REVIEW



Antiplatelet therapy in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: an updated meta-analysis

Keng Siang Lee^{1,2} · Cheyenne Lee³ · Permesh S. Dhillon⁴ · Ramez Kirollos⁵ · Vincent D.W. Nga⁶ · Tseng Tsai Yeo⁶ · Hans Henkes^{7,8} · Adam S. Arthur⁹ · Leonard L.L. Yeo¹⁰ · Pervinder Bhogal¹¹

Received: 15 May 2023 / Revised: 12 July 2023 / Accepted: 15 August 2023 / Published online: 4 September 2023 © The Author(s) 2023

Abstract

Antiplatelet therapy (AT) may serve to reduce the effects of aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage (aSAH)-induced procoagulant state in the cerebral circulation. Several studies, however, have delivered conflicting conclusions on the efficacy of AT post aSAH. Systematic searches of Medline, Embase, and Cochrane Central were undertaken on 27th March 2023. The primary outcome was delayed cerebral ischaemia (DCI). Secondary outcomes were symptomatic and angiographic vasospasm, good functional outcome (modified Rankin Scale [mRS] with scores 0-2), hemorrhagic events, and in-hospital mortality. Twenty-two studies reporting 4378 patients with aSAH were included in the meta-analysis. AT was associated with lower rates of DCI (*RR*=0.62, 95% CI: 0.43; 0.89), symptomatic vasospasm (*RR*=0.63, 95% CI: 0.46; 0.86), and moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.74, 95% CI: 0.65; 0.84), with no effect on hemorrhagic complications (RR=1.36, 95% CI: 0.77; 2.41). When analyzing only post-ictal use of AT, AT additionally favored rates of good functional outcomes (*RR*=1.18, 95% CI: 1.10; 1.26) and in-hospital mortality (RR=0.56, 95% CI: 0.39; 0.80). In the subgroup treated with cilostazol, AT was associated with lower rates of DCI (RR=0.40, 95% CI: 0.32), symptomatic vasospasm (RR=0.47, 95% CI: 0.33; 0.65), moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.75, 95% CI: 0.57; 0.98) and good functional outcome (RR=1.24, 95% CI: 1.08; 1.43). In the surgically treated aSAH subgroup, AT favored rates of symptomatic vasospasm (*RR*=0.55, 95% CI: 0.30; 0.98), moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.70, 95% CI: 0.54; 0.90) and good functional outcome (RR=1.23, 95% CI: 1.09; 1.41). In the endovascularly treated aSAH subgroup, AT was associated with lower rates of in-hospital mortality (RR=0.60, 95% CI: 0.41; 0.88). In aSAH patients, post-ictal AT is associated with benefits in terms of rates of DCI, vasospasm, good functional outcomes, and in-hospital mortality without an increased risk of hemorrhagic events.

 $\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{Keywords} \ \ \mbox{Aneurysm} \cdot \ \mbox{Antiplatelet} \cdot \ \mbox{Ischemia} \cdot \ \mbox{Neuroprotection} \cdot \ \mbox{Stroke} \cdot \ \mbox{Subarachnoid hemorrhage} \cdot \ \mbox{Vasospasm} \cdot \ \mbox{Meta-analysis} \\ \mbox{analysis} \end{array}$

Keng Siang Lee mrkengsianglee@gmail.com

- ¹ Department of Neurosurgery, King's College Hospital, London, UK
- ² Department of Basic and Clinical Neurosciences, Maurice Wohl Clinical Neuroscience Institute, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience (IoPPN), King's College London, London, UK
- ³ Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience (IoPPN), London, UK
- ⁴ Interventional Neuroradiology, Queens Medical Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK
- ⁵ Department of Neurosurgery, National Neuroscience Institute, Singapore, Singapore

- ⁶ Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, National University Health System, Singapore, Singapore
- ⁷ Neuroradiologische Klinik, Neurozentrum, Klinikum Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany
- ⁸ Medical Faculty, University Duisburg-Essen, Essen, Germany
- ⁹ Department of Neurosurgery, Semmes-Murphey Clinic, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Memphis, TN, USA
- ¹⁰ Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, National University Health System, Singapore and Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore
- ¹¹ Department of Interventional Neuroradiology, The Royal London Hospital, Barts NHS Trust, London, UK

Introduction

Delayed cerebral ischemia (DCI) occurs in approximately 30% aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage (aSAH) patients and is associated with significant morbidity and mortality [1, 2]. Early recognition and prompt treatment of post aSAH cerebral vasospasm with cardiac output optimization are the mainstays of DCI prophylactic strategies [3, 4]. However, it was recently shown that induced hypertension was associated with increased rates of complications [5].

Although vasospasm with reduced cerebral blood flow and subsequent DCI were historically considered the cause of delayed neurological deterioration after aSAH, the pathogenesis of DCI remains to be fully elucidated. The absence of a convincing association between large vessel vasospasm and DCI has led to a search for alternative etiologies of DCI [6]. Several mechanisms have been proposed, which encompass endothelial dysfunction, inflammatory activation, microcirculatory dysfunction with loss of autoregulation, cortical spreading depolarization, and microthrombosis [7]. Alongside the above, an increased platelet aggregation and related release of thromboxane B2 post aSAH, create a prothrombotic environment in the cerebral vasculature with vasoconstriction, which have been suggested to lead to the development of DCI [8–11]. There is an ongoing pursuit to identify novel therapies for DCI post aSAH. Antiplatelet therapy (AT) may serve to reduce the effects of an aSAH-induced pro-coagulant state, thereby limiting microthrombotic and microembolic events in the cerebral circulation. Several studies have delivered conflicting conclusions on the efficacy of AT post aSAH; some have shown that AT can ameliorate the risk of DCI [12, 13], while others report no benefit. No consensus has been reached.

To arrive at an optimal clinical management protocol, this study aims to investigate the efficacy and safety of AT in patients with aSAH, through a systematic review and metaanalysis of the current literature. In addition, we explored the effect of the timing of AT and various AT types in relation to the treatment modality (i.e., surgical or endovascular treatment).

