedure and LA without vasoconstrictor during the second dental procedure or vice versa. In the second design type, patients are randomized to receive only one type of LA, with or without vasoconstrictor, during the dental procedure.

Language: Any language

Outcomes: The investigations are to report at least one of the following outcomes: death, mortality by specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety, adverse effects, blood pressure changes, changes in heart rate, anxiety, and changes in oximetry.

Primary outcomes:

- death;
- mortality by specific cause swelling;
- stroke;
- acute myocardial infarction;
- hospitalization;
- pain;
- bleeding;

Secondary outcomes:

- arrhythmias;
- ischemic episodes;
- anxiety;
- adverse effects;
- blood pressure changes;
- changes in heart rate;
- changes in oximetry;

Exclusion criteria

We will exclude patients with untreated or out-of-control arterial hypertension, patients who are pregnant or breastfeeding, who are allergic to the LAs used in the studies, with out-of-control diabetes mellitus, or who have had recent myocardial infarction, cancer, and malignant hypertension.

Search methods for primary studies**Electronic searches**

We will search following electronic databases: the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) part of The Cochrane Library; MEDLINE (Ovid); EMBASE (Ovid); Healthstar (Ovid); CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature); and Web of Science, without status of publication restrictions.

Searching other resources

We will search in registration of clinical trials: <https://clinicaltrials.gov>; <http://www.ensaiosclinicos.gov.br>; trials registry and bank of Brazil thesis (CAPES); Brazilian universities database, such as: http://buscaintegrada.usp.br/primo_library/libweb/action/search.do?dsct=1&dstmp=1459264122962&vid=USP&fromLogin=true; conference proceedings of the Brazilian Congress of Cardiology, in the Brazilian Congress of Anesthesiology, and in the International Congress of Dentistry (CIOSP).

We will also search the main LA production companies in Brazil.

Two reviewers will analyze the reference list or quotations found in secondary studies to verify and identify possibly eligible studies. Whenever necessary, the authors of the main studies will be contacted to obtain additional information.

Search strategy

The search strategy will be conducted individually by: (1) type of dental intervention; (2) type of anesthetic; and (3) type of CVD. We have adapted the search strategy according to each database. The search strategy in Ovid Medline is in Appendix 1.

Eligibility determination

Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, RLM, and NKA) working in pairs will independently evaluate whether summaries are in accordance with eligibility criteria. Discrepancies are to be resolved by consensus among all the reviewers. Kappa test will be used to assess selection agreement, given that Kappa values between 0.40 and 0.59 are to be regarded as a weak agreement; values between 0.60 and 0.70 as intermediary agreement; and 0.75 or larger as excellent agreement.¹⁷

In order to exclude duplicate articles, reviewers will analyze all eligible articles and identify those with one or more authors in common. In case of duplicate publications, we will use the article with more complete data.

Data extraction

1
2
3 Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, JOA, and JCR), working in pairs, will
4 independently extract data and record information regarding patients,
5 methods, intervention, outcomes, and missing outcome data by using
6 standardized and pretested data extraction forms with instructions. Before
7 initiating data abstraction, we will conduct calibration exercises to ensure
8 consistency between reviewers. We will contact the study authors to resolve
9 any uncertainties. Disagreements will be resolved by consensus with any
10 unresolved issues referred to another reviewer.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Risk of bias in individual studies**

19 By using a modified version of the Cochrane collaboration risk of bias
20 tool,^{18,19} the same pairs of reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias
21 for each RCT according to the following criteria: random sequence; allocation
22 concealment; blinding of the patient, healthcare professionals, outcome
23 assessors, data collectors, and data analysts; incomplete outcome data;
24 selective outcome reporting; and major baseline imbalance. Reviewers will
25 assign response options of “definitely yes,” “probably yes,” “probably no,” and
26 “definitely no” for each of the domains, with “definitely yes” and “probably yes”
27 ultimately being assigned a low risk of bias and “definitely no” and “probably
28 no” a high risk of bias.²⁰ Reviewers will resolve disagreements by discussion,
29 and one arbitrator will adjudicate unresolved disagreements.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Explaining the heterogeneity of evidence**

41 Possible explanations for the heterogeneity will include: (a) age- the
42 older the age, the bigger the risk of cardiovascular transient episodes; (b)
43 gender- women outnumber men in deaths due to CVD; (c) type of
44 vasoconstrictor agents- vasoconstrictors link to receptors α and β . However,
45 some of these are more often linked to cardiac receptor β (except for
46 felypressin, which links to vasopressin receptors v1, present in the smooth
47 muscles of blood vessel walls), raise cardiac frequency, and thus, greater
48 risks of transient episodes are expected; (d) vasoconstrictor concentration-
49 which may vary from a 1:2,500 to a 1:200,000 greater risk is expected with
50 higher vasoconstrictor concentration; (e) dental procedure duration- the longer
51 the duration to perform the procedure (surgical or periodontal take longer than
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 restorative), the more anesthetic agent is necessary, and the stronger the
4 toxicity for the cardiovascular system, increasing the risks of transient
5 episodes in long-duration procedures; (f) type of dental procedure—usually
6 surgical procedures (periodontal, extraction, and implant) trigger greater
7 stress in the patient, thus increasing the risk of transient episodes, as
8 expected.
9

10
11
12 We ranked heterogeneity associated with pooled effect estimates with
13 the use of a χ^2 test and the I^2 statistic.²¹ The following heterogeneity was
14 considered: 0–25% (low heterogeneity); 50% (moderate heterogeneity); and
15 75% (high heterogeneity).¹⁹
16
17
18
19

20 21 **Data synthesis**

22 We will conduct analyses for each LA intervention and pool these for
23 each outcome of interest. We will determine the confidence in estimates for
24 each body of evidence and conduct an analysis for the body of evidence that
25 warrants greater confidence. Hypotheses, information for which has been
26 documented in at least 10 studies for independent continuous variables or in
27 at least 5 studies for independent categorical variables, will be examined.
28

29 The combined analyses will estimate risks of negative cardiovascular
30 outcomes as well as adverse effects in the use of LAs with and without
31 vasoconstrictors in CVD patients.
32

33 Meta-analyses will be conducted using comprehensive meta-analysis
34 STATA software (version 14.1). We will use random-effects meta-analyses,¹⁷
35 which are conservative in that they consider within- and between-study
36 differences in calculating the error term used in the analysis. For trials that
37 report dichotomous outcomes, we will calculate the pooled relative risk with
38 associated 95% confidence interval (CI).
39

40 For continuous outcomes such as pain and function score, we will use
41 weighted mean differences (WMDs) and its 95% CI as effect measure. Once
42 the WMD has been calculated, we will contextualize this value by noting,
43 when available, the corresponding anchor-based minimally important
44 difference (MID). The smallest change in instrument score that patients
45 perceive is important.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 If studies report the same construct using different measurement
4 instruments, we will calculate the standardized mean difference (SMD) as
5 sensitivity analysis. SMD expresses the intervention effect in standard
6 deviation (SD) units rather than the original units of measurement, with the
7 value of an SMD depending on the size of the effect (difference between
8 means) and the SD of the outcomes (inherent variability among participants).
9 For outcome measures that have an established anchor-based MID, we will
10 use this measure to convert the SMD into an odds ratio and risk difference.²²
11

12 To facilitate the interpretation of the effects of continuous outcomes, we
13 will substitute the MID, when MID is available for different scales, with the SD
14 (denominator) in the SMD equation, which will result in more readily
15 interpretable MID units instead of SD units.²³ If an estimate of the MID is not
16 available, we will use a statistical approach developed by Suissa²⁴ to provide
17 a summary estimate of the proportion of patients who benefit from treatment
18 across all studies. Statistical approaches to enhance the interpretability of
19 results of continuous outcomes outlined in this paragraph will use methods
20 cited as well as those described by Thorlund et al.²⁵ Funnel plots will be
21 created to explore possible publication bias when at least 10 studies have
22 contributed to a pooled analysis.
23

24 The combined estimates will be tested by statistics Z and
25 heterogeneity, measured using chi-statistic among the studies analyzed using
26 chi-squared test. When heterogeneity is present, a variance component
27 because of inter-study variance, it will be incorporated in the calculation of the
28 CI for the estimate. Studies that do not contain any of the aforementioned
29 data will not be included in the pooled estimate; for such studies, we will
30 summarize death, mortality by specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial
31 infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes,
32 anxiety, adverse effects, blood pressure changes, changes in heart rate,
33 anxiety, and changes in oximetry.
34

35 We will use recently developed approaches to address missing
36 participant data for dichotomous outcomes²⁶ and continuous outcomes.²⁷ We
37 will only apply these approaches to outcomes that meet the following criteria:
38 show a significant treatment effect and report sufficient missing participant
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2
3 data to potentially introduce clinically important bias. Thresholds for important
4 missing participant data will be determined on an outcome-by-outcome basis.

5
6 If the meta-analysis is not appropriate owing to excessive
7
8 heterogeneity of the study population, intervention, comparator, outcome, or
9
10 methodology, we will construct summary tables and provide a narrative
11
12 synthesis.

13 14 **Summarizing evidence**

15
16 The quality of the evidences will be independently evaluated
17
18 (confidence in effect estimates) for each of the results by using GRADE.¹⁷

19
20 Results will be presented in evidence profiles, as recommended by
21
22 GRADE Working Group.²⁸⁻²⁹

23
24 Evidence profiles will provide brief presentations of evidence quality
25
26 and effect magnitude. With the help of the software program GRADEpro
27
28 (<http://ims.cochrane.org/grade>), we will construct the evidence profile to
29
30 include following: (1) a list featuring up to seven important results (desirable
31
32 and undesirable); (2) a measure of the typical load of such results (e.g.,
33
34 control group or estimated risk); (3) a measure of the difference between risks
35
36 with and without intervention; (4) the relative magnitude of the effect; (5)
37
38 number of participants and studies that address these outcomes, as well as
39
40 the follow-up time; (6) an overall assessment of confidence in the effect
41
42 estimate for each outcome; and (7) comments, which will include DMI, if
43
44 available.

45
46 In the GRADE approach, randomized studies start with high-quality
47
48 evidence, but they may be assessed as low-quality evidence by one or more
49
50 of the five restriction categories: independent assessment of risk of bias,
51
52 precision, consistency, directness, and publication bias.

53 54 **Discussion**

55
56 Our review will evaluate cardiovascular risks and adverse effects of the
57
58 use of LA with vasoconstrictors compared with LA without vasoconstrictors in
59
60 CVD patients. This will provide estimates for safe use and quality of evidence
body in complete and consistent form by using GRADE.^{28,30} We will prioritize
important outcomes for the patient. The result of this systematic review will be

1
2
3 relevant to dentists and physicians for prescription and use of LAs in CVD
4 patients. Our aim is to inform medical professionals and dentists on the best
5 estimate of the effects and reliability of the estimates for safe use of LAs with
6 and without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD and identify key areas for
7 future research.
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Abbreviations**

14 Local anesthetic (LA), cardiovascular disease (CVD), Cochrane Central
15 Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Cumulative Index to Nursing and
16 Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
17 Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), randomized clinical trial (RCT), bank
18 of Brazil thesis (CAPES), Congresso Internacional de Odontologia de São
19 Paulo (CIOSP), confidence interval (CI), weighted mean difference (WMD),
20 minimally important difference (MID), and standardized mean difference
21 (SMD), standard deviation (SD).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 30 **Competing interests**

31 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
32
33

34 35 **Funding**

36 This project received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
37 public or commercial; the authors fund this project.
38
39

40 41 42 **Contributors**

43 CCG is the principal investigator and led the writing of the manuscript.
44 LCL and RLM are the project managers, co-investigators and contributed to
45 the writing and revision of the manuscript. CCB, JCR, JOA, NKA, and MFF
46 co-investigators contributed to the writing and revision of the manuscript. All
47 authors read and approved the final manuscript.
48
49
50

51 52 53 **Provenance and peer review**

54 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
55
56

57 58 **References**

1. (WHO) WHO. Global status report on noncommunicable disease, 2014.
2. Ministerio da Saude SE, DATASUS. Morbidade informações epidemiológicas, 2011.
3. Different heart diseases. 2016. World Heart Federation.
4. Jowett NI, Cabot LB. Patients with cardiac disease: considerations for the dental practitioner. *British dental journal* 2000;**189**(6):297-302.
5. American Dental Association A. Guideline for teaching pain control and sedation to dentist and dental students. 2012:1-18.
6. Budenz AW. Local anesthetics and medically complex patients. *Journal of the California Dental Association* 2000;**28**(8):611-9.
7. Haas DA. An update on local anesthetics in dentistry. *Journal (Canadian Dental Association)* 2002;**68**(9):546-51.
8. SF M. Pharmacology of Vasoconstrictors. *Hand-book of Local Anesthesia* 6 th ed, 2013:89-93.
9. Becker DE, Reed KL. Essentials of local anesthetic pharmacology. *Anesthesia progress* 2006;**53**(3):98-108; quiz 09-10.
10. Bader JD, Bonito AJ, Shugars DA. A systematic review of cardiovascular effects of epinephrine on hypertensive dental patients. *Oral surgery, oral medicine, oral pathology, oral radiology, and endodontics* 2002;**93**(6):647-53.
11. Godzieba A, Smektala T, Jedrzejewski M, et al. Clinical assessment of the safe use local anaesthesia with vasoconstrictor agents in cardiovascular compromised patients: a systematic review. *Medical science monitor : international medical journal of experimental and clinical research* 2014;**20**:393-8.
12. Meyer FU. Haemodynamic changes under emotional stress following a minor surgical procedure under local anaesthesia. *International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery* 1987;**16**(6):688-94.
13. Brand HS, Gortzak RA, Palmer-Bouva CC, et al. Cardiovascular and neuroendocrine responses during acute stress induced by different types of dental treatment. *International dental journal* 1995;**45**(1):45-8.
14. Fencil JL. Guideline implementation: local anesthesia. *AORN journal* 2015;**101**(6):682-9; quiz 90-2.
15. Perusse R, Goulet JP, Turcotte JY. Contraindications to vasoconstrictors in dentistry: Part I. Cardiovascular diseases. *Oral surgery, oral medicine, and oral pathology* 1992;**74**(5):679-86.
16. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2015;**349**:g7647.
17. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2011;**64**(12):1294-302.
18. Altman R, Alarcon G, Appelrouth D, et al. The American College of Rheumatology criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis of the hand. *Arthritis and rheumatism* 1990;**33**(11):1601-10.
19. Higgins JPT GS. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.

