

(HR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.68-1.20;  $P = .49$ ; Fig). There was minimal trial heterogeneity and, accordingly, little difference in the pooled result from random-effects modeling.

The results of our analysis suggest that the perioperative survival advantage with EVR compared with OSR may be limited to only the first postoperative year. One possible explanation for the early convergence of all-cause mortality is that patients surviving the stress of OSR may be somewhat less likely to die in the first year than patients undergoing EVR because the latter group is not subjected to OSR; that is, the perioperative survival advantage resulting from EVR may largely be based on postponing death among higher-risk patients from the perioperative period to the subsequent year.<sup>2</sup> Another possible explanation is the failure of EVR to prevent rupture of the AAA. In the EVAR 1 trial, with 8-year follow-up,<sup>4</sup> graft rupture occurred in 25 (4.2%) of per-protocol 598 patients after EVR, with a high mortality of 72.0%.

*Hisato Takagi, MD, PhD*  
*Masafumi Matsui, MD*  
*Takuya Umemoto, MD, PhD*

Department of Cardiovascular Surgery  
Shizuoka Medical Center  
Shizuoka, Japan

## REFERENCES

1. Jetty P, Hebert P, van Walraven C. Long-term outcomes and resource utilization of endovascular versus open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms in Ontario. *J Vasc Surg* 2010;51:577-83, 583.e1-3.
2. Blankensteijn JD, de Jong SE, Prinssen M, van der Ham AC, Buth J, van Sterkenburg SM, et al. Two-year outcomes after conventional or endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysms. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:2398-405.
3. EVAR trial participants. Endovascular aneurysm repair versus open repair in patients with abdominal aortic aneurysm (EVAR trial 1): randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;365:2179-86.
4. The United Kingdom EVAR Trial Investigators. Greenhalgh RM, Brown LC, Powell JT, Thompson SG, Epstein D, Sculpher MJ. Endovascular versus open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1863-71.
5. Lederle FA, Freischlag JA, Kyriakides TC, Padberg FT Jr, Matsumura JS, Kohler TR, et al. Outcomes following endovascular vs open repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2009;302:1535-42.
6. Williamson PR, Smith CT, Hutton JL, Marson AG. Aggregate data meta-analysis with time-to-event outcomes. *Stat Med* 2002;21:3337-51.

doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2010.04.083

## Regarding "A closer look at meta-analyses of observational data"

We read carefully the article by Jonker et al. entitled "Meta-analysis of open versus endovascular repair for ruptured descending thoracic aortic aneurysm".<sup>1</sup> Observational studies were retrieved in the meta-analysis. When dealing with meta-analyses, in particular with meta-analyses of nonrandomized data, some key points in the building up process of the analysis must be considered.

The first issue not investigated in this article is the quality of studies included. Meta-analyses of observational studies face the challenge of incorporating studies with various quality levels. Including studies of various quality levels can mask or can have a reverse effect.<sup>2</sup> The "Newcastle-Ottawa Scale" for assessing quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses is quite comprehensive and has been recommended by the Cochrane

Nonrandomized Studies Methods Working Group.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, the authors did not include a table on the quality evaluation of the studies retrieved in their work, as conventionally recommended.

The second issue is the "publication bias." Since published studies are more likely to find their way into a meta-analysis, any bias in the literature is likely to be reflected in the meta-analysis as well, and in particular, in the case of meta-analysis of observational data.<sup>2,4</sup> A simple graphic test such as the funnel plot could have excluded this bias by showing in the graph a symmetrical distribution of the studies included.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, the investigation of this bias was not performed in this work. These drawbacks make the accuracy of the pooled estimates of the analysis questionable.

*Eliano Pio Navarese, MD*  
*Antonino Buffon, MD*  
*Giuseppe De Luca, MD, PhD*  
*Stefano De Servi, FESC*

Department of Cardiology  
Eastern Piedmont University  
Novara, Italy

## REFERENCES

1. Jonker FH, Trimarchi S, Verhagen HJ, Moll FL, Sumpio BE, Muhs BE. Meta-analysis of open versus endovascular repair for ruptured descending thoracic aortic aneurysm. *J Vasc Surg* 2010;51:1026-32, 1032.e1-e2.
2. Navarese EP, Lupi A, Buffon A, Franchi E, Aurelio A, Sansa M, Bongo AS. Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies in interventional cardiology: a critical appraisal. *Ital J Pub Health* 2009;6:4.
3. Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.0.1 [updated September 2008]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008. Available at: <http://www.cochrane-handbook.org/>.
4. Easterbrook PJ, Berlin JA, Gopalan R, Matthews DR. Publication bias in clinical research. *Lancet* 1991;337:867-72.
5. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629-34.

doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2010.04.084

## Reply

We would like to thank Navarese et al for their interest and reaction regarding our meta-analysis about the outcomes of open and endovascular repair of ruptured descending thoracic aortic aneurysms (rDTAA). We agree that meta-analyses of non-randomized studies have considerable limitations, which we have addressed in the limitations section at the end of the article. Currently, no randomized controlled trials or large prospective studies have compared the outcomes of open and endovascular repair of rDTAA, and the optimal approach for this emergency remains unclear. Given the rarity of this condition, and its emergent nature, it will be very difficult to ever realize a randomized study investigating the outcomes of rDTAA after both treatments. In the absence of level I evidence, we decided to perform a meta-analysis of the available studies between 1995 and June 2009, in order to provide more insights into this rare but lethal disease, by reporting the overall results of open and endovascular repair of rDTAA in the literature. Despite the described limitations of such a meta-analysis, we believe that our methodology was adequate and that the article provides a concise summary of the published outcomes, which could, therefore, improve the current knowledge about the management and outcomes of rDTAA.

Although the suggestions of Navarese et al might have improved the methodology of our meta-analysis, we doubt that these would have changed the inclusion and exclusion of the