Methods

The review was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [14]. The protocol was registered on the PROSPERO international prospective register of systematic reviews (registration number CRD42023 413704).

Outcomes

The primary outcome was DCI. The definition of DCI among the studies was heterogenous but in general based on radiological and clinical criteria as defined by Vergouwen et al. [15]. Radiological DCI was defined as the presence of cerebral infarction on CT (new hypodensities) or MR (or new diffusion-restricted areas) scan of the brain within 6 weeks after SAH, or on the latest CT or MR scan made before death within 6 weeks, or proven at autopsy, and not attributable to other causes. Clinical deterioration caused by DCI was defined by the occurrence of focal neurological impairment (such as hemiparesis, aphasia, apraxia, hemianopia, or neglect), or a decrease of at least 2 points on the Glasgow Coma Scale, which cannot be attributed to other causes by means of clinical assessment, CT or MRI scanning of the brain, and appropriate laboratory studies.

Secondary outcomes were symptomatic and angiographic vasospasm, good functional outcome, any hemorrhagic events (intracranial and extracranial), and in-hospital mortality. Clinical vasospasm was defined as a significant decline in neurological examination findings, accompanied by impaired flow changes noted on CT perfusion study or radiological evidence on diagnostic cerebral catheter angiography. The degree of angiographic vasospasm was rated as "mild" when narrowing of the arterial diameter was <30%, "moderate" when 30 to 49%, and "severe" when \geq 50%, with the vessel diameter on the initial angiography used as a reference. Good functional outcome was defined on the modified Rankin Scale (mRS) with scores of 0–2, at last follow-up. In studies where other outcome measures were reported, these outcomes were used if they were translatable into a good or poor outcome as defined above.

Search strategy

Searches of the following three electronic databases were undertaken: Ovid Medline, Ovid Embase, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). Searches were performed in each database from its inception until 27 March 2023. The concepts of "subarachnoid hemorrhage," "delayed cerebral ischemia," "vasospasm," and "antiplatelet" were used in addition to synonyms and related terms. The full search strategy used for the databases is presented in Supplementary Table 1.

Study selection

All titles and abstracts were screened against the pre-defined eligibility criteria developed independently by two reviewers (KSL and CL). A full list of inclusion and exclusion criteria can be found in Supplementary Table 2. Disagreements were resolved by discussion, and where agreement could not be reached, the senior reviewer assisted with decision making (PB). Agreement among the reviewers on study inclusion was evaluated using Cohen's kappa statistic [16].

In the event of multiple publications analyzing the same cohort, the publication that reported the largest patient data was used for evaluation. This was to avoid multiple counting which overstates sample size, leading to an artificially exaggerated precision in the pooled estimate [17]. The reference lists of included studies were also scrutinized to identify relevant studies fitting the inclusion criteria that may have been inadvertently overlooked in our search strategy [18].

Data extraction

A pro forma was developed and piloted to extract data on the following variables to ensure standardization and consistency in this process: (1) study details, (2) study design, (3) participant demographics (Fisher grades, Hunt and Hess grades, World Federation of Neurosurgical Societies [WFNS] grades, aneurysm location), (4) country and dataset, (5) selection criteria, (6) type of antiplatelet and control, (7) indication for treatment, (8) results (DCI, vasospasm, functional outcome, in-hospital mortality, and complications).

Risk of bias assessment

The quality of included studies was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) checklist for non-randomized experimental studies and version 2 of the Cochrane riskof-bias assessment for randomized trials (RoB 2) for randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Statistical analysis

Meta-analyses were performed assuming the random effects model to account for heterogeneity within and between individual studies [16].

To obtain risk ratios (RRs) from reported binary outcomes, pairwise meta-analysis was conducted using the Mantel–Haenszel method without continuity correction, using the Paule-Mandel estimator. Overall pooled proportions of demographic comorbidities of included patients were computed using the generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) method using a random intercept logistic regression model via logit transformation [16, 19]. Knapp–Hartung adjustments were used to reduce the chance of false positive and to control the estimate uncertainties of the betweenstudy heterogeneity. GLMM instead of Freeman–Tukey double arcsine transformation was employed as GLMM has been shown to provide the most accurate estimate for metaanalysis of single proportions in simulation studies [16, 19]. The I² statistic was used to present inter-study heterogeneity, where I² \leq 30%, between 30 and 50%, between 50 and 75%, and \geq 75% were considered to indicate low, moderate, substantial, and considerable heterogeneity, respectively [20]. *P* values for the I² statistic were derived from the chisquared distribution of Cochran's Q test. Prediction intervals were reported for all outcome measures. A prediction interval provides estimates of what the effect size might be for similar studies conducted in the future.

For pooling of means of numerical variables, we computed missing means and standard deviations (SDs) from medians, ranges (minimum to maximum) and interquartile ranges (IQRs) using the methods proposed by Hozo et al. and Wan et al. [21, 22].

In order to delineate the individual effects of the timing of antiplatelet administration, individual antiplatelet agents and treatment modality, subgroup analyses were performed for post-ictal and pre-ictal AT, various AT, surgically treated ruptured aneurysms, and endovascularly treated ruptured aneurysms. Importantly, the controls defined in our study were limited to only patients not administered AT post SAH in our post-ictal analysis, and patients previously unexposed to AT prior to SAH, in our pre-ictal analysis.

Summary-level meta-regression was performed using mixed-effect meta-analysis model by GLMM method, to identify predictors of DCI including older age, higher clinical and radiographic grades of aSAH, and acute hydrocephalus, in accordance with literature [7].

Publication bias of studies was assessed using funnel plots, where an asymmetrical distribution of studies was suggestive of bias. Quantitative analysis of funnel plot asymmetry was done using Egger's regression test. The GRADE approach was used to evaluate the quality of evidence for each outcome [23].

