

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Comparative efficacy and safety of different catheter ablation strategies for persistent atrial fibrillation: a network meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1802252> since 2022-11-12T09:12:18Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1093/ehjqcco/qcab066

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 Abstract

2 **Aims.** Whereas pulmonary vein isolation (PVI) is the universally agreed target in catheter
3 ablation of paroxysmal AF, an ideal ablation set in persistent AF patients remains questioned.
4 Aim of the present study is to conduct a network meta-analysis (NMA) of available randomized
5 controlled clinical trials (RCTs) comparing different ablation strategies in persistent AF
6 patients.

7 **Methods and Results.** NMA was performed in a frequentist framework with the different
8 ablation strategies constituting the competitive arms of interest. Primary efficacy endpoint was
9 recurrences of atrial tachyarrhythmia (AF, atrial flutter and/or organized atrial tachycardia).
10 Secondary endpoints included major peri-procedural complications, procedure and fluoroscopy
11 duration. PubMed/MEDLINE and EMBASE databases were searched through June 2020.
12 2548 records were screened and 57 full-text articles assessed. Eventually 24 RCTs were
13 included, encompassing 3,245 patients (median follow-up 15 months, IQR 12-18). Compared
14 to PVI alone, PVI plus linear lesions in the left atrium and elimination of extra-PV sources was
15 the only strategy associated with a reduced risk of arrhythmia recurrence (RR 0.49, 95% CI
16 0.27-0.88). Most treatment arms were associated with longer procedural time compared with
17 PVI, however, major peri-procedural complications and fluoroscopy time did not differ.

18 **Conclusion.** A comprehensive strategy including PVI, linear lesions in the left atrium and
19 elimination of extra-PV sources (constrained by a heterogeneous definition across studies)
20 associated with reduced risk of recurrent atrial tachyarrhythmias compared to PVI alone. All
21 investigated treatments arms yielded similar safety profiles. Further research should rely on
22 enhanced substrate-based approach definitions to solve one of the most evident knowledge gaps
23 in interventional electrophysiology.

24 *Keywords:* atrial fibrillation; persistent; catheter ablation; strategies

1 Introduction

2 Atrial fibrillation (AF) catheter ablation is recommended to improve symptoms and quality of
3 life in patients in whom pharmacologic therapy has failed, and as first line treatment, in patients
4 with heart failure¹.

5 Ablation target in paroxysmal AF ablation is well defined, with pulmonary vein isolation (PVI)
6 being the established approach. Conversely, an ideal ablation set in case of persistent AF is
7 lacking². In fact, the need of additional ablation lesions in this subset of patients is questioned³.

8 The underlying rationale is that due to the wider atrial remodeling⁴, mechanisms other than the
9 sole pulmonary vein (PV) triggers are likely implied in onset and maintenance of the arrhythmia.

10 In this scenario extra PV trigger ablation⁵, substrate-modification by creation of lines of block⁶,
11 elimination of complex fractionated atrial electrograms (CFAE)⁷ or low voltage areas (LVA)⁸
12 seem intriguing; a role for ganglionic plexi⁹ and rotor¹⁰ ablation has also been advocated. As a
13 matter of fact, despite doubts on effectiveness¹¹, several randomized clinical trials (RCTs) have
14 been published on alternative ablation targets, other than PVI, in persistent AF procedures.

15 Few meta-analyses have compared the alternative ablation lesion sets with conventional PVI in
16 persistent AF patients, leading to conflicting results. While a potential benefit of additional
17 ablation lesions occasionally emerged¹², other analyses did not register any statistically
18 significant improvement on long term arrhythmic outcomes in patients treated with additional
19 ablation strategies compared to PVI^{13,14}. Notably, a meta-regression on 58 studies (randomized
20 and observational)¹⁵ suggested that lines of block and CFAE ablation improve intraprocedural
21 AF termination but not arrhythmia-free long-term outcomes, while posterior wall isolation and
22 left atrial (LA) appendage isolation, which frequently embody extra-PV sources, relate to
23 improved long-term rhythm outcomes.

24 Network meta-analysis (NMA) is a recent development in the statistical field, which extends
25 principles of meta-analysis to the evaluation of multiple treatments in a single analysis,

1 overcoming the main limitation of classical pairwise approaches comparing only two
2 interventions at a time¹⁶.
3 Driven by one of the most evident knowledge gaps in interventional electrophysiology, aim of
4 the present study was to conduct a NMA on available RCTs to compare different ablation
5 strategies in persistent AF patients and identify the most effective and safe ablation strategy.

1 **Methods**

2 Literature search and study selection

3 PubMed, MEDLINE and EMBASE databases were searched for relevant articles using the
4 following search strategy: ((((((atrial fibrillation OR af OR afib)) AND (persistent OR long-
5 standing OR chronic OR non-paroxysmal OR longstanding OR nonparoxysmal OR non
6 paroxysmal OR long standing)) AND (ablation OR catheter ablation OR afca)) AND (clinical
7 trial OR random*))). MESH terms and publication type labels were avoided, in order not to
8 miss studies that could have not already been indexed when the search was performed. Search
9 ended in June 2020. Results were screened by three independent authors (A.B., A.S. and M.A.)
10 through title and abstract, divergences were solved by consensus. Non-English language studies,
11 abstracts and unpublished data were excluded. Inclusion criteria were:

- 12 • RCTs in patients undergoing percutaneous catheter ablation for non-paroxysmal atrial
13 fibrillation;
- 14 • presence of at least two arms in the protocol of each study, comparing different strategy
15 of ablation;
- 16 • presence of at least 10 patients with non-paroxysmal AF for each study arm;
- 17 • indication of number of recurrences or patients free from atrial arrhythmia at the end of
18 follow-up;
- 19 • randomization to different ablation strategies before the procedure (to ensure adherence
20 to the transitivity principle, studies focusing on a certain subgroup of AF patients as, for
21 example, those without restoration of sinus rhythm after PVI, were excluded).

22 Risk of bias assessment was performed at the study level using the Cochrane bias risk
23 assessment tool (RoB2)¹⁷. Studies were classified as low-risk if all domains were low risk; if
24 one or two domains presented some concerns, studies were classified as intermediate risk; if
25 three domains presented some concerns or one domain was high-risk, studies were deemed at

1 high risk for bias. Results were reported according to Cochrane recommendation¹⁸ and the
2 specific PRISMA statement¹⁹.

3

4 Data collection, competitive arms and study endpoint

5 The following study-level data were collected: general characteristics, patient population,
6 ablation strategies, follow-up duration, major inclusion and exclusion criteria, primary and
7 secondary end-points, and sponsor (Supplementary Table S1).

8 Stroke risk evaluation was based on the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score [congestive heart failure history;
9 hypertension history; age \geq 75 years old – 2 points; diabetes mellitus history; stroke/transient
10 ischemic attack/thromboembolism history – 2 points; vascular disease history (prior myocardial
11 infarction, peripheral artery disease or aortic plaque); age 65-74 years old; sex category –
12 female, 1 point]^{20,21}.

13 The different ablation strategies constituted the competitive arms of interest and were described
14 according to a modular scheme, categorized in predetermined singular ablation approaches, as
15 follows: pulmonary vein isolation [PVI], ablation lines [LIN], complex fractionated atrial
16 electrogram ablation [CFAE], ganglionic plexi ablation [ganglionic], extra PV sources ablation
17 [extraPV], posterior wall box isolation [BOX], low voltage area ablation [LVA]. A stepwise
18 ablation strategy [stepwise] was also considered as a separate ablation strategy. In more details
19 LIN included LA roof line, LA posterior wall line, mitral isthmus line, LA anterior line and LA
20 septal line. ExtraPV sources were thoroughly searched for in the atria (and superior vena cava)
21 during isoprotenerol infusion; presence was registered when a repetitive regular activity
22 emerged (study specific details in Table S1, Supplementary Material).