20. Akl EA, Sun X, Busse JW, et al. Specific instructions for estimating unclearly reported blinding status in randomized trials were reliable and valid. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2012;**65**(3):262-7.
21. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine* 2002;**21**(11):1539-58.
22. Busse JW, Bartlett SJ, Dougados M, et al. Optimal Strategies for Reporting Pain in Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: Recommendations from an OMERACT 12 Workshop. *The Journal of rheumatology* 2015.
23. Johnston BC, Thorlund K, Schunemann HJ, et al. Improving the interpretation of quality of life evidence in meta-analyses: the application of minimal important difference units. *Health and quality of life outcomes* 2010;**8**:116.
24. Suissa S, Shuster JJ. The 2 x 2 matched-pairs trial: exact unconditional design and analysis. *Biometrics* 1991;**47**(2):361-72.
25. Thorlund K, Walter SD, Johnston BC, et al. Pooling health-related quality of life outcomes in meta-analysis-a tutorial and review of methods for enhancing interpretability. *Research synthesis methods* 2011;**2**(3):188-203.
26. Akl EA, Johnston BC, Alonso-Coello P, et al. Addressing dichotomous data for participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic reviewers. *PloS one* 2013;**8**(2):e57132.
27. Ebrahim S, Akl EA, Mustafa RA, et al. Addressing continuous data for participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic reviewers. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013;**66**(9):1014-21.e1.
28. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013;**66**(2):158-72.
29. Guyatt GH, Thorlund K, Oxman AD, et al. GRADE guidelines: 13. Preparing summary of findings tables and evidence profiles-continuous outcomes. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013;**66**(2):173-83.
30. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2008;**336**(7652):1049-51.

APPENDIX 1 -Search strategy (Via Ovid, MEDLINE)

- 1 exp Dentistry/ (357819)
- 2 exp Dentistry, Operative/ (32163)
- 3 exp Dental Care/ (29438)
- 4 Dental Restoration, Permanent/ (18759)
- 5 Dental Restoration Repair/ (102)
- 6 Periodontal Debridement/ (191)
- 7 Subgingival Curettage/ (977)
- 8 Dental Scaling/ (3316)
- 9 Chronic Periodontitis/ (1971)
- 10 Periodontal Diseases/ (24137)

- 1
2
3 11 Periodontal Surgery.mp. (1302)
4 12 Periodontal treatment.mp. (2728)
5 13 Oral Surgical Procedures/ (5363)
6 14 exp Surgery, Oral/ (7419)
7 15 Tooth Extraction/ (17008)
8 16 Dental Prosthesis/ (3384)
9 17 "Root Canal Therapy"/ (11735)
10 18 exp Dental Implants/ (17311)
11 19 Dental Implants, Single Tooth/ (1901)
12 20 Dental Implantation/ (3773)
13
14 21 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR
15 13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19 OR 20 (372164)
16
17 22 exp Anesthetics, Local/ (96504)
18 23 exp Anesthesia, Local/ (15673)
19 24 exp Anesthesia, Dental/ (10417)
20 25 Lidocaine/ (22512)
21 26 Prilocaine/ (2018)
22 27 Bupivacaine/ (10713)
23 28 Procaine/ (11313)
24 29 Mepivacaine/ (1899)
25 30 Carticaine/ (451)
26 31 Etidocaine/ (288)
27
28 32 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31
29 (114729)
30
31 33 exp Cardiovascular Diseases/ (2067079)
32 34 Cardiac.mp. (631932)
33 35 Coronary Disease/ (128393)
34 36 Coronary Artery Disease/ (47503)
35 37 Coronary arteriosclerosis.mp. (733)
36 38 Coronariopathy.mp. (29)
37 39 Arrhythmias, cardiac/ (56112)
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 40 Heart Valve Diseases/ (21116)

4 41 Heart Diseases/ (63528)

5 42 Heart Failure/ (63528)

6 43 Rheumatic Heart Disease/ (12263)

7 44 Myocardial Ischemia/ (34898)

8 45 Myocardial Infarction/ (151398)

9 46 Hypertension (210548)

10 47 Hypertensive Patients.mp. (25167)

11
12 48 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43
13 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 (2314784)

14
15 49 21 AND 32 AND 48 (752)

PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|-----------------------------------|----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Title | | | | | |
| Identification | 1a | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1 |
| Update | 1b | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Registration | 2 | If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 3 |
| Authors | | | | | |
| Contact | 3a | Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1,2 |
| Contributions | 3b | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Amendments | 4 | If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Support | | | | | |
| Sources | 5a | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Sponsor | 5b | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
| Rationale | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 4,5 |
| Objectives | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|---|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | | | |
| METHODS | | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 8 | Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Information sources | 9 | Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 7,8 |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 8 |
| STUDY RECORDS | | | | | |
| Data management | 11a | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10,11 |
| Selection process | 11b | State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data collection process | 11c | Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data items | 12 | List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10 |
| Outcomes and prioritization | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6,7 |
| Risk of bias in individual studies | 14 | Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,12 |
| DATA | | | | | |
| Synthesis | 15a | Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11 |
| | 15b | If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11,12 |
| | 15c | Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta- | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 11,12 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|--|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | regression) | | | |
| | 15d | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |
| Meta-bias(es) | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Confidence in cumulative evidence | 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |

peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

BMJ Open

Local anesthetics combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with cardiovascular disease undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2016-014611.R1 |
| Article Type: | Protocol |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 20-Apr-2017 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Guimaraes, Caio; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Motta, Rogério; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Bergamaschi, Cristiane; University of Sorocaba, Pharmaceutical Science Araújo, Jimmy; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics de Andrade, Natalia Karol; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Figueiró, Mabel; Hospital do Coracao Ramacciato, Juliana ; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Lopes, Luciane; UNISO, Pharmacie Science |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Dentistry and oral medicine |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Anaesthesia, Evidence based practice, Pharmacology and therapeutics |
| Keywords: | Local anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Local anesthetics combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with cardiovascular disease undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Short title: Local anesthesia in dental patients with cardiovascular disease

Authors:

Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS*

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

Rogério Heládio Lopes Motta, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
rogerio.motta@slmandic.com.br

Cristiane de Cássia Bergamasch, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Sorocaba, Brazil
cristiane.motta@prof.uniso.br

Jimmy de oliveira Araújo, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
Jimmy_dental@hotmail.com

Natalia Karol de Andrade, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
karol.andrade.odonto@hotmail.com

Mabel Fernandes Figueiró

Librarian, Research Institute, Heart Hospital, São Paulo, Brazil
Mfigueiro@hcor.com.br

Juliana Cama Ramacciato, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Dental
School and Research Center, Brazil
Juliana.ramacciato@slmandic.com.br

Luciane Cruz Lopes, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Brazil
Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de
Mesquita Filho, Araraquara, Brazil
luslopes@terra.com.br

No conflict of interest**Word count:** 2764**Number of references:** 28**Keywords:** Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular
Disease***Corresponding author:****Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS- Corresponding author**

São Leopoldo Mandic University, Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil
Address: Rua Dr. José rocha Junqueira, 13, Swift,
(55)67984535056
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The use of vasoconstrictors combined with local anesthetics (LAs) in dentistry for patients with cardiovascular disease (CVD) is still controversial in the scientific literature. It raises concerns regarding the possibility of transient episodes, triggering negative cardiovascular outcomes.

Method/Design: Trials eligible for our systematic review will enroll patients with CVD who have undergone dental treatments that demand the use of LAs by comparing two arms: LAs with vasoconstrictors and LAs without vasoconstrictors. The research will be conducted in the electronic databases Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), MEDLINE, EMBASE, Healthstar (via Ovid), CINAHL, and Web of Science, without any restrictions in terms of language and status of publication. A team of reviewers will independently assess titles, abstracts, and complete text to determine eligibility. For eligible studies, the same reviewers will perform data extraction and evaluate the risk of bias in the selected articles. The selected outcomes comprise death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety, adverse effects, changes in blood pressure, changes in heart rate, anxiety, and results obtained via oximetry. Whenever possible, we will conduct a meta-analysis to establish the effects of LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in the patients with CVD, and the overall quality of evidence for each outcomes will be determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) classification system.

Ethics and Dissemination: Ethics committee approval was not necessary because this is a protocol of systematic review. This systematic review will be submitted for presentation at conferences and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Our review will assess the risks of cardiovascular events when using LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, focusing on important clinical outcomes.

Protocol registration: PROSPERO- CRD42016045421

Keywords: Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Transient cardiovascular episodes during or after dental interventions are negative outcomes in dentistry, which generate uncertainties regarding the use of LAs combined with vasoconstrictors. Estimating the risk of such episodes in patients with CVD may contribute to an adequate use of LAs in such patients.
- The use of GRADE will evaluate the strength and quality of evidence body on the effect estimate for each outcomes, including the independent analysis of bias risk, accuracy, consistency, publication bias, and indirect evidence.
- This review method includes explicit eligibility criteria, a comprehensive and extensive database research, and an independent assessment of the quality and eligibility of studies by a pair of reviewers.
- The quality of the primary studies to be included in this review may be a limiting factor owing to each study design and outcome measures.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the primary cause of death worldwide. It is estimated that 17.5 million people died from CVD in 2012, representing 31% of all deaths worldwide. Over three-fourths of deaths from CVD have been reported in low- or middle-income countries.¹ In Brazil, CVD mortality accounted for one-third of all causes of deaths in 2002.² CVD comprises arterial hypertension, rheumatic heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, heart inflammatory diseases, and so on.³

In dentistry, attending patients with CVD should be differentiated to minimize the stress associated with the completion of dental procedures. Besides lowering anxiety, pain control is fundamental to minimize transient episodes that may trigger negative cardiovascular outcomes, primarily in such patients.⁴

Anxiety and pain control techniques in dentistry may be psychological as well as pharmacological. Psychological techniques may involve not only

1
2
3 simple relaxing techniques used in anxious patients but also understanding
4 the behavior regarding pain control. Pharmacological techniques comprise
5 drugs such as local anesthetics (LAs), sedatives, and pain killers.⁵
6
7

8 Local anesthesia is the basis for pain control in dentistry. There is a
9 long history of the safe use of LAs, not only in healthy patients but also in
10 patients with complex medical situations.^{5,6}
11
12

13 Clinical anesthetic agents are combined with vasoconstrictors to
14 increase the duration of the anesthetic effect, reduce systemic toxicity, and
15 optimize soft tissue hemostasis.^{7,8}
16
17

18 Despite the beneficial properties of vasoconstrictors, there is some
19 concern regarding systemic absorption and the induction of adverse cardiac
20 effects, primarily in patients with CVD;⁹ However, pain, stress, fear, and
21 anxiety during dental treatment caused by lack in the anesthesia are
22 responsible for the systematic endogenous release of catecholamines, which
23 may lead to autonomic responses such as arrhythmias.^{5,8,10} Endogenously
24 released epinephrine may reach higher concentrations than concentrations of
25 epinephrine released using dental LAs.^{5,11,12}
26
27
28
29
30

31 Nevertheless, the occurrence of most alterations may be attributed to
32 inappropriate applications such as high-dose injections, intravascular
33 accidental applications, and drug interactions.^{4,8,13}
34
35

36 A systematic review has shown that most complications that arise while
37 using LAs with vasoconstrictors are clinically insignificant arrhythmias and that
38 the use of the anesthetic agent lidocaine associated with epinephrine in the
39 recommended dosage seems to be relatively safe for patients with CVD.¹⁰
40 However, putative standards and guidelines continue to present and advise
41 against or limit the use of vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, which brings
42 uncertainties in their use.⁹
43
44
45
46
47