All statistical analyses were performed using R software version 4.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2022), with the package *meta*. *P*-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

Overview of included studies

The systematic search yielded 1726 unique publications. After screening of titles and abstracts, 54 publications were reviewed in full text. A total of 22 studies, of 4378 patients with aSAH met the eligibility criteria for inclusion in our meta-analysis (Supplementary Figure 1) [8, 12, 13, 24–40]. The study by Shimamura et al. was excluded from analysis as AT use occurred pre-ictal which continued during procedures [41]. Reliability of study selection between observers was substantial at both the title and abstract screening stage

Neurosurgical Review (2023) 46:221

(Cohen's κ =0.92) and the full-text review stage (Cohen's κ =1.00) [42].

Eight randomized controlled trials and 14 non-randomized cohort studies were included. Data were collected across seven countries — one from Finland, three from Germany, 10 from Japan, one from Korea, two from the Netherlands, one from Switzerland, and four from the USA. Details of included studies, including types and doses of AT administered, are reported in Supplementary Table 3. On assessing the risk of bias using the JBI checklist, 12 studies attained a full score of 11, while one each attained a score of 10 and 9 (Supplementary Table 4). On assessing the risk of bias using the RoB-2 checklist, four RCTs had low risk of bias, two had some concerns, and two had high risk of bias (see Supplementary Table 4, 5).

Patient baseline characteristics and workflow

Of the 4378 patients, 1645 were treated with AT, whereas 2733 patients did not receive antiplatelet agents. The antiplatelet agent was cilostazol in seven studies, thromboxane A2 synthetase inhibitors (OKY-046) in three, aspirin monotherapy in seven, and aspirin with clopidogrel in five. Post-ictal AT administration ranged between one to greater than 6 weeks, with most regimens lasting 2 weeks.

Gender of the patients was reported in 19 of 22 studies — 28.1% and 32.7% were male in the AT and non-AT groups, respectively. The mean and SD of their age were reported or imputable in 16 of 22 studies. Overall pooled mean age across the AT and non-AT groups were 57.0 years (95% CI: 54.1; 60.0, l^2 =93.6% [p<0.001]) and 56.8 (95% CI: 53.5; 60.1, l^2 =94.9% [p<0.001]), respectively.

 Table 1
 Pooled baseline characteristics of included patients

Pooled prevalence of baseline characteristics, including SAH grades, stratified according to treatment arm, is summarized in Table 1. There were no baseline differences between the groups. Clinical follow-up ranged from discharge to 1 year.

Primary outcome — delayed cerebral ischemia

DCI was reported across 20 studies, including 3817 patients. Compared with the non-AT group, lower rates of DCI were reported in the AT group (RR=0.62, 95% CI: 0.43; 0.89, prediction interval: 0.16; 2.45, l^2 =66%, p<0.001) (Fig. 1). On meta-regression, age (p=0.662) and proportions of Fisher grade 3 and 4 (p=0.928), Hunt and Hess III and IV (p=0.340), WFNS IV and V (p=0.707), posterior circulation aneurysms (p=0.738), and acute hydrocephalus (p=0.324) were not statistically significant predictors of DCI post aSAH.

Secondary outcomes

Compared with non-AT, AT was associated with lower rates of symptomatic vasospasm (RR=0.63, 95% CI: 0.46; 0.86, prediction interval: 0.25; 1.59, I^2 =62%, p=0.001), moderate/ severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.74, 95% CI: 0.65; 0.84, prediction interval: 0.64; 0.86, I^2 =0, p=0.550) and severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.66, 95% CI: 0.51; 0.84, prediction interval: 0.50; 0.87, I^2 =71.7, p<0.001).

The effect of AT on rates of good functional outcome (*RR*=1.12, 95% CI: 0.99; 1.28, prediction interval:

Characteristic	Antiplatelet				No antiplatelet							
	No. of studies	Pooled effect size (95% CI)	I ² (%)	P value of I ² (from χ^2 test)	No. of studies	Pooled effect size (95% CI)	I ² (%)	$\frac{P \text{ value of }}{I^2 \text{ (from } \chi^2 \text{ test)}}$				
Mean age (SD), year	16	57.0 [54.1; 60.0]	93.6	< 0.001	16	56.8 [53.5; 60.1]	94.9	< 0.001				
Hypertension	6	47.00 [36.20; 58.08]	67.9	0.008	6	38.71 [29.80; 48.45]	82.9	< 0.001				
Diabetes mellitus	3	9.96 [4.20; 21.82]	0.0	0.405	3	5.72 [0.79; 31.61]	86.3	< 0.001				
Fisher 3 and 4	12	80.63 [70.53; 87.86]	82.5	< 0.001	12	83.63 74.52; 89.93]	90.0	< 0.001				
Hunt and Hess III and IV	10	44.49 [35.65; 53.69]	64.6	0.003	10	52.16 [38.16; 65.83]	84.8	<0.001				
WFNS IV and V	9	32.35 [26.52; 38.78]	55.1	0.023	9	32.63 [24.37; 42.14]	79.4	< 0.001				
MCA	13	25.33 [18.50; 33.64]	63.8	< 0.001	13	18.97 [14.17; 24.92]	58.6	0.004				
ICA	14	25.00 [22.04; 28.22]	0.0	0.665	14	24.65 [16.97; 34.37]	79.5	< 0.001				
Vertebrobasilar	11	7.96 [3.60; 16.67]	88.4	< 0.001	11	10.52 [4.82; 21.43]	91.5	< 0.001				
Acute hydrocephalus	9	49.04 [29.51; 68.86]	89.3	< 0.001	9	54.45 [36.91; 70.96]	89.3	< 0.001				