23 For the purpose of this analysis, cavo-tricuspid isthmus (CTI) ablation was not included as a
24 competitive arm of interest. Nevertheless, whenever part of the study protocol, it was reported
25 in Table S1 (Supplementary Material).

1 Primary efficacy endpoint of the present analysis was the number of recurrences of any atrial
2 arrhythmia (AF, atrial flutter and/or organized atrial tachycardia) at the longest follow-up period
3 for which event counts were available. Secondary endpoints included safety (peri-procedural
4 major complications: please refer to Supplementary Table S2 for study-specific definitions), as
5 well as procedure and fluoroscopy duration.

6

7 Statistical analysis

8 Pooled estimates of baseline characteristics of study populations were calculated by meta-
9 analysis of mean values for continuous variables and percentage for categorical variables with
10 the corresponding 95% CI, using a generic random-effect inverse variance model. Follow-up
11 duration was summarized as median values between the studies with the corresponding
12 interquartile range (IQR). In case of binary endpoint, comparison between the competitive arms
13 was performed in terms of risk ratio (RR), while mean difference (MD) was used as summary
14 measure in case of continuous outcome. For each contrast, RR, its standard error and the
15 corresponding 95%CI were calculated (detailed summary of study-level outcome data used for
16 the NMA of primary and secondary endpoints are reported in the Supplementary Table S3 and
17 Table S2-5, respectively; the R code used is indicated in the Appendix). NMA was performed
18 in a frequentist framework, using a random-effect model accounting for correlations induced
19 by multi-arm trials (the used statistical package automatically accounts for within-study
20 correlation by reweighting comparisons of each multi-arm study). The competitive arm
21 characterized by PVI-only ablation strategy was used as the reference group. Cochran's Q
22 statistics and I^2 statistics was used to evaluate heterogeneity/inconsistency across the network.
23 In particular, the Q statistic was decomposed in a within-design Q statistic (representing
24 heterogeneity in studies comparing the same treatment arms) and a between-design Q statistic
25 (which incorporates the concept of design inconsistency). To assess the inconsistency in a

1 random-effect model, the between-design Q statistic was calculated based on a full design-by-
2 treatment interaction random effects model, as proposed by Higgins²². Publication bias was
3 assessed by comparison-adjusted funnel plot²³ and Egger's test²⁴. The Grading of
4 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) method was used to
5 evaluate the certainty of the network meta-analysis evidence²⁵. Sensitivity analyses was also
6 performed after excluding studies with a high risk of bias. Treatment ranking was assessed by
7 p-scores²⁶, the frequentist analogues of Surface Under the Cumulative RAnking curve (SUCRA)
8 values in the Bayesian framework, which measure the extent of certainty that a treatment is
9 better than another, averaged over all competing treatments. Analyses were performed using
10 the R version 4.0.0; in particular, NMA was performed with the R package *netmeta* (version
11 1.2)²⁷.

1 Results

2 Out of 57 eligible studies, 24 were finally included in the analysis (Figure 1). A detailed
3 description of the selection process, including references and reasons for exclusion is found in
4 the Supplementary Appendix.

5 Table 1 reports treatment arm, sample size and bibliographic references for each of the 24
6 included RCTs. Main characteristics of each study are reported in the Supplementary Appendix
7 (Table S1).

8 The included studies encompassed 3,245 patients, with a median follow-up of 15 (IQR 12-18)
9 months. Table 2 reports summarized baseline characteristics of studies included in this review.
10 Pooled mean age was 58.1 (95%CI 57.7-58.4) years, with a 3:1 male-to-female pooled ratio
11 (males 79%, 95%CI 77-80%). Hypertension was a frequent concurrent comorbid condition
12 (52%, 95%CI 50-54%). Diabetic patients accounted for a pooled mean 10% of the included
13 patients (95%CI 9-12%), while baseline heart failure was present in 5% of the patients (95%CI
14 4-6%; pooled mean left ventricular ejection fraction [LVEF] 56.7%, 95%CI 56.4-57.0%). 8%
15 of the patients had ischemic heart disease (95%CI 7-9%) and 4% had history of previous
16 thromboembolic events (95%CI 3-5%). Pooled mean LA antero-posterior diameter was 45.2
17 mm (95%CI 44.9-45.4 mm). The pooled mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc score was 1.8 (95% CI 1.6-
18 1.9). Pooled mean AF history was 4.1 years (95%CI 3.9-4.3), while pooled mean duration of
19 persistent episodes was 8.9 months (95%CI 8.7-9.1 months). Three of the included studies were
20 deemed at high risk of bias, since three out of the five RoB2 assessed domains presented alarms
21 (Figure 2).

22

23 *Primary outcome analysis*

24 All included studies reported recurrences of atrial tachyarrhythmias (Supplementary Table S3).
25 Figure 3 graphically represents the network of treatment arms included in the primary outcome

1 analysis. 14 treatment arms (graph nodes) were encompassed, with 17 different designs and 28
2 pairwise comparisons. 2 studies^{11,28} were multi-arm studies. The most frequent design was
3 PVI+LIN vs PVI (5 studies reported this pairwise comparison).

4 Compared to PVI alone (Figure 4), PVI+LIN+extraPV was the only strategy reducing the risk
5 of atrial arrhythmia recurrence during follow-up (RR 0.49, 95%CI 0.27-0.88). Table 3 is the
6 NMA league table for the primary outcome, providing pairwise comparison between the
7 investigated treatment arms. We found that standalone ganglionic plexi ablation was the least
8 likely to achieve the best results if compared to most of the other treatments. GRADE
9 assessment of each pairwise comparison is reported under the RR estimate to evaluate certainty:
10 GRADE assessment of comparisons including PVI resulted, on average, higher.

11 Figure 5 reports treatment arm ranking according to p-score values. Of note, ablation strategies
12 based on a single approach (LIN, PVI, CFAE, ganglionic) achieved the lowest rankings.

13 Some degree of heterogeneity/inconsistency across the network ($I^2 = 68\%$) was found; within-
14 design heterogeneity was significant (Q statistics: 18.46, p-value 0.010), while no between-
15 design inconsistency was detected (Q statistics: 9.11, p-value 0.168). Further decomposition of
16 the within-design Q statistics indicates the PVI+LIN vs PVI design as the culprit of the observed
17 heterogeneity (p-value 0.015). Funnel plot analysis (Supplementary Figure S1) and Egger test
18 did not indicate potential publication bias (p-value 0.837).

19 A sensitivity analysis, excluding the three studies deemed at high risk of bias, yielded unvaried
20 results, with the PVI+LIN+extraPV arm consistently remaining the only ablation strategy
21 achieving improved arrhythmia freedom compared to PVI alone (Supplementary Figure S2).

22 Supplementary Figure S3 illustrates the direct evidence plot showing the proportion of direct
23 evidence available for network comparisons contributing both direct and indirect evidence.

24

25 *Secondary outcomes analysis*

1 15 out of the 24 included studies provided details concerning major peri-procedural
2 complications (Supplementary Table S2). 10 treatment arms (graph nodes) were encompassed,
3 with 11 different designs and 17 pairwise comparisons. No significant differences emerged
4 between the different treatment arms.

5 No heterogeneity/inconsistency was found for this outcome ($I^2 = 0\%$; within-design Q statistic
6 2.00, p-value 0.734; between-design Q statistic 0.38, p-value 0.944). Forest plot, with PVI alone
7 ablation strategy as reference, and NMA league table, providing pairwise comparison between
8 the included treatment arms, are reported in Supplementary Appendix (Supplementary Figure
9 S4 and Supplementary Table S4, respectively).

10 15 and 17 out of the 24 included studies reported data on procedure and fluoroscopy time,
11 respectively (Supplementary Table S5). 12 treatment arms (graph nodes) were encompassed for
12 both outcomes, with 13 and 14 different designs and 17 and 19 pairwise comparisons for
13 procedure and fluoroscopy time, respectively. Compared to PVI alone, a significant increase in
14 mean procedure duration was observed for all treatment arms, except ganglionic plexi ablation
15 (Supplementary Figure S5). Fluoroscopy time, however, did not significantly differ between
16 the different strategies (Supplementary Figure S6).