48 Scientific evidence demonstrating the safe use of LAs combined with
49 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD is scarce and contradictory. Thus, this
50 systematic review was aimed to determine the risk of cardiovascular events
51 when using LAs combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, both
52 during and immediately after dental procedures.
53
54
55
56
57

58 **METHODS AND ANALYSES**

59
60

1
2
3 The systematic review will be performed according to the
4 recommendations specified in the Cochrane Handbook for Interventional
5 Reviews and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
6 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-P) statement.¹⁴
7
8
9

10 11 **Protocol and Registration**

12 Our review protocol is registered with the International Prospective
13 Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO-CRD42016045421).
14
15
16

17 18 **Eligibility criteria**

19 ***Inclusion criteria***

20
21 **Patients:** adult patients with CVD: arterial hypertension, rheumatic
22 heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, and heart
23 inflammatory diseases.³
24
25

26 **Interventions:** one arm wherein patients received LAs with
27 vasoconstrictors compared to another arm wherein patients received LAs
28 without vasoconstrictors.
29
30

31 **Procedures:** patients who undergo tooth extraction, dental
32 restorations, treatment and periodontal surgery, implantation, oral surgery,
33 root canal treatments, and prosthetic procedures.
34
35

36 **Type of study:** randomized controlled studies (RCTs): we will include
37 two types of RCT designs. In the first type, patients are randomized to receive
38 either LAs with vasoconstrictors during the first dental procedure and LAs
39 without vasoconstrictors during the second dental procedure or vice versa. In
40 the second type, patients are randomized to receive only one type of LA, with
41 or without vasoconstrictors, during the dental procedure.
42
43
44
45

46 **Language:** any language
47

48 **Outcomes:** The investigations are to report at least one of the
49 following outcomes: death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute
50 myocardial infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic
51 episodes, anxiety, adverse effects, anxiety, changes in blood pressure,
52 changes in heart rate, and changes in results obtained via oximetry.
53
54
55

56 **Primary outcomes:**

- 57 • death;
- 58
- 59
- 60

- mortality by a specific cause;
- stroke;
- acute myocardial infarction;
- hospitalization;
- pain;
- bleeding;

Secondary outcomes:

- arrhythmias;
- ischemic episodes;
- anxiety;
- adverse effects;
- changes in blood pressure;
- changes in heart rate;
- changes in results obtained via oximetry;

Exclusion criteria

We will exclude studies involving patients with untreated or out-of-control arterial hypertension, who are pregnant or breastfeeding, who are allergic to the LAs used in the studies, with out-of-control diabetes mellitus, or who have had recent myocardial infarction, cancer, and malignant hypertension.

Search methods for primary studies

Electronic searches

We will search the following electronic databases: the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) part of The Cochrane Library; MEDLINE (Ovid); EMBASE (Ovid); Healthstar (Ovid); CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature); and Web of Science, without restrictions on the status of publication.

Searching other resources

We will search in registration of clinical trials: <https://clinicaltrials.gov>, WHO clinical trials registry, <http://www.ensaiosclinicos.gov.br>; trials registry

1
2
3 and bank of Brazil thesis (CAPES); conference proceedings of the Brazilian
4 Congress of Cardiology, in the Brazilian Congress of Anesthesiology, and in
5 the International Congress of Dentistry (CIOSP).
6
7

8 We will also search the main LA production companies in Brazil.

9
10 Two reviewers will analyze the reference list or quotations found in secondary
11 studies to verify and identify possible eligible studies. Whenever necessary,
12 the authors of the main studies will be contacted to obtain additional
13 information.
14
15

16 17 18 **Search strategy**

19 The search strategy will be individually conducted by: (1) type of dental
20 intervention; (2) type of anesthetic; and (3) type of CVD. We have adapted the
21 search strategy according to each database. The search strategy in Ovid
22 Medline is in Appendix 1.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Eligibility determination**

29 Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, RLM, and NKA) working in pairs will
30 independently evaluate whether summaries are in accordance with eligibility
31 criteria. Discrepancies are to be resolved by a consensus reached among all
32 reviewers. Kappa test will be used to assess selection agreement, given that
33 Kappa values between 0.40 and 0.59 are to be regarded as a weak
34 agreement; values between 0.60 and 0.70 as intermediary agreement; and
35 0.75 or larger as excellent agreement.¹⁵
36
37

38 To exclude duplicate articles, reviewers will analyze all eligible articles
39 and identify those with one or more authors in common. In case of duplicate
40 publications, we will use the article with more complete data.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Data extraction**

49 Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, JOA, and JCR), working in pairs, will
50 independently extract data and record information regarding patients,
51 methods, interventions, outcomes, and missing outcome data using
52 standardized and pretested data extraction forms with instructions. Before
53 initiating data abstraction, we will conduct calibration exercises to ensure
54 consistency among the reviewers. We will contact the study authors to resolve
55
56
57
58
59
60

any uncertainties. Disagreements will be resolved by a consensus with any unresolved issues referred to another reviewer.

Risk of bias in individual studies

Using a modified version of the Cochrane collaboration risk of bias tool,^{16,17} the same pairs of reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias for each RCT according to the following criteria: random sequence; allocation concealment; blinding of the patient, healthcare professionals, outcome assessors, data collectors, and data analysts; incomplete outcome data; selective outcome reporting; and major baseline imbalance. Reviewers will assign response options of “definitely yes,” “probably yes,” “probably no,” and “definitely no” for each of the domains, with the options “definitely yes” and “probably yes” ultimately being assigned a low risk of bias and “definitely no” and “probably no” as having a high risk of bias.¹⁸ Reviewers will resolve disagreements by discussion, and one arbitrator will adjudicate unresolved disagreements.

Explaining the heterogeneity of evidence

Possible explanations for heterogeneity will include: (a) age- the older the age, the higher the risk of cardiovascular transient episodes; (b) gender- women outnumber men in deaths due to CVD; (c) vasoconstrictor type- vasoconstrictors are linked to receptors α and β . However, some of these are more often linked to cardiac receptor β (except for felypressin, which links to the vasopressin receptor $v1$, present in the smooth muscles of blood vessel walls), raise cardiac frequency, and thus, higher risks of transient episodes are expected; (d) vasoconstrictor concentration- which may vary from a 1:2,500 to a 1:200,000 greater risk is expected with higher vasoconstrictor concentration; (e) dental procedure duration- the longer the duration to perform the procedure (surgical or periodontal procedures take longer than restorative procedures), the higher the concentration of anesthetic agent necessary, and the stronger the toxicity to the cardiovascular system, thereby increasing the risks of transient episodes in long-duration procedures; (f) dental procedure type: usually surgical procedures (periodontal, extraction,

1
2
3 and implantation) trigger great stress in the patient, thus increasing the risk of
4 transient episodes.
5

6 We ranked heterogeneity associated with pooled effect estimates with
7 the use of the χ^2 test and the I^2 statistic.¹⁹ The following heterogeneities were
8 considered: 0–25% (low heterogeneity), 50% (moderate heterogeneity), and
9 75% (high heterogeneity).¹⁷
10
11
12
13

14 **Data synthesis**

15 We will conduct analyses for each LA intervention and pool these for
16 each outcome of interest. We will determine the confidence in estimates for
17 each body of evidence and conduct an analysis for the body of evidence that
18 warrants greater confidence. Hypotheses, information for which has been
19 documented in at least 10 studies for independent continuous variables or in
20 at least 5 studies for independent categorical variables, will be examined.
21
22
23
24
25

26 The combined analyses will estimate risks of negative cardiovascular
27 outcomes as well as adverse effects in the use of LAs with and without
28 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD.
29
30

31 We will conduct meta-analyses using comprehensive the meta-analysis
32 STATA software (version 14.1). We will use random-effects meta-analyses,¹⁵
33 which are conservative in that they consider within- and between-study
34 differences in calculating the error term used in the analysis. For trials that
35 report dichotomous outcomes, we will calculate the pooled relative risk with
36 associated 95% confidence interval (CI).
37
38
39
40

41 For continuous outcomes such as pain and function score, we will use
42 the weighted mean differences (WMD) and its 95% CI as an effect measure.
43 Once the WMD has been calculated, we will contextualize this value by
44 noting, when available, the corresponding anchor-based minimally important
45 difference (MID). The smallest change in instrument score that patients
46 perceive is important.
47
48
49
50

51 If studies report the same construct using different measurement
52 instruments, we will calculate the standardized mean difference (SMD) as
53 sensitivity analysis. SMD expresses the intervention effect in standard
54 deviation (SD) units rather than the original units of measurement, with the
55 value of an SMD depends on the size of the effect (difference between
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 means) and the SD of the outcomes (inherent variability among patients). For
4 outcome measures that have an established anchor-based MID, we will use
5 this measure to convert the SMD into an odds ratio and a risk difference.²⁰
6
7

8 To facilitate the interpretation of the effects of continuous outcomes, we
9 will substitute the MID, when it is available for different scales, with the SD
10 (denominator) in the SMD equation, which will result in more readily
11 interpretable MID units instead of SD units.²¹ If an estimate of the MID is
12 unavailable, we will use the statistical approach developed by Suissa²² to
13 provide a summary estimate of the proportion of patients who benefit from
14 treatment across all studies. Statistical approaches to enhance the
15 interpretability of the results of continuous outcomes outlined in this paragraph
16 will use methods cited as well as those described by Thorlund et al.²³ Funnel
17 plots will be created to explore a possible publication bias when at least 10
18 studies have contributed to the pooled analysis.
19
20

21 The combined estimates will be tested by statistics Z and
22 heterogeneity, measured using chi-statistic among the studies analyzed using
23 chi-squared test. When heterogeneity is present, a variance component
24 because of inter-study variance, it will be incorporated in the calculation of the
25 CI for the estimate. Studies that do not contain the aforementioned data will
26 not be included in the pooled estimate; for such studies, we will summarize
27 death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction,
28 hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety,
29 adverse effects, changes in blood pressure, changes in heart rate, anxiety,
30 and changes in results obtained via oximetry.
31
32

33 We will use recently developed approaches to address missing patient
34 data for dichotomous²⁴ and continuous outcomes.²⁵ We will only apply these
35 approaches to outcomes that meet the following criteria: show a significant
36 treatment effect and report sufficient missing patient data to potentially
37 introduce clinically important bias. Thresholds for important missing patient
38 data will be determined on an outcome-by-outcome basis.
39
40

41 If the meta-analysis is not appropriate owing to excessive
42 heterogeneity of the study population, intervention, comparator, outcome, or
43 methodology, we will construct summary tables and provide a narrative
44 synthesis.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Summarizing evidence

The quality of evidence will be independently evaluated (confidence in effect estimates) for each result using GRADE.¹⁵ Results will be presented in evidence profiles, as recommended by the GRADE Working Group.²⁶⁻²⁷

Evidence profiles will provide brief presentations of evidence quality and effect magnitude. With the help of the software program GRADEpro (<http://ims.cochrane.org/grade>), we will construct an evidence profile to include following: (1) a list featuring up to seven important results (desirable and undesirable), (2) a measure of the typical load of such results (e.g., control group or estimated risk), (3) a measure of the difference between risks with and without intervention, (4) the relative magnitude of the effect, (5) number of patient and studies that address these outcomes, as well as the follow-up time, (6) an overall assessment of confidence in the effect estimate for each outcome, and (7) comments, which will include DMI, if available.

In the GRADE approach, randomized studies start with high-quality evidence, but they may be assessed as low-quality evidence by one or more of the five restriction categories: independent assessment of risk of bias, precision, consistency, directness, and publication bias.