В		AT						
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
drug = Aspirin and clopidogr	el				11			
Al Mulfti F et al. 2021	0	18	22	168 -		0.20	[0.01; 3.20]	1.0%
Darkwah Oppong M et al. 2018	68	329	58	251))	0.89	[0.66; 1.22]	11.4%
Ditz C et al. 2020	22	54	17	36		0.86	[0.54; 1.38]	9.7%
Nagahama Y et la. 2017	12	85	26	76		0.41	[0.22; 0.76]	8.2%
Sun G et al. 2020	1	65	13	101		0.12	[0.02; 0.89]	1.8%
Random effects model		551		632		0.59	[0.26; 1.36]	32.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 57\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.24$	07, p = 0	.05						
drug = Aspirin								
Juvela S et al. 1995	21	62	38	144	<u></u>	1.28	[0.82:2.00]	10.0%
Toussant I G et al. 2004	13	28	99	268	두	1.26	[0.82:1.93]	10.2%
Random effects model	.0	90	00	412	•	1.27	[1.11: 1.45]	20.2%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p =$	0.95							
drug = Cilostazol	-		05					0.00/
Kimura H et al. 2015		62	25	68		0.31	[0.14; 0.66]	6.8%
Nakotouko V et al. 2016	11	74	10	74		0.44	[0.21; 0.96]	0.7%
Cashaluwa Natal 0010	11	51	12	30	- T	0.05	[0.32, 1.30]	7.4%
Senbokuya N et al. 2013		54 40	10	55		0.32	[0.15; 0.70]	0.0%
Vochimoto T et al. 2011	5	49	19	24		0.00	[0.32, 1.13]	5.0%
Pandom affacts model	5	316	5	308		0.01	[0.33: 0.65]	/1 1%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p =$	0.61	510		500	~	0.47	[0.00, 0.00]	41.1/6
drug = Thromboxane A2 synt	netase i	nhibit	or (OKY-	046)				
Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991	5	13	8	11		0.53	[0.24; 1.15]	6.7%
Bandom effects model		970		1363	4	0.63	[0.46: 0.86]	100.0%
Prediction interval		5.0				2.00	[0.25: 1.59]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 62\%$ $\tau^2 = 0.16$	$16 \ n < 0$	01						
Test for subgroup differences: γ_2^2 =	69.45. df	l = 3 (p	< 0.01)		0.1 0.51 2 10			
5 P 73			,		Favors AT Favors no AT			

U								
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
drug = Aspirin Bruder M et al. 2018 Hop JW et al. 2000 Sebok M et al. 2021 Toussant LG et al. 2004	71 18 71 19	144 24 161 29	75 16 575 185	144 26 872 276		0.95 1.22 0.67 0.98	[0.75; 1.19] [0.83; 1.79] [0.56; 0.80] [0.74: 1.29]	8.0% 5.2% 8.9% 7.0%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 75\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.04$	30, <i>p</i> < 0	358 .01		1318		0.90	[0.61; 1.34]	29.1%
drug = Aspirin and clopidogra Darkwah Oppong M et al. 2018 Nagahama Y et la. 2017 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p =$	el 242 77 0.51	329 85 414	157 62	251 76 327		1.18 1.11 1.15	[1.05; 1.32] [0.98; 1.26] [0.80; 1.65]	10.2% 10.0% 20.1%
drug = Cliostazol Kimura H et al. 2015 Matsuda N et al. 2016 Nakatsuka Y et al. 2016 Senbokuya N et al. 2013 Sugimoto K et al. 2013 Suzuki S et al. 2011 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: / ² = 24%, c ² = 0.00	30 70 32 47 17 39 22 63, <i>p</i> = 0	62 74 51 54 23 49 26 339 .24	20 61 17 40 14 24 19	68 74 36 55 25 51 24 333		- 1.65 1.15 1.33 1.20 1.32 1.69 1.07 1.24	[1.05; 2.58] [1.02; 1.29] [0.89; 1.99] [0.99; 1.45] [0.86; 2.02] [1.22; 2.34] [0.82; 1.39] [1.08; 1.43]	4.3% 10.1% 4.9% 8.7% 4.6% 6.1% 7.3% 46.1%
drug = Thromboxane A2 synth Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Random effects model Prediction interval	hetase i 11	nhibito 13 1124	or (OKY- 8	-046) 11 1989		1.16 1.12	[0.76; 1.79] [0.99; 1.28] [0.74; 1.71]	4.6% 100.0%
Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 =$	29, <i>p</i> < 0 5.58, df	= 3 (p =	= 0.13)		0.5 1 2 Favors no AT Favors AT			

Fig. 1 Forest plots with random-effects model, stratified by individual antiplatelets, of A delayed cerebral ischemia, B symptomatic vasospasm, C moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm, and D good functional outcome (mRS0-2)

0.74; 1.71, $I^2=72\%$, p<0.001), in-hospital mortality (*RR*=0.77, 95% CI: 0.43; 1.37, prediction interval: 0.23; 2.63, $I^2=74\%$, p<0.001), and hemorrhagic complications (*RR*=1.36 95% CI: 0.77; 2.41, prediction interval: 0.73; 2.54, $I^2=0$, p=0.476) was not significant (Fig. 2) (Table 2).

Subgroup analyses by timing of antiplatelet administered

Only outcomes with more than one included study in the subgroup analysis are reported (Supplementary Table 6).

When specifically looking at post-ictal use of AT, AT was associated with improved rates of DCI (*RR*=0.50, 95% CI:

0.32; 0.82, $l^2=0$), symptomatic vasospasm (*RR*=0.56, 95% CI: 0.42; 0.75, $l^2=0$), and moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (*RR*=0.74, 95% CI: 0.64; 0.86, $l^2=0$) (Fig. 3). In addition, the use of AT was associated with increased rates of good functional outcomes (*RR*=1.18, 95% CI: 1.10; 1.26 $l^2=0$) and lowered rates of in-hospital mortality (*RR*=0.56, 95% CI: 0.39; 0.80, $l^2=0$) (Fig. 4).

When specifically looking at pre-ictal use of AT, AT was not associated with any benefits, in terms of rates of DCI (RR=0.96, 95% CI: 0.76; 1.23, $l^2=62.3$), symptomatic vasospasm (RR=1.24, 95% CI: 0.67; 2.30, $l^2=0$), good functional outcomes (RR=0.84, 95% CI: 0.49; 1.43, $l^2=74.7$), and in-hospital mortality (RR=1.20, 95% CI: 0.01; 96.78, $l^2=75.9$).