1 Discussion

2 The main findings of the present study on catheter ablation of persistent AF can be summarized
3 as follows: 1) a comprehensive ablation set including PVI, lines of block in the LA, and
4 elimination of extra-PV sources is the only strategy, compared to PVI alone, associated with a
5 reduced risk of recurrent atrial tachyarrhythmias; 2) strategies involving single approaches
6 show the least likelihood of being the ideal treatment; 3) the investigated treatment arms have
7 similar safety profiles, not exposing, compared to PVI alone, to an increase of peri-procedural
8 complications or longer fluoroscopy times.

9 It is widely acknowledged that AF catheter ablation outcomes are suboptimal in patients with
10 persistent AF, if compared to paroxysmal AF^{1,2}. Anatomical, electrical and mechanical
11 remodeling, induced both by the arrhythmia itself ('AF begets AF')²⁹ and by the eventual
12 underlying heart disease, are within the most likely reasons. At least hypothetically, thus, the
13 arrhythmia may result in less "PV trigger" and more "substrate" dependent. In addition, non-
14 PV triggers, which can be found in 10-33% of unselected patients undergoing AF catheter
15 ablation, more easily act as arrhythmia initiators in the context of an altered atrial substrate³⁰.
16 However, despite several adjunctive ablation approaches have been proposed and tested, a
17 definitive conclusion regarding the potential additional benefit compared to PVI alone has not
18 been reached. In fact, the latest consensus document on AF catheter ablation recommends PVI
19 isolation as the cornerstone approach in every procedure (class I recommendation), suggesting
20 only a marginal role for adjunctive ablation approaches (class IIb recommendation)².

21 The present NMA, to our knowledge the first of its kind, holds the advantage of being able to
22 gather evidence both from direct and indirect comparisons, allowing ranking of different
23 ablation strategies in similar settings. The similar inclusion criteria of the included studies
24 (please refer to Table S1) guarantee the satisfaction of the transitivity assumption, one of the
25 most important statistical assumptions underlying a network meta-analysis. In this sense, our

1 choice of excluding studies in which patients were randomized after PVI and/or included in the
2 study only if the PVI was not able to restore sinus rhythm (refer to Supplementary Material)
3 was driven by the fact that, including these studies with a selected subgroup of persistent AF
4 patients, would have violated the transitivity principle. In addition, NMA, as suggested by
5 previous literature^{31,32}, has been used to compare non independent treatments (e.g. PVI and
6 PVI+LIN+extraPV both include PVI). The finding that an approach including PVI, linear lines
7 of block and elimination of non-PV triggers represents the best transcatheter treatment option
8 for persistent AF supports the rationale that a comprehensive ablation strategy targeting all
9 postulated components of AF induction and maintenance (PV/non-PV triggers and susceptible
10 atrial substrate) is needed. Previous meta-analysis, albeit not designed as network meta-analysis,
11 suggested PVI alone might be inferior to a more comprehensive ablation scheme in persistent
12 AF patients: Sau et al.¹⁵, in a recent meta-regression, suggested that linear blocks and CFAE
13 ablation did not relate to improved long-term freedom from arrhythmia recurrences, while
14 posterior wall isolation and LA appendage isolation were associated with fewer long-term
15 arrhythmia recurrences. Similarly, Romero et al.¹² reported that LA appendage isolation, in
16 addition to PVI, improved long-term freedom from atrial arrhythmia recurrence, without
17 increasing acute periprocedural complications or the risk of stroke. Conversely, other meta-
18 analysis did not register significant benefits for CFAE ablation and linear blocks¹⁴, as well as
19 for ganglionated plexi ablation¹³. Overall, the main difference of these analyses is that they limit
20 their focus to a single alternative ablation approach, while the present work, assesses the effect
21 of comprehensive strategies, including more than one strategy in addition to PVI.
22 Similar indications supporting the benefit of a comprehensive ablation scheme originate,
23 indirectly, from cohorts of patients who have, for other reasons, modified LA substrate and
24 eliminated ectopic sources. During heart transplantation, for example, the recipients receive a
25 complete (“cut and sew”) electrical isolation of the PV/posterior LA wall and venae cavae,

1 similar to the target of the PVI+LIN+extraPV ablation strategy. In a recent observational study
2 on more than 350 heart transplantation patients followed for 10 years, despite a high
3 comorbidity burden, persistent AF incidence was extremely low (0.3%)³³. Interestingly, the four
4 ablation strategies yielding the lowest p-scores consisted in single approaches (PVI, LIN, CFAE,
5 and ganglionic ablation alone, not in combination).

6 Given the mean duration of AF episodes of 8.9 months (95% CI 8.7-9.1), present findings are
7 mainly generalizable to persistent AF cases with at least about 9-month episode duration. It
8 cannot be excluded that less complex strategies, as PVI alone, may be sufficient in AF cases
9 with less than 6-month duration, particularly in case of short diagnosis-to-ablation time³⁴.

10 Importantly all investigated strategies did not result in an increased risk of major peri-
11 procedural complications. The sole potential trade-off is that more comprehensive treatment
12 arms require longer procedural times, however, without increasing fluoroscopy exposure to the
13 patient, most likely associated with the wide use in this setting of three-dimensional electro-
14 anatomical mapping systems³⁵.

15

1 *Limitations*

2 First, the modular definition of the treatment arms is a forced but necessary simplification of
3 the broad spectrum of ablation protocols: in particular, the same ablation approach can refer to
4 non-identical interventions in different studies (for example, in the extraPV approach different
5 sources can be targeted; similarly, PVI can be performed by ostial or wide antral isolation, as
6 well as linear lesions may include different combination of ablation lines). In this regard, the
7 hot-spot of heterogeneity identified in studies comparing PVI vs PVI+LIN, the most frequent
8 design in the included RCTs, might be explained both by the heterogeneous definition of the
9 lines, and the challenge of obtaining continuous and transmural lesions, requiring validation by
10 differential pacing. Moreover, we cannot exclude that the modular and simplified classification
11 of the treatment arms may, at least partly, reduce the validity of the transitivity assumption.
12 Second, definition of persistent AF can be heterogeneous, as it reflects guidelines indication
13 contemporary to the specific study. Anyhow, mean duration of persistent AF episodes (8.9
14 months) strongly suggests inclusion of “true” persistent AF patients¹. Third, outcome
15 assessment during follow-up, anti-arrhythmic drugs management and blanking period
16 definition vary across studies. However, the use of a random effect model was chosen to cope
17 with the anticipated heterogeneity within studies. Fourth, the lack of specification of recurrence
18 type (AF, atrial flutter and/or organized atrial tachycardia) in most of the studies prevented
19 subtype-specific analysis and, consequently, assessment of any potential pro-arrhythmic effect
20 (iatrogenic atrial flutter and/or organized atrial tachycardia) of the different treatment arms.
21 Finally, albeit the period range of the included studies is wide (2005-2019), the nature of NMA
22 (where the single studies are head-to-head comparisons) limits the possible impact of
23 technological advancement on overall results, being the time-dependent benefit comparable for
24 all ablation strategies.

1 **Conclusion**

2 In this network meta-analysis of catheter ablation strategies in persistent AF patients, a
3 comprehensive strategy including PVI, linear lesion in the LA and elimination of extra-PV
4 triggers was the only approach, compared to PVI alone, associated to reduced risk of recurrent
5 atrial tachyarrhythmias. All investigated treatments arms yielded similar safety profiles, not
6 differing concerning peri-procedural complications. Further research should rely on enhanced
7 substrate-based definitions, going beyond the actual heterogeneous definitions of extra-
8 pulmonary vein sources, to definitely solve one of the most evident knowledge gaps in
9 interventional electrophysiology.