DISCUSSION

Our review will evaluate the cardiovascular risks and adverse effects of the use of LAs with vasoconstrictors compared with those of LAs without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD. This will provide estimates for the safe use of LAs and quality of evidence in complete and consistent form using GRADE.^{26,28} We will prioritize important outcomes for the patients. The result of this systematic review will be relevant to dentists and physicians for the prescription and use of LAs in patients with CVD. Our aim is to inform medical professionals and dentists on the best estimate of the effects and reliability of the estimates for the safe use of LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD and identify key areas for future research.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

1
2
3 Ethics approval is not required this is a protocol for a systematic
4 review. The systematic review will be published in a peer-reviewed journal
5 and presented at conferences. The evidence of this study will allow health
6 professionals to be aware of the safety of LA use with and without
7 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD.
8
9
10

11 12 13 **Contributors**

14 CCG is the principal investigator and led the writing of the manuscript.
15 LCL and RLM are the project managers, and co-investigators and contributed
16 to the writing and revision of the manuscript. CCB, JCR, JOA, NKA, and MFF
17 are co-investigators who contributed to the writing and revision of the
18 manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Competing interests**

25 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
26
27
28
29

30 **Funding**

31 This project received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
32 public or commercial; the authors funded this project.
33
34
35

36 **Provenance and peer review**

37 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
38
39
40

41 **Abbreviations**

42 Local anesthetic (LA), cardiovascular disease (CVD), Cochrane Central
43 Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Cumulative Index to Nursing and
44 Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
45 Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), randomized clinical trial (RCT), bank
46 of Brazil thesis (CAPES), Congresso Internacional de Odontologia de São
47 Paulo (CIOSP), confidence interval (CI), weighted mean difference (WMD),
48 minimally important difference (MID), and standardized mean difference
49 (SMD), standard deviation (SD).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. (WHO) WHO. Global status report on noncommunicable disease, 2014.
2. Ministerio da Saude SE, DATASUS. Morbidade informações epidemiológicas, 2011.
3. Different heart diseases. 2016. World Heart Federation.
4. Jowett NI, Cabot LB. Patients with cardiac disease: considerations for the dental practitioner. *British dental journal* 2000;**189**(6):297-302.
5. American Dental Association A. Guideline for teaching pain control and sedation to dentist and dental students. 2012:1-18.
6. Budenz AW. Local anesthetics and medically complex patients. *Journal of the California Dental Association* 2000;**28**(8):611-9.
7. Haas DA. An update on local anesthetics in dentistry. *Journal (Canadian Dental Association)* 2002;**68**(9):546-51.
8. SF M. Pharmacology of Vasoconstrictors. *Hand-book of Local Anesthesia* 6 th ed, 2013:89-93.
9. Becker DE, Reed KL. Essentials of local anesthetic pharmacology. *Anesthesia progress* 2006;**53**(3):98-108; quiz 09-10.
10. Godzieba A, Smektala T, Jedrzejewski M, et al. Clinical assessment of the safe use local anaesthesia with vasoconstrictor agents in cardiovascular compromised patients: a systematic review. *Medical science monitor : international medical journal of experimental and clinical research* 2014;**20**:393-8.
11. Meyer FU. Haemodynamic changes under emotional stress following a minor surgical procedure under local anaesthesia. *International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery* 1987;**16**(6):688-94.
12. Brand HS, Gortzak RA, Palmer-Bouva CC, et al. Cardiovascular and neuroendocrine responses during acute stress induced by different types of dental treatment. *International dental journal* 1995;**45**(1):45-8.
13. Fencil JL. Guideline implementation: local anesthesia. *AORN journal* 2015;**101**(6):682-9; quiz 90-2.
14. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2015;**349**:g7647.
15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2011;**64**(12):1294-302.
16. Altman R, Alarcon G, Appelrouth D, et al. The American College of Rheumatology criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis of the hand. *Arthritis and rheumatism* 1990;**33**(11):1601-10.
17. Higgins JPT GS. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.
18. Akl EA, Sun X, Busse JW, et al. Specific instructions for estimating unclearly reported blinding status in randomized trials were reliable and valid. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2012;**65**(3):262-7.
19. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine* 2002;**21**(11):1539-58.

- 1
2
3 20. Busse JW, Bartlett SJ, Dougados M, et al. Optimal Strategies for Reporting Pain
4 in Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: Recommendations from an
5 OMERACT 12 Workshop. *The Journal of rheumatology* 2015.
6
7 21. Johnston BC, Thorlund K, Schunemann HJ, et al. Improving the interpretation
8 of quality of life evidence in meta-analyses: the application of minimal
9 important difference units. *Health and quality of life outcomes*
10 2010;**8**:116.
11 22. Suissa S, Shuster JJ. The 2 x 2 matched-pairs trial: exact unconditional design
12 and analysis. *Biometrics* 1991;**47**(2):361-72.
13 23. Thorlund K, Walter SD, Johnston BC, et al. Pooling health-related quality of
14 life outcomes in meta-analysis-a tutorial and review of methods for
15 enhancing interpretability. *Research synthesis methods* 2011;**2**(3):188-
16 203.
17 24. Akl EA, Johnston BC, Alonso-Coello P, et al. Addressing dichotomous data for
18 participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic
19 reviewers. *PloS one* 2013;**8**(2):e57132.
20 25. Ebrahim S, Akl EA, Mustafa RA, et al. Addressing continuous data for
21 participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic
22 reviewers. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013;**66**(9):1014-21.e1.
23 26. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing
24 summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. *Journal of clinical*
25 *epidemiology* 2013;**66**(2):158-72.
26 27. Guyatt GH, Thorlund K, Oxman AD, et al. GRADE guidelines: 13. Preparing
27 summary of findings tables and evidence profiles-continuous outcomes.
28 *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013;**66**(2):173-83.
29 28. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. Going from evidence to
30 recommendations. *British medical journal (Clinical research ed)*
31 2008;**336**(7652):1049-51.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

APPENDIX 1 -Search strategy (Via Ovid, MEDLINE)

- 1 exp Dentistry/ (357819)
- 2 exp Dentistry, Operative/ (32163)
- 3 exp Dental Care/ (29438)
- 4 Dental Restoration, Permanent/ (18759)
- 5 Dental Restoration Repair/ (102)
- 6 Periodontal Debridement/ (191)
- 7 Subgingival Curettage/ (977)
- 8 Dental Scaling/ (3316)
- 9 Chronic Periodontitis/ (1971)
- 10 Periodontal Diseases/ (24137)
- 11 Periodontal Surgery.mp. (1302)
- 12 Periodontal treatment.mp. (2728)
- 13 Oral Surgical Procedures/ (5363)
- 14 exp Surgery, Oral/ (7419)
- 15 Tooth Extraction/ (17008)
- 16 Dental Prosthesis/ (3384)
- 17 "Root Canal Therapy"/ (11735)
- 18 exp Dental Implants/ (17311)
- 19 Dental Implants, Single Tooth/ (1901)
- 20 Dental Implantation/ (3773)

- 21 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR
13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19 OR 20 (372164)

- 22 exp Anesthetics, Local/ (96504)
- 23 exp Anesthesia, Local/ (15673)
- 24 exp Anesthesia, Dental/ (10417)
- 25 Lidocaine/ (22512)
- 26 Prilocaine/ (2018)
- 27 Bupivacaine/ (10713)
- 28 Procaine/ (11313)
- 29 Mepivacaine/ (1899)

1
2
3 30 Carticaine/ (451)
4

5 31 Etidocaine/ (288)
6
7

8 32 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31
9 (114729)
10

11
12 33 exp Cardiovascular Diseases/ (2067079)

13 34 Cardiac.mp. (631932)

14 35 Coronary Disease/ (128393)

15 36 Coronary Artery Disease/ (47503)

16 37 Coronary arteriosclerosis.mp. (733)

17 38 Coronariopathy.mp. (29)

18 39 Arrhythmias, cardiac/ (56112)

19 40 Heart Valve Diseases/ (21116)

20 41 Heart Diseases/ (63528)

21 42 Heart Failure/ (63528)

22 43 Rheumatic Heart Disease/ (12263)

23 44 Myocardial Ischemia/ (34898)

24 45 Myocardial Infarction/ (151398)

25 46 Hypertension (210548)

26 47 Hypertensive Patients.mp. (25167)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 48 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43
42 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 (2314784)
43
44

45
46 49 21 AND 32 AND 48 (752)
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|-----------------------------------|----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Title | | | | | |
| Identification | 1a | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1 |
| Update | 1b | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Registration | 2 | If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 3 |
| Authors | | | | | |
| Contact | 3a | Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1,2 |
| Contributions | 3b | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Amendments | 4 | If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Support | | | | | |
| Sources | 5a | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Sponsor | 5b | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
| Rationale | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 4,5 |
| Objectives | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|---|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | | | |
| METHODS | | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 8 | Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Information sources | 9 | Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 7,8 |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 8 |
| STUDY RECORDS | | | | | |
| Data management | 11a | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10,11 |
| Selection process | 11b | State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data collection process | 11c | Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data items | 12 | List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10 |
| Outcomes and prioritization | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6,7 |
| Risk of bias in individual studies | 14 | Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,12 |
| DATA | | | | | |
| Synthesis | 15a | Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11 |
| | 15b | If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11,12 |
| | 15c | Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta- | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 11,12 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|--|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | regression) | | | |
| | 15d | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |
| Meta-bias(es) | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Confidence in cumulative evidence | 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |

peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

BMJ Open

Local anesthetics combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with cardiovascular disease undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2016-014611.R2 |
| Article Type: | Protocol |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 30-May-2017 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Guimaraes, Caio; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Motta, Rogério; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Bergamaschi, Cristiane; University of Sorocaba, Pharmaceutical Science Araújo, Jimmy; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics de Andrade, Natalia Karol; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Figueiró, Mabel; Hospital do Coracao Ramacciato, Juliana ; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Lopes, Luciane; UNISO, Pharmacie Science |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Dentistry and oral medicine |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Anaesthesia, Evidence based practice, Pharmacology and therapeutics |
| Keywords: | Local anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Local anesthetics combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with cardiovascular disease undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Short title: Local anesthesia in dental patients with cardiovascular disease

Authors:

Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS*

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

Rogério Heládio Lopes Motta, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
rogerio.motta@slmandic.com.br

Cristiane de Cássia Bergamasch, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Sorocaba, Brazil
cristiane.motta@prof.uniso.br

Jimmy de oliveira Araújo, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
Jimmy_dental@hotmail.com

Natalia Karol de Andrade, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
karol.andrade.odonto@hotmail.com

Mabel Fernandes Figueiró

Librarian, Research Institute, Heart Hospital, São Paulo, Brazil
Mfigueiro@hcor.com.br

Juliana Cama Ramacciato, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Dental
School and Research Center, Brazil
Juliana.ramacciato@slmandic.com.br

Luciane Cruz Lopes, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Brazil
Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de
Mesquita Filho, Araraquara, Brazil
luslopes@terra.com.br

No conflict of interest**Word count:** 2799**Number of references:** 31**Keywords:** Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular
Disease***Corresponding author:****Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS- Corresponding author**

São Leopoldo Mandic University, Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil
Address: Rua Dr. José rocha Junqueira, 13, Swift,
(55)67984535056
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The use of vasoconstrictors combined with local anesthetics (LAs) in dentistry for patients with cardiovascular disease (CVD) is still controversial in the scientific literature. It raises concerns regarding the possibility of transient episodes, triggering negative cardiovascular outcomes.

Method/Design: Trials eligible for our systematic review will enroll patients with CVD who have undergone dental treatments carried out with the use of LAs by comparing two arms: LAs with vasoconstrictors and LAs without vasoconstrictors. The research will be conducted in the electronic databases Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), MEDLINE, EMBASE, Healthstar (via Ovid), CINAHL, and Web of Science, without any restrictions in terms of language and status of publication. A team of reviewers will independently assess titles, abstracts, and complete text to determine eligibility. For eligible studies, the same reviewers will perform data extraction and evaluate the risk of bias in the selected articles. The selected outcomes comprise death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety, adverse effects, changes in blood pressure, changes in heart rate, anxiety, and results obtained via oximetry. Whenever possible, we will conduct a meta-analysis to establish the effects of LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in the patients with CVD, and the overall quality of evidence for each outcome will be determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) classification system.

Ethics and Dissemination: Ethics committee approval was not necessary because this is a protocol of systematic review. This systematic review will be submitted for presentation at conferences and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Our review will assess the risks of cardiovascular events when using LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, focusing on important clinical outcomes.

Protocol registration: PROSPERO- CRD42016045421

Keywords: Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Transient cardiovascular episodes during or after dental interventions are negative outcomes in dentistry, which generate uncertainties regarding the use of LAs combined with vasoconstrictors. Estimation of the risk of such episodes in patients with CVD allows clinicians to determine which drug will minimize the risk of an adverse event.
- The use of GRADE will evaluate the strength and quality of evidence body on the effect estimate for each outcome, including the independent analysis of bias risk, accuracy, consistency, publication bias, and indirect evidence.
- This review method includes explicit eligibility criteria, a comprehensive and extensive database research, and an independent assessment of the quality and eligibility of studies by a pair of reviewers.
- The quality of the primary studies to be included in this review may be a limiting factor owing to each study design and outcome measures.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the primary cause of death worldwide. It is estimated that 17.5 million people died from CVD in 2012, representing 31% of all deaths worldwide. Over three-fourths of deaths from CVD have been reported in low- or middle-income countries.¹ In Brazil, CVD mortality accounted for one-third of all causes of deaths in 2002.² CVD comprises arterial hypertension, rheumatic heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, heart inflammatory diseases, and so on.³

In dentistry, clinical procedures in patients with CVD should be carefully assessed to minimize the stress associated with the completion of dental procedures. Besides lowering anxiety, pain control is fundamental to minimize transient episodes that may trigger negative cardiovascular outcomes, primarily in such patients.⁴

Anxiety and pain control techniques in dentistry may be psychological as well as pharmacological. Psychological techniques may involve not only

1
2
3 simple relaxing techniques used in anxious patients but also understanding
4 the behavior regarding pain control. Pharmacological techniques comprise
5 drugs such as local anesthetics (LAs), sedatives, and pain killers.⁵
6
7

8 Local anesthesia is the basis for pain control in dentistry. There is a
9 long history of the safe use of LAs, not only in healthy patients but also in
10 patients with complex medical situations.^{5,6}
11
12