Fig. 2 Forest plots with random-effects model, stratified by individual antiplatelets, of A in-hospital mortality, and B hemorrhagic complications

Subgroup analyses by type of antiplatelet administered

In the subgroup treated with cilostazol, AT was associated with lower rates of DCI (RR=0.40, 95% CI: 0.32; 0.49, I^2 =0), symptomatic vasospasm (RR=0.47, 95% CI: 0.33; 0.65, I^2 =0), moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.75, 95% CI: 0.57; 0.98, I^2 =20.3), and good functional outcome (RR =1.24, 95% CI: 1.08; 1.43, I^2 =24). The effect of AT on rates of severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.59, 95% CI: 0.28; 1.27, I^2 =28), in-hospital mortality (RR=0.23, 95% CI: 0.00; 34.81, I^2 =0), and hemorrhagic complications (RR=0.64, 95% CI: 0.00; 1306991.97, I^2 =46) was not significant (Supplementary Table 7).

In the subgroup treated with dual therapy of aspirin and clopidogrel, AT favored rates of moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.76, 95% CI: 0.59; 0.97, I^2 =0) and in-hospital mortality (RR=0.60, 95% CI: 0.41; 0.88, I^2 =0). The effect of AT on rates of DCI (RR=0.40, 95% CI: 0.10; 1.53, I^2 =71), symptomatic vasospasm (RR=0.59, 95% CI: 0.26; 1.36, I^2 =57), good function outcome (RR=1.15, 95% CI: 0.80; 1.65, I^2 =0), and hemorrhagic complications (RR=1.46, 95% CI: 0.61; 3.46, I^2 =4.3) was not significant.

In the subgroup treated with monotherapy of aspirin, AT was associated with greater rates of symptomatic vasospasm (RR=1.27, 95% CI: 1.11; 1.45, $l^2=0$). It is to be noted that the two studies included for this outcome in aspirin monotherapy, however, were pre-ictal uses of AT (Fig. 1) [37, 43]. The effect of AT on rates of DCI (RR=0.91, 95% CI: 0.64;

Outcome	No. of studies reporting vari- able	No. of patients analyzed	Pooled effect size (95% con- fidence interval) [prediction interval]	I ² (%)	<i>P</i> value of I^2 (from χ^2 test)	Quality of evidence (GRADE)
Delayed cerebral ischemia	20	3817	RR0.62 (0.43; 0.89) [0.16; 2.45]	65.8	<0.001	Low
Symptomatic vasospasm	14	2333	RR0.63 (0.46; 0.86) [0.25; 1.59]	62.1	0.001	Low
Angiographic vasospasm (moder- ate and severe)	8	1017	RR0.74 (0.65; 0.84) [0.64; 0.86]	0.0	0.550	Low
Angiographic vasospasm (severe)	7	989	RR0.66 (0.51; 0.84) [0.50; 0.87]	0.0	0.546	Low
mRS score 0–2	14	3113	RR1.12 (0.99; 1.28) [0.74; 1.71]	71.7	<0.001	Low
In-hospital mortality	7	2392	RR0.77 (0.43; 1.37) [0.23; 2.63]	74.1	<0.001	Low
Hemorrhagic complications	7	1445	RR1.36 (0.77; 2.41) [0.73; 2.54]	0.0	0.476	Low