10

11

1 **Acknowledgments**

2 None.

3

1 **Sources of funding**

2 None.

1 **Ethics**

2 Not applicable.

3

1 **Data availability statement**

- 2 The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

1 **Supplementary material**

2 Supplementary data to this article are available online. Including:

3 Additional Results

4 R code

5 Online Figures S1-S6

6 Online Tables S1-S5

1 References

- 2 1. Hindricks G, Potpara T, Dagres N, Arbelo E, Bax JJ, Blomström-Lundqvist C, Boriani
3 G, Castella M, Dan G-A, Dilaveris PE, Fauchier L, Filippatos G, Kalman JM, Meir M
4 La, Lane DA, Lebeau J-P, Lettino M, Lip GYH, Pinto FJ, Thomas GN, Valgimigli M,
5 Gelder IC Van, Putte BP Van, Watkins CL, Kirchhof P, Kühne M, Aboyans V, Ahlsson
6 A, Balsam P, Bauersachs J, et al. 2020 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and
7 management of atrial fibrillation developed in collaboration with the European
8 Association of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Eur Heart J* Oxford University
9 Press (OUP); 2020;1–126.
- 10 2. Calkins H, Hindricks G, Cappato R, Kim Y-H, Saad EB, Aguinaga L, Akar JG,
11 Badhwar V, Brugada J, Camm J, Chen P-S, Chen S-A, Chung MK, Nielsen JC, Curtis
12 AB, Davies DW, Day JD, D’Avila A, Groot NMS (Natasja) de, Biase L Di,
13 Duytschaever M, Edgerton JR, Ellenbogen KA, Ellinor PT, Ernst S, Fenelon G,
14 Gerstenfeld EP, Haines DE, Haissaguerre M, Helm RH, et al. 2017
15 HRS/EHRA/ECAS/APHRs/SOLAECE expert consensus statement on catheter and
16 surgical ablation of atrial fibrillation. *Heart Rhythm* Elsevier Inc.; 2017;14:e275–e444.
- 17 3. Dagres N, Bongiorni MG, Larsen TB, Hernandez-Madrid A, Pison L, Blomström-
18 Lundqvist C. Current ablation techniques for persistent atrial fibrillation: results of the
19 European Heart Rhythm Association Survey. *Europace* 2015;17:1596–1600.
- 20 4. Teh AW, Kistler PM, Lee G, Medi C, Heck PM, Spence SJ, Sparks PB, Morton JB,
21 Kalman JM. Electroanatomic remodeling of the left atrium in paroxysmal and
22 persistent atrial fibrillation patients without structural heart disease. *J Cardiovasc*
23 *Electrophysiol* J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol; 2012;23:232–238.
- 24 5. Santangeli P, Zado ES, Hutchinson MD, Riley MP, Lin D, Frankel DS, Supple GE,
25 Garcia FC, Dixit S, Callans DJ, Marchlinski FE. Prevalence and distribution of focal

- 1 triggers in persistent and long-standing persistent atrial fibrillation. *Hear Rhythm*
2 Elsevier; 2016;**13**:374–382.
- 3 6. Jaïs P, Hocini M, Hsu LF, Sanders P, Scavee C, Weerasooriya R, Macle L, Raybaud F,
4 Garrigue S, Shah DC, Metayer P Le, Clémenty J, Haïssaguerre M. Technique and
5 results of linear ablation at the mitral isthmus. *Circulation* 2004;**110**:2996–3002.
- 6 7. Wong KCK, Paisey JR, Sopher M, Balasubramaniam R, Jones M, Qureshi N, Hayes
7 CR, Ginks MR, Rajappan K, Bashir Y, Betts TR. No Benefit of Complex Fractionated
8 Atrial Electrogram Ablation in Addition to Circumferential Pulmonary Vein Ablation
9 and Linear Ablation. *Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* United States; 2015;**8**:1316–1324.
- 10 8. Kircher S, Arya A, Altmann D, Rolf S, Bollmann A, Sommer P, Dagues N, Richter S,
11 Breithardt O-A, Dinov B, Husser D, Eitel C, Gaspar T, Piorkowski C, Hindricks G.
12 Individually tailored vs. standardized substrate modification during radiofrequency
13 catheter ablation for atrial fibrillation: a randomized study. *EP Eur* England;
14 2018;**20**:1766–1775.
- 15 9. Pokushalov E, Romanov A, Katritsis DG, Artyomenko S, Shirokova N, Karaskov A,
16 Mittal S, Steinberg JS. Ganglionated plexus ablation vs linear ablation in patients
17 undergoing pulmonary vein isolation for persistent/long-standing persistent atrial
18 fibrillation: A randomized comparison. *Hear Rhythm* Elsevier; 2013;**10**:1280–1286.
- 19 10. Narayan SM, Baykaner T, Clopton P, Schricker A, Lalani GG, Krummen DE,
20 Shivkumar K, Miller JM. Ablation of Rotor and Focal Sources Reduces Late
21 Recurrence of Atrial Fibrillation Compared With Trigger Ablation Alone. *J Am Coll*
22 *Cardiol* United States; 2014;**63**:1761–1768.
- 23 11. Verma A, Jiang CY, Betts TR, Chen J, Deisenhofer I, Mantovan R, Macle L, Morillo
24 CA, Haverkamp W, Weerasooriya R, Albenque J-PP, Nardi S, Menardi E, Novak P,
25 Sanders P. Approaches to catheter ablation for persistent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J*

- 1 *Med* 2015;**372**:1812–1822.
- 2 12. Romero J, Michaud GF, Avendano R, Briceño DF, Kumar S, Carlos Diaz J, Mohanty S,
3 Trivedi C, Gianni C, Rocca D Della, Proietti R, Perrotta L, Bordignon S, Chun JKR,
4 Schmidt B, Garcia M, Natale A, Biase L Di. Benefit of left atrial appendage electrical
5 isolation for persistent and long-standing persistent atrial fibrillation: a systematic
6 review and meta-analysis. *EP Eur Europace*; 2018;**20**:1268–1278.
- 7 13. Kampaktsis PN, Oikonomou EK, Y. Choi D, Cheung JW. Efficacy of ganglionated
8 plexi ablation in addition to pulmonary vein isolation for paroxysmal versus persistent
9 atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled clinical trials. *J Interv Card*
10 *Electrophysiol J Interv Card Electrophysiol*; 2017;**50**:253–260.
- 11 14. Scott PA, Silberbauer J, Murgatroyd FD. The impact of adjunctive complex
12 fractionated atrial electrogram ablation and linear lesions on outcomes in persistent
13 atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis. *Europace Europace*; 2016;**18**:359–367.
- 14 15. Sau A, Al-Aidarous S, Howard J, Shalhoub J, Sohaib A, Shun-Shin M, Novak PG,
15 Leather R, Sterns LD, Lane C, Kanagaratnam P, Peters NS, Francis DP, Sikkell MB.
16 Optimum lesion set and predictors of outcome in persistent atrial fibrillation ablation: a
17 meta-regression analysis. *EP Eur Europace*; 2019;**21**:1176–1184.
- 18 16. Roever L, Biondi-Zoccai G. Network meta-analysis to synthesize evidence for decision
19 making in cardiovascular research. *Arq. Bras. Cardiol. Arquivos Brasileiros de*
20 *Cardiologia*; 2016. p. 333–337.
- 21 17. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, Cates CJ,
22 Cheng HY, Corbett MS, Eldridge SM, Emberson JR, Hernán MA, Hopewell S,
23 Hróbjartsson A, Junqueira DR, Jüni P, Kirkham JJ, Lasserson T, Li T, McAleenan A,
24 Reeves BC, Shepperd S, Shrier I, Stewart LA, Tilling K, White IR, Whiting PF,
25 Higgins JPT. RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*