13 Clinical anesthetic agents are combined with vasoconstrictors to
14 increase the duration of the anesthetic effect, reduce systemic toxicity, and
15 optimize soft tissue hemostasis.^{7,8}
16
17

18 Despite the beneficial properties of vasoconstrictors, there is some
19 concern regarding systemic consequences due to inadvertent intravascular
20 injection and the induction of adverse cardiovascular effects, primarily in
21 patients with CVD;^{9,10} In addition, pain, stress, fear, and anxiety during dental
22 treatment that are caused by lack of pain control and poor anesthesia may be
23 responsible for the systemic endogenous release of catecholamines,
24 particularly norepinephrine¹¹, which may lead to autonomic responses such
25 as hypertension and arrhythmias.^{5,8,12} A previous study reported that the
26 stress-induced release of catecholamines could be more than 10 times
27 greater than the basal level. In stressful situations, such as pain and anxiety,
28 the released of endogenous catecholamines may reach concentrations higher
29 than the low epinephrine concentrations used in dental LAs.^{5,13,14}
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Nevertheless, the occurrence of most alterations may be attributed to
39 inappropriate applications such as high-dose injections, intravascular
40 accidental injections, and drug interactions.^{4,8,15} Thereafter, endogenous or
41 exogenous catecholamines may cause or contribute to hemodynamic and
42 cardiac changes.¹⁶
43
44
45

46 A systematic review has shown that most complications that arise while
47 using LAs with vasoconstrictors are clinically insignificant arrhythmias and that
48 the use of the anesthetic agent lidocaine associated with epinephrine in the
49 recommended dosage seems to be relatively safe for patients with CVD.¹²
50 However, putative standards and guidelines continue to present and advise
51 against or limit the use of vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, which brings
52 uncertainties in their use.⁹
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Scientific evidence demonstrating the safe use of LAs combined with
4 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD is scarce and contradictory. Thus, this
5 systematic review was aimed to determine the risk of cardiovascular events
6 when using LAs combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, both
7 during and immediately after dental procedures.
8
9
10

11 12 13 **METHODS AND ANALYSES**

14 The systematic review will be performed according to the
15 recommendations specified in the Cochrane Handbook for Interventional
16 Reviews and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
17 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-P) statement.¹⁷
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Protocol and Registration**

24 Our review protocol is registered with the International Prospective
25 Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO-CRD42016045421).
26
27
28

29 **Eligibility criteria**

30 ***Inclusion criteria***

31 **Patients:** adult patients with CVD: arterial hypertension, rheumatic
32 heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, and heart
33 inflammatory diseases.³
34
35
36
37

38 **Interventions:** one arm wherein patients received LAs with
39 vasoconstrictors compared to another arm wherein patients received LAs
40 without vasoconstrictors.
41
42

43 **Procedures:** patients who undergo tooth extraction, dental
44 restorations, treatment and periodontal surgery, implantation, oral surgery,
45 root canal treatments, and prosthetic procedures.
46
47

48 **Type of study:** randomized controlled studies (RCTs): we will include
49 two types of RCT designs. In the first type, patients are randomized to receive
50 either LAs with vasoconstrictors during the first dental procedure and LAs
51 without vasoconstrictors during the second dental procedure or vice versa. In
52 the second type, patients are randomized to receive only one type of LA, with
53 or without vasoconstrictors, during the dental procedure.
54
55
56
57

58 **Language:** any language
59
60

1
2
3 **Outcomes:** The investigations are to report at least one of the
4 following outcomes:
5

6 **Primary outcomes:**

- 7
8 • death;
9
10 • mortality by a specific cause;
11
12 • stroke;
13
14 • acute myocardial infarction;
15
16 • hospitalization;
17
18 • pain;
19
20 • bleeding;

21 **Secondary outcomes:**

- 22 • arrhythmias;
23
24 • ischemic episodes;
25
26 • anxiety;
27
28 • adverse effects;
29
30 • changes in blood pressure;
31
32 • changes in heart rate;
33
34 • changes in results obtained via oximetry.

35
36 **Exclusion criteria**

37 We will exclude studies involving patients with untreated or out-of-
38 control arterial hypertension, who are pregnant or breastfeeding, who are
39 allergic to the LAs used in the studies, with out-of-control diabetes mellitus, or
40 who have had recent myocardial infarction, cancer, and malignant
41 hypertension.
42
43
44
45

46
47 **Search methods for primary studies**

48 **Electronic searches**

49 We will search the following electronic databases: the Cochrane
50 Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) part of The Cochrane
51 Library; MEDLINE (Ovid); EMBASE (Ovid); Healthstar (Ovid); CINAHL
52 (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature); and Web of
53 Science, without restrictions on the status of publication.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Searching other resources

We will search in registration of clinical trials: <https://clinicaltrials.gov>, WHO clinical trials registry, <http://www.ensaiosclinicos.gov.br>; trials registry and bank of Brazil thesis (CAPES); conference proceedings of the Brazilian Congress of Cardiology, in the Brazilian Congress of Anesthesiology, and in the International Congress of Dentistry (CIOSP).

We will also search the main LA production companies in Brazil.

Two reviewers will analyze the reference list or quotations found in secondary studies to verify and identify possible eligible studies. Whenever necessary, the authors of the main studies will be contacted to obtain additional information.

Search strategy

The search strategy will be individually conducted by: (1) type of dental intervention; (2) type of anesthetic; and (3) type of CVD. We have adapted the search strategy according to each database. The search strategy in Ovid Medline is in Appendix 1.

Eligibility determination

Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, RLM, and NKA) working in pairs will independently evaluate whether summaries are in accordance with eligibility criteria. Discrepancies are to be resolved by a consensus reached among all reviewers. Kappa test will be used to assess selection agreement, given that Kappa values between 0.40 and 0.59 are to be regarded as a weak agreement; values between 0.60 and 0.70 as intermediary agreement; and 0.75 or larger as excellent agreement.¹⁸

To exclude duplicate articles, reviewers will analyze all eligible articles and identify those with one or more authors in common. In case of duplicate publications, we will use the article with more complete data.

Data extraction

Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, JOA and JCR), working in pairs, will independently extract data and record information regarding patients,

1
2
3 methods, interventions, outcomes, and missing outcome data using
4 standardized and pretested data extraction forms with instructions. Before
5 initiating data abstraction, we will conduct calibration exercises to ensure
6 consistency among the reviewers. We will contact the study authors to resolve
7 any uncertainties. Disagreements will be resolved by a consensus with any
8 unresolved issues referred to another reviewer.
9
10
11
12

13 **Risk of bias in individual studies**

14
15 Using a modified version of the Cochrane collaboration risk of bias
16 tool,^{19,20} the same pairs of reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias
17 for each RCT according to the following criteria: random sequence; allocation
18 concealment; blinding of the patient, healthcare professionals, outcome
19 assessors, data collectors, and data analysts; incomplete outcome data;
20 selective outcome reporting; and major baseline imbalance. Reviewers will
21 assign response options of “definitely yes,” “probably yes,” “probably no,” and
22 “definitely no” for each of the domains, with the options “definitely yes” and
23 “probably yes” ultimately being assigned a low risk of bias and “definitely no”
24 and “probably no” as having a high risk of bias.²¹ Reviewers will resolve
25 disagreements by discussion, and one arbitrator will adjudicate unresolved
26 disagreements.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Explaining the heterogeneity of evidence**

39
40 Possible explanations for heterogeneity will include: (a) age- the older
41 the age, the higher the risk of cardiovascular transient episodes; (b) gender-
42 women outnumber men in deaths due to CVD; (c) vasoconstrictor type-
43 vasoconstrictors are linked to receptors α and β . However, some of these are
44 more often linked to cardiac receptor β (except for felypressin, which links to
45 the vasopressin receptor v1, present in the smooth muscles of blood vessel
46 walls), raise cardiac frequency, and thus, higher risks of transient episodes
47 are expected; (d) vasoconstrictor concentration - which may vary from a
48 1:2,500 to a 1:200,000 greater risk is expected with higher vasoconstrictor
49 concentration; (e) dental procedure duration- the longer the duration to
50 perform the procedure (surgical or periodontal procedures take longer than
51 restorative procedures), the higher the concentration of anesthetic agent
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 necessary, and the stronger the toxicity to the cardiovascular system, thereby
4 increasing the risks of transient episodes in long-duration procedures; (f)
5 dental procedure type: usually surgical procedures (periodontal, extraction,
6 and implantation) trigger great stress in the patient, thus increasing the risk of
7 transient episodes.
8
9

10
11 We ranked heterogeneity associated with pooled effect estimates with
12 the use of the χ^2 test and the I^2 statistic.²² The following heterogeneities were
13 considered: 0–25% (low heterogeneity), 50% (moderate heterogeneity), and
14 75% (high heterogeneity).²⁰
15
16
17

18 19 20 **Data synthesis**

21 We will conduct analyses for each LA intervention and pool these for
22 each outcome of interest. We will determine the confidence in estimates for
23 each body of evidence and conduct an analysis for the body of evidence that
24 warrants greater confidence. Hypotheses, information for which has been
25 documented in at least 10 studies for independent continuous variables or in
26 at least 5 studies for independent categorical variables, will be examined.
27
28

29 The combined analyses will estimate risks of negative cardiovascular
30 outcomes as well as adverse effects in the use of LAs with and without
31 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD.
32
33

34 We will conduct meta-analyses using comprehensive the meta-analysis
35 STATA software (version 14.1). We will use random-effects meta-analyses,¹⁸
36 which are conservative in that they consider within- and between-study
37 differences in calculating the error term used in the analysis. For trials that
38 report dichotomous outcomes, we will calculate the pooled relative risk with
39 associated 95% confidence interval (CI).
40
41
42

43 For continuous outcomes such as pain and function score, we will use
44 the weighted mean differences (WMD) and its 95% CI as an effect measure.
45 Once the WMD has been calculated, we will contextualize this value by
46 noting, when available, the corresponding anchor-based minimally important
47 difference (MID). The smallest change in instrument score that patients
48 perceive is important.
49
50
51

52 If studies report the same framework using different measurement
53 instruments, we will calculate the standardized mean difference (SMD) as
54
55
56

1
2
3 sensitivity analysis. SMD expresses the intervention effect in standard
4 deviation (SD) units rather than the original units of measurement, with the
5 value of an SMD depends on the size of the effect (difference between
6 means) and the SD of the outcomes (inherent variability among patients). For
7 outcome measures that have an established anchor-based MID, we will use
8 this measure to convert the SMD into an odds ratio and a risk difference.²³
9

10 To facilitate the interpretation of the effects of continuous outcomes, we
11 will substitute the MID, when it is available for different scales, with the SD
12 (denominator) in the SMD equation, which will result in more readily
13 interpretable MID units instead of SD units.²⁴ If an estimate of the MID is
14 unavailable, we will use the statistical approach developed by Suissa²⁵ to
15 provide a summary estimate of the proportion of patients who benefit from
16 treatment across all studies. Statistical approaches to enhance the
17 interpretability of the results of continuous outcomes outlined in this paragraph
18 will use methods cited as well as those described by Thorlund et al.²⁶ Funnel
19 plots will be created to explore a possible publication bias when at least 10
20 studies have contributed to the pooled analysis.
21

22 The combined estimates will be tested by statistics Z and
23 heterogeneity, measured using chi-statistic among the studies analyzed using
24 chi-squared test. When heterogeneity is present, a variance component
25 because of inter-study variance, it will be incorporated in the calculation of the
26 CI for the estimate. Studies that do not contain the aforementioned data will
27 not be included in the pooled estimate; for such studies, we will summarize
28 death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction,
29 hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety,
30 adverse effects, changes in blood pressure, changes in heart rate, anxiety,
31 and changes in results obtained via oximetry.
32

33 We will use recently developed approaches to address missing patient
34 data for dichotomous²⁷ and continuous outcomes.²⁸ We will only apply these
35 approaches to outcomes that meet the following criteria: show a significant
36 treatment effect and report sufficient missing patient data to potentially
37 introduce clinically important bias. Thresholds for important missing patient
38 data will be determined on an outcome-by-outcome basis.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 If the meta-analysis is not appropriate owing to excessive
4 heterogeneity of the study population, intervention, comparator, outcome, or
5 methodology, we will construct summary tables and provide a narrative
6 synthesis.
7
8
9

10 11 **Summarizing evidence**

12 The quality of evidence will be independently evaluated (confidence in
13 effect estimates) for each result using GRADE.¹⁸ Results will be presented in
14 evidence profiles, as recommended by the GRADE Working Group.²⁹⁻³⁰
15
16

17 Evidence profiles will provide brief presentations of evidence quality
18 and effect magnitude. With the help of the software program GRADEpro
19 (<http://ims.cochrane.org/grade>), we will construct an evidence profile to
20 include following: (1) a list featuring up to seven important results (desirable
21 and undesirable), (2) a measure of the typical load of such results (e.g.,
22 control group or estimated risk), (3) a measure of the difference between risks
23 with and without intervention, (4) the relative magnitude of the effect, (5)
24 number of patient and studies that address these outcomes, as well as the
25 follow-up time, (6) an overall assessment of confidence in the effect estimate
26 for each outcome, and (7) comments, which will include DMI, if available.
27
28