Table 2 Pooled outcomes of included patients

mRS modified Rankin Scale. No antiplatelet group used as control

Α									В							
Study	Events	Total I	r Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-	CI Weight	Study	Events	Total Eve	nts Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95% CI	Weight
timing = Pre-ictal					11				timing = Pre-ictal							
Al Mulfti F et al. 2021	11	18	111	168		0.92	[0.63; 1.3	6] 7.1%	Al Mulfti F et al. 2021	0	18	22 168		0.20 [0	.01; 3.20]	1.0%
Bruder M et al. 2018	64	144	60	144	100	1.07	[0.82; 1.3	9] 7.4%	Juvela S et al. 1995	21	62	38 144		1.28 [0	.82; 2.00]	10.0%
Juvela S et al. 1995	19	62	40	144		1.10	[0.70; 1.7	4] 6.8%	Toussant LG et al. 2004	13	28	99 268		1.26 [0	.82; 1.93]	10.2%
Sebok M et al. 2021	32	161	219	872		0.79	[0.57; 1.1	0] 7.3%	Random effects model		108	580	+	1.24 [0	.67; 2.30]	21.2%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p	= 0.51	385		1328	Ť	0.96	[0.76; 1.2	3] 28.6%	Heterogeneity: $I^{2} = 0\%$, $\tau^{2} = 0$, p timing = Root intol	= 0.43						
timing = Post-ictal									Darkwah Oppong M et al. 201	8 68	329	58 251	<u>i</u>	0.89 [0	.66; 1.22]	11.4%
Darkwah Oppong M et al. 2018	8 57	329	76	251	-	0.57	[0.42; 0.7	7] 7.3%	Ditz C et al. 2020	22	54	17 36		0.86 [0	.54; 1.38]	9.7%
Ditz C et al. 2020	21	85	20	75		0.93	[0.55; 1.5	7] 6.6%	Kimura H et al. 2015	7	62	25 68		0.31 [0	.14; 0.66]	6.8%
Hop JW et al. 2000	4	24	4	26		1.08	[0.30; 3.8	6] 3.8%	Matsuda N et al. 2016	8	74	18 74		0.44 [0	.21; 0.96]	6.7%
Kimura H et al. 2015	7	62	25	68		0.31	[0.14; 0.6	6] 5.6%	Nagahama Y et la. 2017	12	85	26 76		0.41 [0	.22; 0.76]	8.2%
Matsuda N et al. 2016	4	74	8	74		0.50	[0.16; 1.5	9] 4.1%	Nakatsuka Y et al. 2016	11	51	12 36		0.65 [0	.32; 1.30]	7.4%
Nagahama Y et la. 2017	2	85	17	76 —		0.11	[0.03; 0.4	4] 3.3%	Senbokuya N et al. 2013		54	22 55		0.32 [0	.15; 0.70]	6.8%
Nakatsuka Y et al. 2016	8	51	10	36		0.56	[0.25; 1.2	9 5.4%	Sun G et al. 2020		65	13 101		0.12 [0	.02; 0.89]	1.8%
Senbokuya N et al. 2013	6	54	16	55		0.38	[0.16; 0.9	0] 5.2%	Suzuki S et al. 2011	11	49	19 51		0.60 [0	32; 1.13]	8.0%
Sugimoto K et al. 2018	3	23	10	25		0.33	[0.10; 1.0	4 4.1%	Iokiyoshi K et al. 1991	5	13	8 11		0.53 [0	24; 1.15	5.7%
Sun G et al. 2020	1	65	11	101		0.14	[0.02; 1.0	7] 2.1%	Pandam offects model	5	20	9 24		0.51 [0	40.0751	5.4%
Suzuki S et al. 2011	5	49	14	51		0.37	[0.14; 0.9	5 4.9%	Handom effects model	0072 n - 0	002	/03	T	0.56 [0	.42; 0.75]	/0.0%
Von den Bergh WM et al. 2006	s 20	13	11	74		1.55	[0.02; 0.0 [0.70; 2.0	4 2.3%	Heterogeneity: $T = 40\%$, $t = 0.0$	1073, p = 0	05					
Vana K at al. 1002	20	12		16		2.46 1	1 10.10	41 4 49/	Bandom effects model		970	1363	_	0 63 10	46.0 861	100.0%
Vochimoto T et al. 2009	3	26	7	24		0.40	1.10, 10.1	4) 4.4% 6) 3.0%	Prediction interval		510	1000		0] 00.0	25. 1 591	100.078
Zanaty M et al. 2020	1	21	21	81		0.40	[0.03· 1.2	9 2.2%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 62\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1$	616 $n < 0$	01			[0		
Random effects model		1061	2.	1043	- i - i - i - i - i - i - i - i - i - i	0.51	0.32 0.8	2] 71.4%	Test for subgroup differences: γ^2	= 17.13. df	= 1 (p < 0.0)	1)	0.1 0.51 2 10			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 62\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.4$	1646, <i>p</i> < 0.	01						-,	• • •		-		Favors AT Favors no AT			
Random effects model		1446		2371	•	0.62	[0.43; 0.8	9] 100.0%								
Prediction interval							[0.16; 2.4	5]								
Heterogeneity: $I^{-} = 66\%$, $\tau^{-} = 0.3$	3989, p < 0.	01			01 051 0 10											
test for subgroup differences. 7,1	= 7.40, ui =	- T (p < 1	5.01)		Eavors AT Eavors n	, AT										
•					atolo / atolo /	574			D							
C									D							
Study Ever	AT Inte Total	Evente	No AT		liek Batio	BB 059	CI Wei	aht			AT	No AT				
Study	into rotar	Lventa	Total			111 357	-01 1101	gin	Study	Events	Total Eve	nts Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
timing = Pre-ictal			400		_			6 67	timing = Pre-ictal				13			
Al Multti F et al. 2021	/ 18	82	168			0.80 [0.44;	1.45] 3.	8%	Bruder M et al. 2018	71	144	75 144		0.95 [0	75: 1.19	8.0%
timing Deet intel									Sebok M et al. 2021	71	161 5	575 872		0.67 0	.56: 0.801	8.9%
Dite C at al. 2000	05 54		00		÷.	0.75 10.50	0.051 0.4	00/	Toussant LG et al. 2004	19	29 1	85 276		0.98 0	74: 1.291	7.0%
Kimura H at al 2015	30 04	31				0.75 [0.59;	0.95j 24. 1.001 7	3% 00/	Random effects model		334	1292		0.84 [0	.49; 1.43]	23.9%
Mateuda N et al. 2015	46 74	55	7/		-	0.84 [0.67]	1.00 7.	0%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 75\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0$)329, p = 0	.02					
Senbokuva N et al. 2013	27 54	42	55	_		0.65 [0.48:	0.801 1/	6 %								
Sugimoto K et al. 2018	14 23	16	25			0.95 [0.61]	1 48] 7	0%	timing = Post-ictal							
Suzuki S et al. 1989	53 170	41	86	-	-	0.65 [0.48:	0.901 13	7%	Darkwah Oppong M et al. 201	8 242	329 1	157 251		1.18 [1	.05; 1.32]	10.2%
Yoshimoto T et al. 2009	4 26	10	24			0.37 [0.13:	1.021 1.	3%	Hop JW et al. 2000	18	24	16 26		1.22 [0	.83; 1.79]	5.2%
Random effects model	463		368			0.74 [0.64;	0.861 96.	2%	Kimura H et al. 2015	30	62	20 68		- 1.65 [1	.05; 2.58]	4.3%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p	= 0.45						•		Matsuda N et al. 2016	70	74	61 74		1.15 [1	.02; 1.29]	10.1%
									Nagahama Y et la. 2017	77	85	62 76		1.11 [0	.98; 1.26]	10.0%
Random effects model	481		536		•	0.74 [0.65;	0.85] 100.	0%	Nakatsuka Y et al. 2016	32	51	17 36		1.33 [0	.89; 1.99]	4.9%
Prediction interval					-	[0.64;	0.86]		Senbokuya N et al. 2013	47	54	40 55		1.20 [0	.99; 1.45]	8.7%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p									Sugimoto K et al. 2018	1/	23	14 25		1.32 [0	.86; 2.02]	4.6%
	= 0.56								Suzuki S et al. 2011	39	24			1.69 [1	.22; 2.34	6.1%
Test for subgroup differences: χ_1^2	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5	i 1 2 5				Takinashi K at al. 1001		10	24 51		1 10 10	70. 1 701	4 CO/
Test for subgroup differences: χ_1^2	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	= 1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	o 1 2 5 AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991	11	13	8 11		1.16 [0	.76; 1.79]	4.6%
Test for subgroup differences: χ_1^2	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Bandom effects model	11 22	13 26	8 11 19 24 607		1.16 [0 1.07 [0	.76; 1.79]	4.6% 7.3%
Test for subgroup differences: χ_1^2	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	: 1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	5 1 2 5 AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p	11 22 = 0.52	13 26 790	8 11 19 24 697		1.16 (0 1.07 (0 1.18 (1	.76; 1.79] .82; 1.39] . 10; 1.26]	4.6% 7.3% 76.1%
Test for subgroup differences: χ_1^2	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	: 1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	5 1 2 5 AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p Random effects model	11 22 = 0.52	13 26 790	8 11 19 24 697 1989		1.16 (0 1.07 (0 1.18 [1 1.12 [0	.76; 1.79] .82; 1.39] .10; 1.26] .99; 1.28]	4.6% 7.3% 76.1%
Test for subgroup differences: χ_1^2	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	: 1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	5 1 2 5 AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, ρ Random effects model Prediction interval	11 22 = 0.52	13 26 790 1124	8 11 19 24 697 1989		1.16 [0 1.07 [0 1.18 [1 1.12 [0 [0	.76; 1.79] .82; 1.39] .10; 1.26] .99; 1.28] .74; 1.71]	4.6% 7.3% 76.1%
Test for subgroup differences: χ^2_1	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	= 1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	i 1 2 5 AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p Random effects model Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 72\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2$	11 22 = 0.52 0329, <i>p</i> < 0	13 26 790 1124 01	8 11 19 24 697 1989		1.16 (0 1.07 (0 1.18 (1 1.12 (0 (0	.76; 1.79] .82; 1.39] .10; 1.26] .99; 1.28] .74; 1.71]	4.6% 7.3% 76.1% 100.0%
Test for subgroup differences: χ^2_1	= 0.56 = 0.05, df =	: 1 (p =	0.82)	0.2 0.5 Favors	5 1 2 5 AT Favors no AT				Tokiyoshi K et al. 1991 Yoshimoto T et al. 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: / ² = 0%, r ² = 0, p Random effects model Prediction interval Heterogeneity: / ² = 72%, r ² = 0.1 Test for subgroup differences: r ² _A	11 22 = 0.52 0329, <i>p</i> < 0 = 7.07, df =	13 26 790 1124 01 = 1 (p < 0.01	8 11 19 24 697 1989		1.16 (0 1.07 (0 1.18 (1 1.12 (0 [0	.76; 1.79] .82; 1.39] .10; 1.26] .99; 1.28] .74; 1.71]	4.6% 7.3% 76.1%