- 1 BMJ Publishing Group; 2019;**366**.
- 2 18. Chaimani A, Caldwell D, Li T, Higgins J, Salanti G. Chapter 11: Undertaking network
3 meta-analyses | Cochrane Training. 2020;1–69.
- 4 19. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, Ioannidis
5 JPA, Straus S, Thorlund K, Jansen JP, Mulrow C, Catalá-López F, Gøtzsche PC,
6 Dickersin K, Boutron I, Altman DG, Moher D. The PRISMA Extension Statement for
7 Reporting of Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses of Health Care
8 Interventions: Checklist and Explanations. *Ann Intern Med* Ann Intern Med;
9 2015;**162**:777.
- 10 20. Lip GYH, Nieuwlaat R, Pisters R, Lane DA, Crijns HJGM. Refining Clinical Risk
11 Stratification for Predicting Stroke and Thromboembolism in Atrial Fibrillation Using a
12 Novel Risk Factor-Based Approach. *Chest* Chest; 2010;**137**:263–272.
- 13 21. Friberg L, Rosenqvist M, Lip GYH. Evaluation of risk stratification schemes for
14 ischaemic stroke and bleeding in 182 678 patients with atrial fibrillation: the Swedish
15 Atrial Fibrillation cohort study. *Eur Heart J* Eur Heart J; 2012;**33**:1500–1510.
- 16 22. Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Barrett JK, Lu G, Ades AE, White IR. Consistency and
17 inconsistency in network meta - analysis: concepts and models for multi - arm studies.
18 *Res Synth Methods* Wiley; 2012;**3**:98–110.
- 19 23. Chaimani A, Salanti G. Using network meta-analysis to evaluate the existence of small-
20 study effects in a network of interventions. *Res Synth Methods* Res Synth Methods;
21 2012;**3**:161–176.
- 22 24. Sterne JA., Egger M. Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*
23 *J Clin Epidemiol*; 2001;**54**:1046–1055.
- 24 25. Salanti G, Giovane C Del, Chaimani A, Caldwell DM, Higgins JPT. Evaluating the
25 Quality of Evidence from a Network Meta-Analysis. Tu Y-K, ed. *PLoS One* PLoS One;

- 1 2014;**9**:e99682.
- 2 26. Rucker G, Schwarzer G. Ranking treatments in frequentist network meta-analysis
3 works without resampling methods. *BMC Med Res Methodol* BioMed Central Ltd.;
4 2015;**15**.
- 5 27. Schwarzer G, Carpenter JR, Rucker G. Meta-Analysis with R. Cham: Springer
6 International Publishing; 2015.
- 7 28. Verma A, Mantovan R, Macle L, Martino G De, Chen J, Morillo CA, Novak P,
8 Calzolari V, Guerra PG, Nair G, Torrecilla EG, Khaykin Y. Substrate and Trigger
9 Ablation for Reduction of Atrial Fibrillation (STAR AF): a randomized, multicentre,
10 international trial. *Eur Heart J* England; 2010;**31**:1344–1356.
- 11 29. Wijffels MCEF, Kirchhof CJHJ, Dorland R, Allessie MA. Atrial fibrillation begets
12 atrial fibrillation: A study in awake chronically instrumented goats. *Circulation* 1995;
- 13 30. Anselmino M, Matta M, Bunch TJ, Fiala M, Scaglione M, Nölker G, Qian P, Neumann
14 T, Ferraris F, Gaita F. Conduction recovery following catheter ablation in patients with
15 recurrent atrial fibrillation and heart failure. *Int J Cardiol* Elsevier Ireland Ltd;
16 2017;**240**:240–245.
- 17 31. Komajda M, Böhm M, Borer JS, Ford I, Tavazzi L, Pannaux M, Swedberg K.
18 Incremental benefit of drug therapies for chronic heart failure with reduced ejection
19 fraction: a network meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail* Eur J Heart Fail; 2018;**20**:1315–
20 1322.
- 21 32. Tseng AS, Kunze KL, Lee JZ, Amin M, Neville MR, Almader-Douglas D, Killu AM,
22 Madhavan M, Cha Y-M, Asirvatham SJ, Friedman PA, Gersh BJ, Mulpuru SK.
23 Efficacy of Pharmacologic and Cardiac Implantable Electronic Device Therapies in
24 Patients With Heart Failure and Reduced Ejection Fraction. *Circ Arrhythmia*
25 *Electrophysiol* Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol; 2019;**12**.

- 1 33. Anselmino M, Matta M, Saglietto A, Gallo C, Gaita F, Marchetto G, Rinaldi M, Ferrari
2 GM De, Boffini M. Long-term atrial arrhythmias incidence after heart transplantation.
3 *Int J Cardiol* Elsevier Ireland Ltd; 2020;
- 4 34. Chew DS, Black-Maier E, Loring Z, Noseworthy PA, Packer DL, Exner D V., Mark
5 DB, Piccini JP. Diagnosis-to-Ablation Time and Recurrence of Atrial Fibrillation
6 following Catheter Ablation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational
7 Studies. *Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* Lippincott Williams and Wilkins;
8 2020;**13**:350–357.
- 9 35. Gaita F, Guerra PG, Battaglia A, Anselmino M. The dream of near-zero X-rays ablation
10 comes true. *Eur Heart J* 2016;**37**:2749–2755.
- 11 36. Lee JM, Shim J, Park J, Yu HT, Kim T-H, Park J-K, Uhm J-S, Kim J-B, Joung B, Lee
12 M-H, Kim Y-H, Pak H-N. The Electrical Isolation of the Left Atrial Posterior Wall in
13 Catheter Ablation of Persistent Atrial Fibrillation. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol* United
14 States; 2019;**5**:1253–1261.
- 15 37. Pappone C, Ciconte G, Vicedomini G, Mangual JO, Li W, Conti M, Giannelli L,
16 Lipartiti F, McSpadden L, Ryu K, Guazzi M, Menicanti L, Santinelli V. Clinical
17 Outcome of Electrophysiologically Guided Ablation for Nonparoxysmal Atrial
18 Fibrillation Using a Novel Real-Time 3-Dimensional Mapping Technique. *Circ*
19 *Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* 2018;**11**:1–13.
- 20 38. Yang B, Jiang C, Lin Y, Yang G, Chu H, Cai H, Lu F, Zhan X, Xu J, Wang X, Ching C-
21 K, Singh B, Kim Y-H, Chen M. STABLE-SR (Electrophysiological Substrate Ablation
22 in the Left Atrium During Sinus Rhythm) for the Treatment of Nonparoxysmal Atrial
23 Fibrillation. *Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* United States; 2017;**10**.
- 24 39. Fink T, Schlüter M, Heeger CH, Lemes C, Maurer T, Reissmann B, Riedl J, Rottner L,
25 Santoro F, Schmidt B, Wohlmuth P, Mathew S, Sohns C, Ouyang F, Metzner A, Kuck