29 In the GRADE approach, randomized studies start with high-quality
30 evidence, but they may be assessed as low-quality evidence by one or more
31 of the five restriction categories: independent assessment of risk of bias,
32 precision, consistency, directness, and publication bias.
33
34

35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 **DISCUSSION**

43 Our review will evaluate the cardiovascular risks and adverse effects of
44 the use of LAs with vasoconstrictors compared with those of LAs without
45 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD. This will provide estimates for the safe
46 use of LAs and quality of evidence in complete and consistent form using
47 GRADE.^{29,31} We will prioritize important outcomes for the patients. The result
48 of this systematic review will be relevant to dentists and physicians for the
49 prescription and use of LAs in patients with CVD. Our aim is to inform medical
50 professionals and dentists on the best estimate of the effects and reliability of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the estimates for the safe use of LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in
4 patients with CVD and identify key areas for future research.
5
6
7

8 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

9
10 Ethics approval is not required this is a protocol for a systematic
11 review. The systematic review will be published in a peer-reviewed journal
12 and presented at conferences. The evidence of this study will allow health
13 professionals to be aware of the safety of LA use with and without
14 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD.
15
16
17

18 **Contributors**

19
20 CCG is the principal investigator and led the writing of the manuscript.
21 LCL and RLM are the project managers and co-investigators and contributed
22 to the writing and revision of the manuscript. CCB, JCR, JOA, NKA, and MFF
23 are co-investigators who contributed to the writing and revision of the
24 manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
25
26
27
28

29 **Competing interests**

30
31 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
32
33
34
35

36 **Funding**

37
38 This project received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
39 public or commercial; the authors funded this project.
40
41
42

43 **Provenance and peer review**

44
45 Not commissioned, externally peer reviewed.
46
47

48 **Abbreviations**

49
50 Local anesthetic (LA), cardiovascular disease (CVD), Cochrane Central
51 Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Cumulative Index to Nursing and
52 Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
53 Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), randomized clinical trial (RCT), bank
54 of Brazil thesis (CAPES), Congresso Internacional de Odontologia de São
55 Paulo (CIOSP), confidence interval (CI), weighted mean difference (WMD),
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 minimally important difference (MID), and standardized mean difference
4 (SMD), standard deviation (SD).
5
6
7

8 REFERENCES

- 9 1. World Health Organization. Global status report on noncommunicable disease,
10 WHO 2014.
- 11 2. Ministerio da Saude, DATASUS. Morbidade informações epidemiológicas,
12 2011.
- 13 3. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs). WHO 2017
- 14 4. Jowett NI, Cabot LB. Patients with cardiac disease: considerations for the
15 dental practitioner. *Br Dent J* 2000;**189**(6):297-302.
- 16 5. American Dental Association A. Guideline for teaching pain control and
17 sedation to dentist and dental students. 2012:1-18.
- 18 6. Budenz AW. Local anesthetics and medically complex patients. *J Calif Dent*
19 *Assoc* 2000;**28**(8):611-9.
- 20 7. Haas DA. An update on local anesthetics in dentistry. *J Can Dent Assoc*
21 2002;**68**(9):546-51.
- 22 8. SF M. Pharmacology of Vasoconstrictors. *Hand-book of Local Anesthesia* 6 th
23 ed, 2013:89-93.
- 24 9. Becker DE, Reed KL. Essentials of local anesthetic pharmacology. *Anesth prog*
25 2006;**53**(3):98-108; quiz 09-10.
- 26 10. Jage J. Circulatory effects of vasoconstrictors combined with local anesthetics.
27 *Anesth Pain Control Dent* 1993;**2**(2):81-6.
- 28 11. Brown RS. Local anesthetics. *Dent Clin North Am* 1994;**38**(4):619-32.
- 29 12. Godzieba A, Smektala T, Jedrzejewski M, et al. Clinical assessment of the safe
30 use local anaesthesia with vasoconstrictor agents in cardiovascular
31 compromised patients: a systematic review. *Med Sci Monit* 2014;**20**:393-
32 8.
- 33 13. Meyer FU. Haemodynamic changes under emotional stress following a minor
34 surgical procedure under local anaesthesia. *Int J Oral maxillofac Surg*
35 1987;**16**(6):688-94.
- 36 14. Brand HS, Gortzak RA, Palmer-Bouva CC, et al. Cardiovascular and
37 neuroendocrine responses during acute stress induced by different types
38 of dental treatment. *Int Dent J* 1995;**45**(1):45-8.
- 39 15. Fencil JL. Guideline implementation: local anesthesia. *AORN J*
40 2015;**101**(6):682-9; quiz 90-2.
- 41 16. Liao FL, Kok SH, Lee JJ, et al. Cardiovascular influence of dental anxiety
42 during local anesthesia for tooth extraction. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral*
43 *Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2008;**105**(1):16-26.
- 44 17. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for
45 systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
46 elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;**349**:g7647.
- 47 18. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality
48 of evidence--inconsistency. *J Clinical Epidemiol* 2011;**64**(12):1294-302.
- 49 19. Altman R, Alarcon G, Appelrouth D, et al. The American College of
50 Rheumatology criteria for the classification and reporting of
51 osteoarthritis of the hand. *Arthritis Rheum* 1990;**33**(11):1601-10.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
20. Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.
21. Akl EA, Sun X, Busse JW, et al. Specific instructions for estimating unclearly reported blinding status in randomized trials were reliable and valid. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012;**65**(3):262-7.
22. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;**21**(11):1539-58.
23. Busse JW, Bartlett SJ, Dougados M, et al. Optimal Strategies for Reporting Pain in Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: Recommendations from an OMERACT 12 Workshop. *J Rheumatol* 2015.
24. Johnston BC, Thorlund K, Schunemann HJ, et al. Improving the interpretation of quality of life evidence in meta-analyses: the application of minimal important difference units. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2010;**8**:116.
25. Suissa S, Shuster JJ. The 2 x 2 matched-pairs trial: exact unconditional design and analysis. *Biometrics* 1991;**47**(2):361-72.
26. Thorlund K, Walter SD, Johnston BC, et al. Pooling health-related quality of life outcomes in meta-analysis-a tutorial and review of methods for enhancing interpretability. *Res Synth Methods* 2011;**2**(3):188-203.
27. Akl EA, Johnston BC, Alonso-Coello P, et al. Addressing dichotomous data for participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic reviewers. *PloS One* 2013;**8**(2):e57132.
28. Ebrahim S, Akl EA, Mustafa RA, et al. Addressing continuous data for participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic reviewers. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**(9):1014-21.e1.
29. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**(2):158-72.
30. Guyatt GH, Thorlund K, Oxman AD, et al. GRADE guidelines: 13. Preparing summary of findings tables and evidence profiles-continuous outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**(2):173-83.
31. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;**336**(7652):1049-51.

APPENDIX 1 -Search strategy (Via Ovid, MEDLINE)

- 1 exp Dentistry/ (357819)
- 2 exp Dentistry, Operative/ (32163)
- 3 exp Dental Care/ (29438)
- 4 Dental Restoration, Permanent/ (18759)
- 5 Dental Restoration Repair/ (102)
- 6 Periodontal Debridement/ (191)
- 7 Subgingival Curettage/ (977)
- 8 Dental Scaling/ (3316)
- 9 Chronic Periodontitis/ (1971)
- 10 Periodontal Diseases/ (24137)
- 11 Periodontal Surgery.mp. (1302)
- 12 Periodontal treatment.mp. (2728)
- 13 Oral Surgical Procedures/ (5363)
- 14 exp Surgery, Oral/ (7419)
- 15 Tooth Extraction/ (17008)
- 16 Dental Prosthesis/ (3384)
- 17 "Root Canal Therapy"/ (11735)
- 18 exp Dental Implants/ (17311)
- 19 Dental Implants, Single Tooth/ (1901)
- 20 Dental Implantation/ (3773)

- 21 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR
13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19 OR 20 (372164)

- 22 exp Anesthetics, Local/ (96504)
- 23 exp Anesthesia, Local/ (15673)
- 24 exp Anesthesia, Dental/ (10417)
- 25 Lidocaine/ (22512)
- 26 Prilocaine/ (2018)
- 27 Bupivacaine/ (10713)
- 28 Procaine/ (11313)
- 29 Mepivacaine/ (1899)

1
2
3 30 Carticaine/ (451)
4

5 31 Etidocaine/ (288)
6
7

8 32 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31
9 (114729)
10

11
12 33 exp Cardiovascular Diseases/ (2067079)

13 34 Cardiac.mp. (631932)

14 35 Coronary Disease/ (128393)

15 36 Coronary Artery Disease/ (47503)

16 37 Coronary arteriosclerosis.mp. (733)

17 38 Coronariopathy.mp. (29)

18 39 Arrhythmias, cardiac/ (56112)

19 40 Heart Valve Diseases/ (21116)

20 41 Heart Diseases/ (63528)

21 42 Heart Failure/ (63528)

22 43 Rheumatic Heart Disease/ (12263)

23 44 Myocardial Ischemia/ (34898)

24 45 Myocardial Infarction/ (151398)

25 46 Hypertension (210548)

26 47 Hypertensive Patients.mp. (25167)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 48 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43
42 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 (2314784)
43
44

45
46 49 21 AND 32 AND 48 (752)
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|-----------------------------------|----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Title | | | | | |
| Identification | 1a | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1 |
| Update | 1b | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Registration | 2 | If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 3 |
| Authors | | | | | |
| Contact | 3a | Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1,2 |
| Contributions | 3b | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Amendments | 4 | If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Support | | | | | |
| Sources | 5a | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Sponsor | 5b | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
| Rationale | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 4,5 |
| Objectives | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|---|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | | | |
| METHODS | | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 8 | Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Information sources | 9 | Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 7,8 |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 8 |
| STUDY RECORDS | | | | | |
| Data management | 11a | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10,11 |
| Selection process | 11b | State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data collection process | 11c | Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data items | 12 | List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10 |
| Outcomes and prioritization | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6,7 |
| Risk of bias in individual studies | 14 | Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,12 |
| DATA | | | | | |
| Synthesis | 15a | Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11 |
| | 15b | If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11,12 |
| | 15c | Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta- | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 11,12 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|--|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | regression) | | | |
| | 15d | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |
| Meta-bias(es) | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Confidence in cumulative evidence | 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |

peer review only

BMJ Open

Local anesthetics combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with cardiovascular disease undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2016-014611.R3 |
| Article Type: | Protocol |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 13-Jul-2017 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Guimaraes, Caio; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Motta, Rogério; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Bergamaschi, Cristiane; University of Sorocaba, Pharmaceutical Science Araújo, Jimmy; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics de Andrade, Natalia Karol; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Figueiró, Mabel; Hospital do Coracao Ramacciato, Juliana ; São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Lopes, Luciane; UNISO, Pharmacie Science |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Dentistry and oral medicine |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Anaesthesia, Evidence based practice, Pharmacology and therapeutics |
| Keywords: | Local anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Local anesthetics combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with cardiovascular disease undergoing dental procedures: Systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Short title: Local anesthesia in dental patients with cardiovascular disease

Authors:

Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS*

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

Rogério Heládio Lopes Motta, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
rogerio.motta@slmandic.com.br

Cristiane de Cássia Bergamasch, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Sorocaba, Brazil
cristiane.motta@prof.uniso.br

Jimmy de oliveira Araújo, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
Jimmy_dental@hotmail.com

Natalia Karol de Andrade, MS

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics, São Leopoldo Mandic Dental School and Research Center, Brazil
karol.andrade.odonto@hotmail.com

Mabel Fernandes Figueiró

Librarian, Research Institute, Heart Hospital, São Paulo, Brazil
Mfigueiro@hcor.com.br

Juliana Cama Ramacciato, PHD

Department of Pharmacology, Anesthesiology and Therapeutics Dental
School and Research Center, Brazil
Juliana.ramacciato@slmandic.com.br

Luciane Cruz Lopes, PHD

Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, University of Sorocaba, Brazil
Pharmaceutical Sciences Course, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de
Mesquita Filho, Araraquara, Brazil
luslopes@terra.com.br

No conflict of interest**Word count:** 2783**Number of references:** 31**Keywords:** Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular
Disease***Corresponding author:****Caio Chaves Guimaraes, MS- Corresponding author**

São Leopoldo Mandic University, Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil
Address: Rua Dr. José rocha Junqueira, 13, Swift,
(55)67984535056
drcaio_cg@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The use of vasoconstrictors combined with local anesthetics (LAs) in dentistry for patients with cardiovascular disease (CVD) is still controversial in the scientific literature. It raises concerns regarding the possibility of transient episodes, triggering negative cardiovascular outcomes.