Fig. 3 Forest plots with random-effects model, stratified by timing of antiplatelet use, of A delayed cerebral ischemia, B symptomatic vasospasm, C moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm, and D good functional outcome (mRS0-2)

Α		AT								В		A	r	No AT					
Study	Events	Total E	vents	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	1	95% Cl	Weight	Study	Events	Tota	I Events	Total	Risk	Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
$\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{timing} = \mbox{Post-ictal} \\ \mbox{Darkaching} Dark W et al. 2014 \\ \mbox{Dir} C et al. 2020 \\ \mbox{Hop} JW et al. 2020 \\ \mbox{Kimura} H et al. 2015 \\ \mbox{Senbokuya} N et al. 2013 \\ \mbox{Suzuki S et al. 2011} \\ \mbox{Toxisshi K et al. 1991} \\ \mbox{Tandom effects model} \\ \mbox{Hetrogeneity: } \mbox{ρ}^2 = 0.\mbox{ρ}, \mbox{ρ}^2 = 0, \mbox{ρ}, \mbox{ρ}^2 = 0.\mbox{ρ}, \mbox{ρ}, $$	34 5 0 1 0 1 1 = 0.77	329 85 24 62 54 49 13 616	43 8 0 7 0 3 2	251 75 26 68 55 51 11 537		0.60 0.55 0.16 0.35 0.42 0.56	[0.4] [0.1] [0.0] [0.04 [0.04 [0.3 9	0; 0.92] 9; 1.61] 2; 1.24] 4; 3.22] 4; 4.06] 9; 0.79]	25.9% 11.9% 0.0% 4.4% 0.0% 3.8% 3.7% 49.8%	$\label{eq:constraints} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{timing} = \mbox{Post-lctal} \\ \mbox{Ditz C et al. 2020} \\ \mbox{Hop JW et al. 2020} \\ \mbox{Hop JW et al. 2010} \\ \mbox{Minural H et al. 2015} \\ \mbox{Matubal N et al. 2016} \\ \mbox{Senbokuya N et al. 2013} \\ \mbox{Sun G et al. 2020} \\ \mbox{Zanay M et al. 2020} \\ \mbox{Random effects model} \\ \mbox{Hetrogenetic}, \mbox{\vec{r}} = 0, \mbox{\vec{r}}, \mbox{\vec{r}} = 0, \mbox{\vec{r}} \\ \mbox{Hetrogenetic}, \$	3 29 5 2 0 0 3 3 2 = 0.48	329 85 62 74 54 27 714		251 75 26 68 74 – 55 101 81 731			2.21 0.88 1.08 0.14 1.53 1.17 0.70 1.36	[1.10; 4.45] [0.27; 2.93] [0.17; 7.10] [0.27; 8.79] [0.27; 5.04] [0.17; 2.93] [0.77; 2.41]	46.2% 15.7% 6.4% 0.0% 2.6% 7.4% 10.6% 11.1% 100.0%
$\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{timing} = \mbox{Pre-ictal} \\ \mbox{Juvela S et al. 1995} \\ \mbox{Sebok M et al. 2021} \\ \mbox{Random effects model} \\ \mbox{Heterogeneity: } \mbox{Pi}^2 = \mbox{76, r}^2 = 0.1 \\ \mbox{Random effects model} \\ \mbox{Prediction interval} \\ \mbox{Heterogeneity: } \mbox{Pi} = \mbox{76, r}^2 = 0.1 \\ \mbox{Random effects model} \\ \mbox{Prediction interval} \\ \mbox{Heterogeneity: } \mbox{Pi} = \mbox{76, r}^2 = 0.1 \\ \mbox{Random effects model} \\ \mbox{Prediction interval} \\ \mbox{Random effects model} \\ \$	11 49 362, p = 0 220, p < 0 4.34, df =	62 161 223 .04 839 .01 = 1 (p = 0	32 165 04)	144 872 1016 1553	0.1 0.51 2 10 Every AT Eavers on AT	0.80 1.61 - 1.20 0.77	[0.4; [1.2; [0.01 [0.4; [0.2;	3; 1.48] 3; 2.11] ; 96.78] 3; 1.37] 3; 2.63]	20.8% 29.5% 50.2%	Random effects model Prediction interval Heterogeneity: $\vec{\ell} = 0\%$, $\vec{\ell} = 0$, p . Test for subgroup differences: χ_2^2 .	= 0.48 = 0.00, df :	714 = 0 (p	1 = NA)	731 r 0.0	1 0.1 1 Favors AT	10 100 Favors no AT	1.36	[0.77; 2.41] [0.73; 2.54]	100.0%