- 1 KH. Stand-Alone Pulmonary Vein Isolation Versus Pulmonary Vein Isolation with
2 Additional Substrate Modification as Index Ablation Procedures in Patients with
3 Persistent and Long-Standing Persistent Atrial Fibrillation: The Randomized Alster-
4 Lost-AF Trial (*Abl. Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* 2017;**10**:1–10.
- 5 40. Wynn GJ, Panikker S, Morgan M, Hall M, Waktare J, Markides V, Hussain W, Salukhe
6 T, Modi S, Jarman J, Jones DG, Snowdon R, Todd D, Wong T, Gupta D. Batrial linear
7 ablation in sustained nonpermanent AF: Results of the substrate modification with
8 ablation and antiarrhythmic drugs in nonpermanent atrial fibrillation (SMAN-PAF)
9 trial. *Hear Rhythm Elsevier*; 2016;**13**:399–406.
- 10 41. Bassiouny M, Saliba W, Hussein A, Rickard J, Diab M, Aman W, Dresing T, Callahan,
11 T, Bhargava M, Martin DO, Shao M, Baranowski B, Tarakji K, Tchou PJ, Hakim A,
12 Kanj M, Lindsay B, Wazni O. Randomized Study of Persistent Atrial Fibrillation
13 Ablation. *Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* 2016;**9**:1–11.
- 14 42. Dong J-Z, Sang C-H, Yu R-H, Long D-Y, Tang R-B, Jiang C-X, Ning M, Liu N, Liu X-
15 P, Du X, Tse H-F, Ma C-S. Prospective randomized comparison between a fixed
16 ‘2C3L’ approach vs. stepwise approach for catheter ablation of persistent atrial
17 fibrillation. *Europace England*; 2015;**17**:1798–1806.
- 18 43. Mamchur SE, Mamchur IN, Khomenko EA, Bokhan NS, Scherbinina DA. ‘Electrical
19 exclusion’ of a critical myocardial mass by extended pulmonary vein antrum isolation
20 for persistent atrial fibrillation treatment. *Interv Med Appl Sci* 2014;**6**:31–39.
- 21 44. Han SW, Shin SY, Im S Il, Na JO, Choi CU, Kim SH, Kim JW, Kim EJ, Rha S-W, Park
22 CG, Seo HS, Oh DJ, Hwang C, Lim HE. Does the amount of atrial mass reduction
23 improve clinical outcomes after radiofrequency catheter ablation for long-standing
24 persistent atrial fibrillation? Comparison between linear ablation and defragmentation.
25 *Int J Cardiol Elsevier Ireland Ltd*; 2014;**171**:37–43.

- 1 45. Lim TW, Koay CH, See VA, McCall R, Chik W, Zecchin R, Byth K, Seow S-C,
2 Thomas L, Ross DL, Thomas SP. Single-Ring Posterior Left Atrial (Box) Isolation
3 Results in a Different Mode of Recurrence Compared With Wide Antral Pulmonary
4 Vein Isolation on Long-Term Follow-Up. *Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* United
5 States; 2012;**5**:968–977.
- 6 46. Estner HL, Hessling G, Biegler R, Schreieck J, Fichtner S, Wu J, Jilek C, Zrenner B,
7 Ndrepepa G, Schmitt C, Deisenhofer I. Complex fractionated atrial electrogram or
8 linear ablation in patients with persistent atrial fibrillation-a prospective randomized
9 study. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol* United States: *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*;
10 2011;**34**:939–948.
- 11 47. Elayi CS, Biase L DI, Bai R, Burkhardt JD, Mohanty P, Sanchez J, Santangeli P, Hongo
12 R, Gallinghouse GJ, Horton R, Bailey S, Zagrodzky J, Beheiry S, Natale A. Identifying
13 the relationship between the non-PV triggers and the critical CFAE sites post-PVAI to
14 curtail the extent of atrial ablation in longstanding persistent AF. *J Cardiovasc*
15 *Electrophysiol* United States: *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*; 2011;**22**:1199–1205.
- 16 48. Dixit S, Marchlinski FE, Lin D, Callans DJ, Bala R, Riley MP, Garcia FC, Hutchinson
17 MD, Ratcliffe SJ, Cooper JM, Verdino RJ, Patel V V, Zado ES, Cash NR, Killian T,
18 Tomson TT, Gerstenfeld EP. Randomized Ablation Strategies for the Treatment of
19 Persistent Atrial Fibrillation. *Circ Arrhythmia Electrophysiol* United States;
20 2012;**5**:287–294.
- 21 49. Corrado A, Bonso A, Madalosso M, Rossillo A, Themistoclakis S, Biase L Di, Natale
22 A, Raviele A. Impact of systematic isolation of superior vena cava in addition to
23 pulmonary vein antrum isolation on the outcome of paroxysmal, persistent, and
24 permanent atrial fibrillation ablation: results from a randomized study. *J Cardiovasc*
25 *Electrophysiol* United States; 2010;**21**:1–5.

- 1 50. Gaita F, Caponi D, Scaglione M, Montefusco A, Corleto A, Monte F Di, Coin D,
2 Donna P Di, Giustetto C. Long-Term Clinical Results of 2 Different Ablation Strategies
3 in Patients With Paroxysmal and Persistent Atrial Fibrillation. *Circ Arrhythmia*
4 *Electrophysiol* 2008;**1**:269–275.
- 5 51. Willems S, Klemm H, Rostock T, Brandstrup B, Ventura R, Steven D, Risius T,
6 Lutomsky B, Meinertz T. Substrate modification combined with pulmonary vein
7 isolation improves outcome of catheter ablation in patients with persistent atrial
8 fibrillation: a prospective randomized comparison. *Eur Heart J* England;
9 2006;**27**:2871–2878.
- 10 52. Calò L, Lamberti F, Loricchio ML, Ruvo E De, Colivicchi F, Bianconi L, Pandozi C,
11 Santini M. Left Atrial Ablation Versus Biatrial Ablation for Persistent and Permanent
12 Atrial Fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* United States; 2006;**47**:2504–2512.
- 13 53. Fassini G, Riva S, Chiodeli R, Trevisi N, Berti M, Carbucicchio C, Maccabelli G,
14 Giraldi F, Bella P Della. Left mitral isthmus ablation associated with PV isolation:
15 Long-term results of a prospective randomized study. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*
16 United States: *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*; 2005;**16**:1150–1156.
- 17 54. Oral H, Chugh A, Good E, Igie P, Elmouchi D, Tschopp DR, Reich SS, Bogun F, Pelosi
18 F, Morady F. Randomized comparison of encircling and nonencircling left atrial
19 ablation for chronic atrial fibrillation. *Heart Rhythm* United States; 2005;**2**:1165–1172.
20
21

1 Figure Legends

2 Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection.



3

4


1 **Figure 2. Risk of bias assessment of the included studies using Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 tool (RoB2).**

<u>Study</u>	<u>D1</u>	<u>D2</u>	<u>D3</u>	<u>D4</u>	<u>D5</u>	<u>Overall</u>	
Lee 2019 (POBI-AF)							Low risk
Pappone 2018							Some concerns
Kircher 2018							High risk
Yang 2017 (STABLE-SR)							
Fink 2017 (Alster-Lost-AF)							D1 Randomisation process
Wynn 2016 (SMAN-PAF)							D2 Deviations from the intended interventions
Bassiouny 2016							D3 Missing outcome data
Wong 2015							D4 Measurement of the outcome
Verma 2015 (STAR-AF II)							D5 Selection of the reported result
Dong 2015							
Mamchur 2014							
Han 2014							
Pokushalov 2013							
Lim 2012							
Estner 2011							
Elayi 2011							
Dixit 2011 (RASTA)							
Verma 2010 (STAR-AF)							
Corrado 2009							
Gaita 2008							
Willems 2006							
Calò 2006							
Fassini 2005							
Oral 2005							

3


4

- 1 **Figure 3. Network plot for comparison of primary outcome (arrhythmia recurrences).**
- 2 Each node represents an ablation strategy. The width of the lines connecting two nodes is
- 3 proportional to the number of studies providing a direct comparison between the two strategies.
- 4 Shaded areas connect comparisons involved in multi-arm studies.



- 5
- 6 BOX: posterior wall box isolation; CFAE: complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation;
- 7 extraPV: extra pulmonary veins AF triggers ablation; ganglionic: ganglionic plexi ablation; LIN:
- 8 ablation lines; LVA: low voltage area ablation; PVI: pulmonary vein isolation; stepwise:
- 9 stepwise ablation strategy.


- 1 **Figure 4 (Representative figure). Network meta-analysis forest plot for primary outcome**
- 2 **(arrhythmia recurrences) comparing different ablation strategies with PVI.**



- 3
- 4 BOX: posterior wall box isolation; CFAE: complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation;
- 5 extraPV: extra pulmonary veins AF triggers ablation; ganglionic: ganglionic plexi ablation; LIN:
- 6 ablation lines; LVA: low voltage area ablation; PVI: pulmonary vein isolation; stepwise:
- 7 stepwise ablation strategy.