Method/Design: Trials eligible for our systematic review will enroll patients with CVD who have undergone dental treatments carried out with the use of LAs by comparing two arms: LAs with vasoconstrictors and LAs without vasoconstrictors. The research will be conducted in the electronic databases Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), MEDLINE, EMBASE, Healthstar (via Ovid), CINAHL, and Web of Science, from their inception to December 2017, without any restrictions in terms of language and status of publication. A team of reviewers will independently assess titles, abstracts, and complete text to determine eligibility. For eligible studies, the same reviewers will perform data extraction and evaluate the risk of bias in the selected articles. The selected outcomes comprise death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction, hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety, adverse effects, changes in blood pressure, changes in heart rate, anxiety, and results obtained via oximetry. Whenever possible, we will conduct a meta-analysis to establish the effects of LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in the patients with CVD, and the overall quality of evidence for each outcome will be determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) classification system.

Ethics and Dissemination: Ethics committee approval was not necessary because this is a protocol of systematic review. This systematic review will be submitted for presentation at conferences and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Our review will assess the risks of cardiovascular events when using LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, focusing on important clinical outcomes.

Protocol registration: PROSPERO- CRD42016045421

Keywords: Local Anesthetics, Anesthesia Dental, Dentistry, Cardiovascular Disease

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This review method includes explicit eligibility criteria, a comprehensive and extensive database research, and an independent assessment of the quality and eligibility of studies by a pair of reviewers.
- The use of GRADE will evaluate the strength and quality of evidence body on the effect estimate for each outcome, including the independent analysis of bias risk, accuracy, consistency, publication bias, and indirect evidence.
- The quality of the primary studies to be included in this review may be a limiting factor owing to each study design and outcome measures. Then it is probable that primary studies have a high risk of bias.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the primary cause of death worldwide. It is estimated that 17.5 million people died from CVD in 2012, representing 31% of all deaths worldwide. Over three-fourths of deaths from CVD have been reported in low- or middle-income countries.¹ In Brazil, CVD mortality accounted for one-third of all causes of deaths in 2002.² CVD comprises arterial hypertension, rheumatic heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, heart inflammatory diseases, and so on.³

In dentistry, clinical procedures in patients with CVD should be carefully assessed to minimize the stress associated with the completion of dental procedures. Besides lowering anxiety, pain control is fundamental to minimize transient episodes that may trigger negative cardiovascular outcomes, primarily in such patients.⁴

Anxiety and pain control techniques in dentistry may be psychological as well as pharmacological. Psychological techniques may involve not only simple relaxing techniques used in anxious patients but also understanding

1
2
3 the behavior regarding pain control. Pharmacological techniques comprise
4 drugs such as local anesthetics (LAs), sedatives, and pain killers.⁵

6 Local anesthesia is the basis for pain control in dentistry. There is a
7 long history of the safe use of LAs, not only in healthy patients but also in
8 patients with complex medical situations.^{5,6}

9
10 Clinical anesthetic agents are combined with vasoconstrictors to
11 increase the duration of the anesthetic effect, reduce systemic toxicity, and
12 optimize soft tissue hemostasis.^{7,8}

13
14 Despite the beneficial properties of vasoconstrictors, there is some
15 concern regarding systemic consequences due to inadvertent intravascular
16 injection and the induction of adverse cardiovascular effects, primarily in
17 patients with CVD;^{9,10} In addition, pain, stress, fear, and anxiety during dental
18 treatment that are caused by lack of pain control and poor anesthesia may be
19 responsible for the systemic endogenous release of catecholamines,
20 particularly norepinephrine¹¹, which may lead to autonomic responses such
21 as hypertension and arrhythmias.^{5,8,12} A previous study reported that the
22 stress-induced release of catecholamines could be more than 10 times
23 greater than the basal level. In stressful situations, such as pain and anxiety,
24 the released of endogenous catecholamines may reach concentrations higher
25 than the low epinephrine concentrations used in dental LAs.^{5,13,14}

26
27 Nevertheless, the occurrence of most alterations may be attributed to
28 inappropriate applications such as high-dose injections, intravascular
29 accidental injections, and drug interactions.^{4,8,15} Thereafter, endogenous or
30 exogenous catecholamines may cause or contribute to hemodynamic and
31 cardiac changes.¹⁶

32
33 A systematic review has shown that most complications that arise while
34 using LAs with vasoconstrictors are clinically insignificant arrhythmias and that
35 the use of the anesthetic agent lidocaine associated with epinephrine in the
36 recommended dosage seems to be relatively safe for patients with CVD.¹²
37 However, putative standards and guidelines continue to present and advise
38 against or limit the use of vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, which brings
39 uncertainties in their use.⁹

40
41 Scientific evidence demonstrating the safe use of LAs combined with
42 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD is scarce and contradictory. Thus, this
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 systematic review was aimed to determine the risk of cardiovascular events
4 when using LAs combined with vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD, both
5 during and immediately after dental procedures.
6
7
8

9 10 **METHODS AND ANALYSES**

11 The systematic review will be performed according to the
12 recommendations specified in the Cochrane Handbook for Interventional
13 Reviews and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
14 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-P) statement.¹⁷
15
16
17

18 19 **Protocol and Registration**

20 Our review protocol is registered with the International Prospective
21 Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO-CRD42016045421).
22
23
24

25 26 **Eligibility criteria**

27 ***Inclusion criteria***

28
29 **Patients:** adult patients with CVD: arterial hypertension, rheumatic
30 heart diseases, ischemic heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, and heart
31 inflammatory diseases.³
32
33

34
35 **Interventions:** one arm wherein patients received LAs with
36 vasoconstrictors compared to another arm wherein patients received LAs
37 without vasoconstrictors.
38

39
40 **Procedures:** patients who undergo tooth extraction, dental
41 restorations, treatment and periodontal surgery, implantation, oral surgery,
42 root canal treatments, and prosthetic procedures.
43

44
45 **Type of study:** randomized controlled studies (RCTs): we will include
46 two types of RCT designs. In the first type, patients are randomized to receive
47 either LAs with vasoconstrictors during the first dental procedure and LAs
48 without vasoconstrictors during the second dental procedure or vice versa. In
49 the second type, patients are randomized to receive only one type of LA, with
50 or without vasoconstrictors, during the dental procedure.
51
52

53
54 **Language:** any language

55
56 **Outcomes:** The investigations are to report at least one of the
57 following outcomes:
58
59
60

Primary outcomes:

- death;
- mortality by a specific cause;
- stroke;
- acute myocardial infarction;
- hospitalization;
- pain;
- bleeding;

Secondary outcomes:

- arrhythmias;
- ischemic episodes;
- anxiety;
- adverse effects;
- changes in blood pressure;
- changes in heart rate;
- changes in results obtained via oximetry.

Exclusion criteria

We will exclude studies involving patients with untreated or out-of-control arterial hypertension, who are pregnant or breastfeeding, who are allergic to the LAs used in the studies, with out-of-control diabetes mellitus, or who have had recent myocardial infarction, cancer, and malignant hypertension.

Search methods for primary studies**Electronic searches**

We will search the following electronic databases: the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) part of The Cochrane Library; MEDLINE (Ovid); EMBASE (Ovid); Healthstar (Ovid); CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature); and Web of Science, from their inception to December 2017, without restrictions on the status of publication or date. The searching will be running from each database beginning to the present.

Searching other resources

We will search in registration of clinical trials: <https://clinicaltrials.gov>, WHO clinical trials registry, <http://www.ensaiosclinicos.gov.br>; trials registry and bank of Brazil thesis (CAPES); conference proceedings of the Brazilian Congress of Cardiology, in the Brazilian Congress of Anesthesiology, and in the International Congress of Dentistry (CIOSP).

We will also search the main LA production companies in Brazil.

Two reviewers will analyze the reference list or quotations found in secondary studies to verify and identify possible eligible studies. Whenever necessary, the authors of the main studies will be contacted to obtain additional information.

Search strategy

The search strategy will be individually conducted by: (1) type of dental intervention; (2) type of anesthetic; and (3) type of CVD. We have adapted the search strategy according to each database. The search strategy in Ovid Medline is in Appendix 1.

Eligibility determination

Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, RLM, and NKA) working in pairs will independently evaluate whether summaries are in accordance with eligibility criteria. Discrepancies are to be resolved by a consensus reached among all reviewers. Kappa test will be used to assess selection agreement, given that Kappa values between 0.40 and 0.59 are to be regarded as a weak agreement; values between 0.60 and 0.70 as intermediary agreement; and 0.75 or larger as excellent agreement.¹⁸

To exclude duplicate articles, reviewers will analyze all eligible articles and identify those with one or more authors in common. In case of duplicate publications, we will use the article with more complete data.

Data extraction

Four reviewers (CCG, CCB, JOA and JCR), working in pairs, will independently extract data and record information regarding patients,

1
2
3 methods, interventions, outcomes, and missing outcome data using
4 standardized and pretested data extraction forms with instructions. Before
5 initiating data abstraction, we will conduct calibration exercises to ensure
6 consistency among the reviewers. We will contact the study authors to resolve
7 any uncertainties. Disagreements will be resolved by a consensus with any
8 unresolved issues referred to another reviewer.
9
10
11
12

13 **Risk of bias in individual studies**

14
15 Using a modified version of the Cochrane collaboration risk of bias
16 tool,^{19,20} the same pairs of reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias
17 for each RCT according to the following criteria: random sequence; allocation
18 concealment; blinding of the patient, healthcare professionals, outcome
19 assessors, data collectors, and data analysts; incomplete outcome data;
20 selective outcome reporting; and major baseline imbalance. Reviewers will
21 assign response options of “definitely yes,” “probably yes,” “probably no,” and
22 “definitely no” for each of the domains, with the options “definitely yes” and
23 “probably yes” ultimately being assigned a low risk of bias and “definitely no”
24 and “probably no” as having a high risk of bias.²¹ Reviewers will resolve
25 disagreements by discussion, and one arbitrator will adjudicate unresolved
26 disagreements.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Explaining the heterogeneity of evidence**

39
40 Possible explanations for heterogeneity will include: (a) age- the older
41 the age, the higher the risk of cardiovascular transient episodes; (b) gender-
42 women outnumber men in deaths due to CVD; (c) vasoconstrictor type-
43 vasoconstrictors are linked to receptors α and β . However, some of these are
44 more often linked to cardiac receptor β (except for felypressin, which links to
45 the vasopressin receptor $v1$, present in the smooth muscles of blood vessel
46 walls), raise cardiac frequency, and thus, higher risks of transient episodes
47 are expected; (d) vasoconstrictor concentration - which may vary from a
48 1:2,500 to a 1:200,000 greater risk is expected with higher vasoconstrictor
49 concentration; (e) dental procedure duration- the longer the duration to
50 perform the procedure (surgical or periodontal procedures take longer than
51 restorative procedures), the higher the concentration of anesthetic agent
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 necessary, and the stronger the toxicity to the cardiovascular system, thereby
4 increasing the risks of transient episodes in long-duration procedures; (f)
5 dental procedure type: usually surgical procedures (periodontal, extraction,
6 and implantation) trigger great stress in the patient, thus increasing the risk of
7 transient episodes.
8
9

10
11 We ranked heterogeneity associated with pooled effect estimates with
12 the use of the χ^2 test and the I^2 statistic.²² The following heterogeneities were
13 considered: 0–25% (low heterogeneity), 50% (moderate heterogeneity), and
14 75% (high heterogeneity).²⁰
15
16
17

18 19 **Data synthesis**

20
21 We will conduct analyses for each LA intervention and pool these for
22 each outcome of interest. We will determine the confidence in estimates for
23 each body of evidence and conduct an analysis for the body of evidence that
24 warrants greater confidence. Hypotheses, information for which has been
25 documented in at least 10 studies for independent continuous variables or in
26 at least 5 studies for independent categorical variables, will be examined.
27
28

29
30 The combined analyses will estimate risks of negative cardiovascular
31 outcomes as well as adverse effects in the use of LAs with and without
32 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD.
33
34
35

36
37 We will conduct meta-analyses using comprehensive the meta-analysis
38 STATA software (version 14.1). We will use random-effects meta-analyses,¹⁸
39 which are conservative in that they consider within- and between-study
40 differences in calculating the error term used in the analysis. For trials that
41 report dichotomous outcomes, we will calculate the pooled relative risk with
42 associated 95% confidence interval (CI).
43
44
45

46
47 For continuous outcomes such as pain and function score, we will use
48 the weighted mean differences (WMD) and its 95% CI as an effect measure.
49 Once the WMD has been calculated, we will contextualize this value by
50 noting, when available, the corresponding anchor-based minimally important
51 difference (MID). The smallest change in instrument score that patients
52 perceive is important.
53
54
55

56
57 If studies report the same framework using different measurement
58 instruments, we will calculate the standardized mean difference (SMD) as
59
60

1
2
3 sensitivity analysis. SMD expresses the intervention effect in standard
4 deviation (SD) units rather than the original units of measurement, with the
5 value of an SMD depends on the size of the effect (difference between
6 means) and the SD of the outcomes (inherent variability among patients). For
7 outcome measures that have an established anchor-based MID, we will use
8 this measure to convert the SMD into an odds ratio and a risk difference.²³
9