1 **Figure 5. Treatment ranking based on p-score (probability of being ranked the best**
 2 **treatment) analysis.**

3



4

5 BOX: posterior wall box isolation; CFAE: complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation;
 6 extraPV: extra pulmonary veins AF triggers ablation; ganglionic: ganglionic plexi ablation; LIN:
 7 ablation lines; LVA: low voltage area ablation; PVI: pulmonary vein isolation; stepwise:
 8 stepwise ablation strategy.

1 Tables

2 **Table 1. Studies included, treatment arms and number of patients for each arm.**

Study	Treatment Group 1	Treatment Group 2	Treatment Group 3	N1	N2	N3
Lee 2019 (POBI-AF) ³⁶	PVI+extraPV	PVI+LIN+extraPV		105	102	
Pappone 2018 ³⁷	PVI+LIN	PVI+LIN+extraPV		40	41	
Kircher 2018 ⁸	PVI+LIN	PVI+LVA		25	36	
Yang 2017 (STABLE-SR) ³⁸	PVI+LVA	stepwise		114	114	
Fink 2017 (Alster-Lost-AF) ³⁹	PVI	stepwise		61	57	
Wynn 2016 (SMAN-PAF) ⁴⁰	PVI	PVI+LIN		39	40	
Bassiouny 2016 ⁴¹	PVI+extraPV	PVI+extraPV+CFAE		46	44	
Wong 2015 ⁷	PVI+LIN	PVI+LIN+CFAE		65	65	
Verma 2015 (STAR-AF II) ^{11*}	PVI	PVI+CFAE	PVI+LIN	67	263	259
Dong 2015 ⁴²	PVI+LIN	stepwise		73	73	
Mamchur 2014 ⁴³	PVI	ganglionic		83	37	
Han 2014 ⁴⁴	PVI+LIN	PVI+CFAE		60	59	
Pokushalov 2013 ⁹	PVI+LIN	PVI+ganglionic		132	132	
Lim 2012 ⁴⁵	PVI+LIN	BOX		44	41	
Estner 2011 ⁴⁶	PVI+LIN	PVI+CFAE		59	57	
Elayi 2011 ⁴⁷	PVI+extraPV	PVI+extraPV+CFAE		48	50	
Dixit 2011 (RASTA) ⁴⁸	PVI+extraPV	PVI+extraPV+CFAE		105	51	
Verma 2010 (STAR-AF) ²⁸	PVI	CFAE	PVI+CFAE	11	13	12
Corrado 2009 ⁴⁹	PVI	PVI+extraPV		87	73	
Gaita 2008 ⁵⁰	PVI	PVI+LIN		26	53	
Willems 2006 ⁵¹	PVI	PVI+LIN		30	32	
Calò 2006 ⁵²	PVI+LIN	PVI+LIN+extraPV		41	39	
Fassini 2005 ⁵³	PVI	PVI+LIN		29	32	
Oral 2005 ⁵⁴	PVI+LIN	LIN		40	40	

3 * 40 patients were eventually not included in the outcome analysis.

4 BOX: posterior wall box isolation; CFAE: complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation;

5 extraPV: extra pulmonary veins AF triggers ablation; ganglionic: ganglionic plexi ablation; LIN:

- 1 ablation lines; LVA: low voltage area ablation; N1, N2 and N3: number of patients in treatment
- 2 group 1, 2 and 3, respectively; PVI: pulmonary vein isolation; stepwise: stepwise ablation
- 3 strategy.
- 4

1 **Table 2. Pooled baseline clinical features of the meta-analytic population.**

Baseline characteristics	Pooled mean/proportion (95%CI)
Age [years]	58.1 (57.7-58.4)
Males	79% (77-80%)
Hypertension	52% (50-54%)
Diabetes	10% (9-12%)
Heart failure	5% (4-6%)
LVEF [%]	56.7 (56.4-57.0)
Ischemic heart disease	8% (7-9%)
Previous thromboembolic events	4% (3-5%)
Left atrial antero-posterior diameter [mm]	45.2 (44.9-45.4)
CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc score	1.8 (1.6-1.9)
AF history [years]	4.1 (3.9-4.3)
Duration of persistent episodes [months]	8.9 (8.7-9.1)

2

3 CHA₂DS₂-VASc score: congestive heart failure history; hypertension history; age \geq 75 years
4 old – 2 points; diabetes mellitus history; stroke/transient ischemic attack/thromboembolism
5 history – 2 points; vascular disease history (prior myocardial infarction, peripheral artery
6 disease or aortic plaque); age 65-74 years old; sex category – female 1 point^{20,21}; LVEF: left
7 ventricular ejection fraction.

- 1 **Table 3. League table for the pairwise comparison of the primary outcome (arrhythmia recurrences) according to the network meta-**
2 **analysis.** Reported estimates (RR with corresponding 95%CI) refer to the comparison between treatment in the column and treatment in the row.
3 For each pairwise comparison, GRADE evaluation is reported under the relative risk estimate.
4

PVI	1.00 (0.48-2.11) <i>Low</i>	1.19 (0.53-2.67) <i>Low</i>	1.66 (0.84-3.31) <i>Moderate</i>	0.52 (0.22-1.21) <i>Low</i>	0.78 (0.58-1.05) <i>High</i>	0.87 (0.57-1.31) <i>High</i>	0.60 (0.30-1.19) <i>Low</i>	0.64 (0.35-1.18) <i>Moderate</i>	0.62 (0.32-1.17) <i>Low</i>	0.49 (0.27-0.88) <i>Moderate</i>	0.92 (0.45-1.88) <i>Low</i>	0.76 (0.37-1.58) <i>Low</i>	0.87 (0.53-1.40) <i>Moderate</i>
1.00 (0.47-2.09) <i>Low</i>	LIN	1.18 (0.40-3.52) <i>Low</i>	1.66 (0.60-4.57) <i>Low</i>	0.52 (0.18-1.47) <i>Low</i>	0.78 (0.39-1.54) <i>Moderate</i>	0.86 (0.40-1.86) <i>Low</i>	0.60 (0.24-1.50) <i>Low</i>	0.64 (0.25-1.62) <i>Low</i>	0.61 (0.25-1.53) <i>Low</i>	0.49 (0.20-1.17) <i>Low</i>	0.92 (0.36-2.35) <i>Low</i>	0.76 (0.27-2.08) <i>Low</i>	0.86 (0.38-1.97) <i>Low</i>
0.84 (0.37-1.90) <i>Low</i>	0.85 (0.28-2.52) <i>Low</i>	CFAE	1.40 (0.48-4.06) <i>Low</i>	0.44 (0.14-1.40) <i>Low</i>	0.66 (0.28-1.54) <i>Low</i>	0.73 (0.30-1.76) <i>Low</i>	0.51 (0.18-1.45) <i>Low</i>	0.54 (0.20-1.49) <i>Low</i>	0.52 (0.19-1.45) <i>Low</i>	0.41 (0.15-1.12) <i>Moderate</i>	0.77 (0.27-2.26) <i>Low</i>	0.64 (0.22-1.90) <i>Low</i>	0.73 (0.29-1.86) <i>Low</i>
0.60 (0.30-1.20) <i>Moderate</i>	0.60 (0.22-1.66) <i>Low</i>	0.71 (0.25-2.07) <i>Low</i>	ganglionic	0.31 (0.10-0.93) <i>Moderate</i>	0.47 (0.22-0.99) <i>Moderate</i>	0.52 (0.23-1.16) <i>Low</i>	0.36 (0.14-0.95) <i>Moderate</i>	0.39 (0.15-0.97) <i>Moderate</i>	0.37 (0.14-0.95) <i>Moderate</i>	0.29 (0.12-0.73) <i>Moderate</i>	0.55 (0.20-1.49) <i>Low</i>	0.46 (0.17-1.24) <i>Low</i>	0.52 (0.22-1.20) <i>Low</i>
1.93 (0.83-4.50) <i>Low</i>	1.94 (0.68-5.51) <i>Low</i>	2.29 (0.71-7.33) <i>Low</i>	3.21 (1.08-9.55) <i>Moderate</i>	BOX	1.51 (0.68-3.33) <i>Moderate</i>	1.67 (0.70-3.98) <i>Low</i>	1.16 (0.43-3.16) <i>Low</i>	1.24 (0.45-3.41) <i>Low</i>	1.19 (0.44-3.22) <i>Low</i>	0.94 (0.36-2.48) <i>Low</i>	1.77 (0.63-4.94) <i>Low</i>	1.46 (0.49-4.34) <i>Low</i>	1.67 (0.67-4.18) <i>Low</i>
1.28 (0.95-1.72) <i>High</i>	1.29 (0.65-2.54) <i>Moderate</i>	1.52 (0.65-3.56) <i>Low</i>	2.13 (1.01-4.51) <i>Moderate</i>	0.66 (0.30-1.47) <i>Moderate</i>	PVI+LIN	1.11 (0.78-1.58) <i>High</i>	0.77 (0.42-1.42) <i>Moderate</i>	0.82 (0.44-1.54) <i>Low</i>	0.79 (0.43-1.45) <i>Moderate</i>	0.63 (0.36-1.09) <i>Moderate</i>	1.18 (0.61-2.26) <i>Moderate</i>	0.97 (0.46-2.05) <i>Low</i>	1.11 (0.70-1.76) <i>Moderate</i>
1.15 (0.76-1.75) <i>High</i>	1.16 (0.54-2.51) <i>Low</i>	1.37 (0.57-3.30) <i>Low</i>	1.92 (0.86-4.29) <i>Low</i>	0.60 (0.25-1.43) <i>Low</i>	0.90 (0.63-1.29) <i>High</i>	PVI+CFAE	0.69 (0.34-1.41) <i>Low</i>	0.74 (0.37-1.50) <i>Low</i>	0.71 (0.35-1.43) <i>Low</i>	0.57 (0.29-1.08) <i>Moderate</i>	1.06 (0.51-2.23) <i>Low</i>	0.88 (0.39-1.97) <i>Low</i>	1.00 (0.57-1.77) <i>Low</i>
1.66 (0.84-3.28) <i>Low</i>	1.67 (0.67-4.18) <i>Low</i>	1.97 (0.69-5.63) <i>Low</i>	2.77 (1.05-7.28) <i>Moderate</i>	0.86 (0.32-2.35) <i>Low</i>	1.30 (0.70-2.40) <i>Moderate</i>	1.44 (0.71-2.93) <i>Low</i>	PVI+ganglionic	1.07 (0.44-2.57) <i>Low</i>	1.02 (0.43-2.42) <i>Low</i>	0.81 (0.36-1.86) <i>Low</i>	1.53 (0.62-3.74) <i>Low</i>	1.26 (0.48-3.31) <i>Low</i>	1.44 (0.67-3.10) <i>Low</i>
1.56 (0.84-2.87) <i>Moderate</i>	1.56 (0.62-3.96) <i>Low</i>	1.85 (0.67-5.09) <i>Low</i>	2.59 (1.03-6.52) <i>Moderate</i>	0.81 (0.29-2.23) <i>Low</i>	1.22 (0.65-2.28) <i>Low</i>	1.35 (0.67-2.73) <i>Low</i>	0.94 (0.39-2.26) <i>Low</i>	PVI+extraPV	0.96 (0.41-2.27) <i>Low</i>	0.76 (0.42-1.40) <i>Moderate</i>	1.43 (0.58-3.54) <i>Low</i>	1.18 (0.79-1.76) <i>Moderate</i>	1.35 (0.63-2.86) <i>Low</i>
1.62 (0.85-3.10) <i>Low</i>	1.63 (0.65-4.07) <i>Low</i>	1.93 (0.69-5.39) <i>Low</i>	2.70 (1.05-6.94) <i>Moderate</i>	0.84 (0.31-2.29) <i>Low</i>	1.27 (0.69-2.33) <i>Moderate</i>	1.41 (0.70-2.82) <i>Low</i>	0.98 (0.41-2.32) <i>Low</i>	1.04 (0.44-2.47) <i>Low</i>	PVI+LVA	0.80 (0.35-1.80) <i>Low</i>	1.49 (0.61-3.64) <i>Low</i>	1.23 (0.48-3.18) <i>Low</i>	1.41 (0.79-2.51) <i>Moderate</i>
2.04 (1.13-3.69) <i>Moderate</i>	2.05 (0.85-4.94) <i>Low</i>	2.43 (0.90-6.57) <i>Moderate</i>	3.40 (1.37-8.42) <i>Moderate</i>	1.06 (0.40-2.79) <i>Low</i>	1.60 (0.92-2.78) <i>Moderate</i>	1.77 (0.92-3.39) <i>Moderate</i>	1.23 (0.54-2.81) <i>Low</i>	1.31 (0.72-2.40) <i>Moderate</i>	1.26 (0.56-2.84) <i>Low</i>	PVI+LIN+extraPV	1.88 (0.80-4.41) <i>Low</i>	1.55 (0.75-3.20) <i>Low</i>	1.77 (0.87-3.59) <i>Low</i>
1.09 (0.53-2.22) <i>Low</i>	1.09 (0.43-2.81) <i>Low</i>	1.29 (0.44-3.77) <i>Low</i>	1.81 (0.67-4.88) <i>Low</i>	0.56 (0.20-1.58) <i>Low</i>	0.85 (0.44-1.63) <i>Moderate</i>	0.94 (0.45-1.98) <i>Low</i>	0.65 (0.27-1.60) <i>Low</i>	0.70 (0.28-1.73) <i>Low</i>	0.67 (0.28-1.63) <i>Low</i>	0.53 (0.23-1.25) <i>Low</i>	PVI+LIN+CFAE	0.83 (0.31-2.22) <i>Low</i>	0.94 (0.42-2.09) <i>Low</i>
1.32 (0.63-2.74) <i>Low</i>	1.32 (0.48-3.64) <i>Low</i>	1.57 (0.53-4.65) <i>Low</i>	2.19 (0.80-5.99) <i>Low</i>	0.68 (0.23-2.03) <i>Low</i>	1.03 (0.49-2.17) <i>Low</i>	1.14 (0.51-2.57) <i>Low</i>	0.79 (0.30-2.08) <i>Low</i>	0.85 (0.57-1.26) <i>Moderate</i>	0.81 (0.31-2.09) <i>Low</i>	0.65 (0.31-1.33) <i>Low</i>	1.21 (0.45-3.26) <i>Low</i>	PVI+extraPV+CFAE	1.14 (0.49-2.68) <i>Low</i>
1.16 (0.71-1.87) <i>Moderate</i>	1.16 (0.51-2.65) <i>Low</i>	1.37 (0.54-3.50) <i>Low</i>	1.92 (0.83-4.45) <i>Low</i>	0.60 (0.24-1.50) <i>Low</i>	0.90 (0.57-1.43) <i>Moderate</i>	1.00 (0.57-1.77) <i>Low</i>	0.70 (0.32-1.50) <i>Low</i>	0.74 (0.35-1.58) <i>Low</i>	0.71 (0.40-1.27) <i>Moderate</i>	0.57 (0.28-1.15) <i>Low</i>	1.06 (0.48-2.36) <i>Low</i>	0.88 (0.37-2.06) <i>Low</i>	stepwise

5

- 1 BOX: posterior wall box isolation; CFAE: complex fractionated atrial electrogram ablation; extraPV: extra pulmonary veins AF triggers ablation;
- 2 ganglionic: ganglionic plexi ablation; LIN: ablation lines; LVA: low voltage area ablation; PVI: pulmonary vein isolation; stepwise: stepwise
- 3 ablation strategy