10 To facilitate the interpretation of the effects of continuous outcomes, we
11 will substitute the MID, when it is available for different scales, with the SD
12 (denominator) in the SMD equation, which will result in more readily
13 interpretable MID units instead of SD units.²⁴ If an estimate of the MID is
14 unavailable, we will use the statistical approach developed by Suissa²⁵ to
15 provide a summary estimate of the proportion of patients who benefit from
16 treatment across all studies. Statistical approaches to enhance the
17 interpretability of the results of continuous outcomes outlined in this paragraph
18 will use methods cited as well as those described by Thorlund et al.²⁶ Funnel
19 plots will be created to explore a possible publication bias when at least 10
20 studies have contributed to the pooled analysis.
21

22 The combined estimates will be tested by statistics Z and
23 heterogeneity, measured using chi-statistic among the studies analyzed using
24 chi-squared test. When heterogeneity is present, a variance component
25 because of inter-study variance, it will be incorporated in the calculation of the
26 CI for the estimate. Studies that do not contain the aforementioned data will
27 not be included in the pooled estimate; for such studies, we will summarize
28 death, mortality by a specific cause, stroke, acute myocardial infarction,
29 hospitalization, pain, bleeding, arrhythmias, ischemic episodes, anxiety,
30 adverse effects, changes in blood pressure, changes in heart rate, anxiety,
31 and changes in results obtained via oximetry.
32

33 We will use recently developed approaches to address missing patient
34 data for dichotomous²⁷ and continuous outcomes.²⁸ We will only apply these
35 approaches to outcomes that meet the following criteria: show a significant
36 treatment effect and report sufficient missing patient data to potentially
37 introduce clinically important bias. Thresholds for important missing patient
38 data will be determined on an outcome-by-outcome basis.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 If the meta-analysis is not appropriate owing to excessive
4 heterogeneity of the study population, intervention, comparator, outcome, or
5 methodology, we will construct summary tables and provide a narrative
6 synthesis.
7
8
9

10 11 **Summarizing evidence**

12 The quality of evidence will be independently evaluated (confidence in
13 effect estimates) for each result using GRADE.¹⁸ Results will be presented in
14 evidence profiles, as recommended by the GRADE Working Group.²⁹⁻³⁰
15
16

17 Evidence profiles will provide brief presentations of evidence quality
18 and effect magnitude. With the help of the software program GRADEpro
19 (<http://ims.cochrane.org/grade>), we will construct an evidence profile to
20 include following: (1) a list featuring up to seven important results (desirable
21 and undesirable), (2) a measure of the typical load of such results (e.g.,
22 control group or estimated risk), (3) a measure of the difference between risks
23 with and without intervention, (4) the relative magnitude of the effect, (5)
24 number of patient and studies that address these outcomes, as well as the
25 follow-up time, (6) an overall assessment of confidence in the effect estimate
26 for each outcome, and (7) comments, which will include DMI, if available.
27
28

29 In the GRADE approach, randomized studies start with high-quality
30 evidence, but they may be assessed as low-quality evidence by one or more
31 of the five restriction categories: independent assessment of risk of bias,
32 precision, consistency, directness, and publication bias.
33
34

35 36 37 **DISCUSSION**

38 Our review will evaluate the cardiovascular risks and adverse effects of
39 the use of LAs with vasoconstrictors compared with those of LAs without
40 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD. This will provide estimates for the safe
41 use of LAs and quality of evidence in complete and consistent form using
42 GRADE.^{29,31} We will prioritize important outcomes for the patients. The result
43 of this systematic review will be relevant to dentists and physicians for the
44 prescription and use of LAs in patients with CVD. Our aim is to inform medical
45 professionals and dentists on the best estimate of the effects and reliability of
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the estimates for the safe use of LAs with and without vasoconstrictors in
4 patients with CVD and identify key areas for future research.
5
6
7

8 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

9
10 Ethics approval is not required this is a protocol for a systematic
11 review. The systematic review will be published in a peer-reviewed journal
12 and presented at conferences. The evidence of this study will allow health
13 professionals to be aware of the safety of LA use with and without
14 vasoconstrictors in patients with CVD.
15
16
17
18

19 **Contributors**

20
21 CCG is the principal investigator and led the writing of the manuscript.
22 LCL and RLM are the project managers and co-investigators and contributed
23 to the writing and revision of the manuscript. CCB, JCR, JOA, NKA, and MFF
24 are co-investigators who contributed to the writing and revision of the
25 manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Competing interests**

32
33 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
34
35

36 **Funding**

37
38 This project received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
39 public or commercial; the authors funded this project.
40
41
42

43 **Provenance and peer review**

44
45 Not commissioned, externally peer reviewed.
46
47

48 **Abbreviations**

49
50 Local anesthetic (LA), cardiovascular disease (CVD), Cochrane Central
51 Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Cumulative Index to Nursing and
52 Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
53 Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), randomized clinical trial (RCT), bank
54 of Brazil thesis (CAPES), Congresso Internacional de Odontologia de São
55 Paulo (CIOSP), confidence interval (CI), weighted mean difference (WMD),
56
57
58
59
60

minimally important difference (MID), and standardized mean difference (SMD), standard deviation (SD).

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Global status report on noncommunicable disease, WHO 2014.
2. Ministerio da Saude, DATASUS. Morbidade informações epidemiológicas, 2011.
3. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs). WHO 2017
4. Jowett NI, Cabot LB. Patients with cardiac disease: considerations for the dental practitioner. *Br Dent J* 2000;**189**(6):297-302.
5. American Dental Association A. Guideline for teaching pain control and sedation to dentist and dental students. 2012:1-18.
6. Budenz AW. Local anesthetics and medically complex patients. *J Calif Dent Assoc* 2000;**28**(8):611-9.
7. Haas DA. An update on local anesthetics in dentistry. *J Can Dent Assoc* 2002;**68**(9):546-51.
8. SF M. Pharmacology of Vasoconstrictors. *Hand-book of Local Anesthesia* 6 th ed, 2013:89-93.
9. Becker DE, Reed KL. Essentials of local anesthetic pharmacology. *Anesth prog* 2006;**53**(3):98-108; quiz 09-10.
10. Jage J. Circulatory effects of vasoconstrictors combined with local anesthetics. *Anesth Pain Control Dent* 1993;**2**(2):81-6.
11. Brown RS. Local anesthetics. *Dent Clin North Am* 1994;**38**(4):619-32.
12. Godzieba A, Smektala T, Jedrzejewski M, et al. Clinical assessment of the safe use local anaesthesia with vasoconstrictor agents in cardiovascular compromised patients: a systematic review. *Med Sci Monit* 2014;**20**:393-8.
13. Meyer FU. Haemodynamic changes under emotional stress following a minor surgical procedure under local anaesthesia. *Int J Oral maxillofac Surg* 1987;**16**(6):688-94.
14. Brand HS, Gortzak RA, Palmer-Bouva CC, et al. Cardiovascular and neuroendocrine responses during acute stress induced by different types of dental treatment. *Int Dent J* 1995;**45**(1):45-8.
15. Fencil JL. Guideline implementation: local anesthesia. *AORN J* 2015;**101**(6):682-9; quiz 90-2.
16. Liao FL, Kok SH, Lee JJ, et al. Cardiovascular influence of dental anxiety during local anesthesia for tooth extraction. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2008;**105**(1):16-26.
17. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;**349**:g7647.
18. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. *J Clinical Epidemiol* 2011;**64**(12):1294-302.
19. Altman R, Alarcon G, Appelrouth D, et al. The American College of Rheumatology criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis of the hand. *Arthritis Rheum* 1990;**33**(11):1601-10.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
20. Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.
21. Akl EA, Sun X, Busse JW, et al. Specific instructions for estimating unclearly reported blinding status in randomized trials were reliable and valid. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012;**65**(3):262-7.
22. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;**21**(11):1539-58.
23. Busse JW, Bartlett SJ, Dougados M, et al. Optimal Strategies for Reporting Pain in Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: Recommendations from an OMERACT 12 Workshop. *J Rheumatol* 2015.
24. Johnston BC, Thorlund K, Schunemann HJ, et al. Improving the interpretation of quality of life evidence in meta-analyses: the application of minimal important difference units. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2010;**8**:116.
25. Suissa S, Shuster JJ. The 2 x 2 matched-pairs trial: exact unconditional design and analysis. *Biometrics* 1991;**47**(2):361-72.
26. Thorlund K, Walter SD, Johnston BC, et al. Pooling health-related quality of life outcomes in meta-analysis-a tutorial and review of methods for enhancing interpretability. *Res Synth Methods* 2011;**2**(3):188-203.
27. Akl EA, Johnston BC, Alonso-Coello P, et al. Addressing dichotomous data for participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic reviewers. *PloS One* 2013;**8**(2):e57132.
28. Ebrahim S, Akl EA, Mustafa RA, et al. Addressing continuous data for participants excluded from trial analysis: a guide for systematic reviewers. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**(9):1014-21.e1.
29. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Santesso N, et al. GRADE guidelines: 12. Preparing summary of findings tables-binary outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**(2):158-72.
30. Guyatt GH, Thorlund K, Oxman AD, et al. GRADE guidelines: 13. Preparing summary of findings tables and evidence profiles-continuous outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**(2):173-83.
31. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;**336**(7652):1049-51.

APPENDIX 1 -Search strategy (Via Ovid, MEDLINE)

- 1 exp Dentistry/ (357819)
- 2 exp Dentistry, Operative/ (32163)
- 3 exp Dental Care/ (29438)
- 4 Dental Restoration, Permanent/ (18759)
- 5 Dental Restoration Repair/ (102)
- 6 Periodontal Debridement/ (191)
- 7 Subgingival Curettage/ (977)
- 8 Dental Scaling/ (3316)
- 9 Chronic Periodontitis/ (1971)
- 10 Periodontal Diseases/ (24137)
- 11 Periodontal Surgery.mp. (1302)
- 12 Periodontal treatment.mp. (2728)
- 13 Oral Surgical Procedures/ (5363)
- 14 exp Surgery, Oral/ (7419)
- 15 Tooth Extraction/ (17008)
- 16 Dental Prosthesis/ (3384)
- 17 "Root Canal Therapy"/ (11735)
- 18 exp Dental Implants/ (17311)
- 19 Dental Implants, Single Tooth/ (1901)
- 20 Dental Implantation/ (3773)

- 21 1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12 OR
13 OR 14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17 OR 18 OR 19 OR 20 (372164)

- 22 exp Anesthetics, Local/ (96504)
- 23 exp Anesthesia, Local/ (15673)
- 24 exp Anesthesia, Dental/ (10417)
- 25 Lidocaine/ (22512)
- 26 Prilocaine/ (2018)
- 27 Bupivacaine/ (10713)
- 28 Procaine/ (11313)
- 29 Mepivacaine/ (1899)

1
2
3 30 Carticaine/ (451)
4

5 31 Etidocaine/ (288)
6
7

8 32 22 OR 23 OR 24 OR 25 OR 26 OR 27 OR 28 OR 29 OR 30 OR 31
9 (114729)
10

11
12 33 exp Cardiovascular Diseases/ (2067079)

13 34 Cardiac.mp. (631932)

14 35 Coronary Disease/ (128393)

15 36 Coronary Artery Disease/ (47503)

16 37 Coronary arteriosclerosis.mp. (733)

17 38 Coronariopathy.mp. (29)

18 39 Arrhythmias, cardiac/ (56112)

19 40 Heart Valve Diseases/ (21116)

20 41 Heart Diseases/ (63528)

21 42 Heart Failure/ (63528)

22 43 Rheumatic Heart Disease/ (12263)

23 44 Myocardial Ischemia/ (34898)

24 45 Myocardial Infarction/ (151398)

25 46 Hypertension (210548)

26 47 Hypertensive Patients.mp. (25167)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 48 33 OR 34 OR 35 OR 36 OR 37 OR 38 OR 39 OR 40 OR 41 OR 42 OR 43
42 OR 44 OR 45 OR 46 OR 47 (2314784)
43
44

45
46 49 21 AND 32 AND 48 (752)
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|-----------------------------------|----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Title | | | | | |
| Identification | 1a | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1 |
| Update | 1b | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Registration | 2 | If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 3 |
| Authors | | | | | |
| Contact | 3a | Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 1,2 |
| Contributions | 3b | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Amendments | 4 | If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Support | | | | | |
| Sources | 5a | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Sponsor | 5b | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 13 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
| Rationale | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 4,5 |
| Objectives | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|---|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | | | |
| METHODS | | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 8 | Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6 |
| Information sources | 9 | Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 7,8 |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 8 |
| STUDY RECORDS | | | | | |
| Data management | 11a | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10,11 |
| Selection process | 11b | State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data collection process | 11c | Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Data items | 12 | List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,10 |
| Outcomes and prioritization | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 6,7 |
| Risk of bias in individual studies | 14 | Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9,12 |
| DATA | | | | | |
| Synthesis | 15a | Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11 |
| | 15b | If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,11,12 |
| | 15c | Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta- | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 11,12 |

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Page number(s) |
|--|-----|---|--------------------------|----|----------------|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| | | regression) | | | |
| | 15d | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |
| Meta-bias(es) | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 9 |
| Confidence in cumulative evidence | 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | 12 |

peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49