Fig. 4 Forest plots with random-effects model, stratified by timing of antiplatelet use, of A in-hospital mortality, and B hemorrhagic complications 1.30, l^2 =64), good functional outcome (*RR*=0.90, 95% CI: 0.61; 1.34, l^2 =75), and in-hospital mortality (*RR*=1.20, 95% CI: 0.01; 3.47, l^2 =76) was not significant.

Subgroup analyses by treatment modality

In the surgically treated aSAH subgroup, AT was associated with lower rates of symptomatic vasospasm (RR=0.55, 95% CI: 0.30; 0.98, l^2 =71), moderate/severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.70, 95% CI: 0.54; 0.90, l^2 =0), and good functional outcome (RR=1.23, 95% CI: 1.09; 1.41, l^2 =13) (Supplementary Figure 2). The effect of AT on rates of DCI (RR=0.58, 95% CI: 0.26; 1.31, l^2 =73), severe angiographic vasospasm (RR=0.61, 95% CI: 0.28; 1.52, l^2 =0), and hemorrhagic complications (RR=1.30, 95% CI: 0.15; 11.50, l^2 =0) was not significant in the surgically treated aSAH subgroup.

In the endovascularly treated aSAH subgroup, AT was associated with lower rates of in-hospital mortality (RR=0.60, 95% CI: 0.41; 0.88, I^2 =0). The effect of AT on rates of DCI (RR=0.37, 95% CI: 0.11; 1.21, I^2 =66), symptomatic vasospasm (RR=0.60, 95% CI: 0.20; 1.80, I^2 =65), good functional outcome (RR=1.15, 95% CI: 0.80; 1.65, I^2 =0), and hemorrhagic complications (RR=1.46, 95% CI: 0.61; 3.46, I^2 =4) was not significant in the endovascularly treated aSAH subgroup (Supplementary Table 8). A sensitivity analysis of only post-ictal studies conferred the same results suggesting robust findings (Supplementary Table 9).

Discussion

Summary of findings

This updated meta-analysis including data on 4378 patients with aSAH found that compared with non-AT treatment, AT was associated with reduced occurrence of DCI and both symptomatic and angiographic vasospasm, with no increased risk of hemorrhagic complications. Specifically in the post-ictal AT group, these benefits translated to improved functional outcomes and reduced in-hospital mortality rates. In the subgroup analyses for each individual antiplatelet agent, outcomes of cilostazol treatment echoed those of the overall analysis. Dual therapy of aspirin and clopidogrel conferred benefits in terms of rates of angiographic vasospasm, good functional outcomes, and in-hospital mortality. The lack of benefit to DCI in this subgroup is likely due to a type 2 error. These benefits were not replicated in the aspirin monotherapy cohort. Subgroup analysis by treatment modality revealed that surgically treated aSAH was associated with lower rates of symptomatic and angiographic vasospasm and greater rates of good functional outcomes, in the AT group.

Another subgroup analysis of endovascularly treated aSAH found a lower rate of in-hospital mortality in the AT cohort. Overall, our findings suggest that the use of AT in aSAH is safe and may confer neuroprotection.

Comparison with literature

Data within the literature about the influence of AT on the occurrence of DCI after aSAH are heterogeneous and contradictory [44-47]. Close to two decades ago, Mees et al. found a trend towards improved functional outcomes in patients with aSAH treated with AT, possibly due to a reduction in DCI. However, these results were not statistically significant, thus no definite conclusions could be drawn [47]. Studies included in those older reviews reported mainly surgically treated patients, which is not as representative of the modern treatment management of aSAH, especially after results of the International Subarachnoid Aneurysm Trial (ISAT) which suggested that in patients with aSAH suitable for both clipping and endovascular treatment, those with endovascular treatment were more likely to survive independently [48]. In our study, only half of the patients underwent clipping which is closer to modern reflection of the neurovascular practice. It has been demonstrated that clipping is associated with increased risk of DCI compared with coiling [49, 50]. Manipulation of the brain and vessel wall during surgery is purported to drive vasospasm and DCI [49, 50]. In addition, patients were administered mainly aspirin monotherapy which might not have been the optimal antiplatelet [38, 46, 47]. However, our secondary analysis on the surgically treated cohort showed AT was associated with lower rates of symptomatic and angiographic vasospasm, which corroborates those of Snyder and colleagues, although they had found the added benefit of functional independence in this specific cohort of patients [45]. Although endovascular treatment avoids the complications of neurosurgical clipping, it is associated with thromboembolic events. Thrombotic events after aSAH include cerebral infarction and microthrombus, both of which are included in the definition of DCI. It is considered standard practice during endovascular procedures to use heparin and monitor the activated clotting time in order to minimize any thromboembolic complications. With the advent of dedicated neurovascular stents, neck bridging devices, and flow diversion, there has been a greater use of these devices in the acute setting. The use of such devices necessitates the appropriate use anti-platelets and typically early on this revolved around the use of aspirin and clopidogrel. More recently, however, there has been a shift towards newer P2Y12 agents such as ticagrelor and prasugrel given the high non-response rate for clopidogrel [51]. Our subgroup analysis of endovascularly treated aSAH showed AT conferred lower rates of in-hospital mortality in the AT cohort; however, these findings were not consistent in the dual antiplatelet cohort, and this could be due to the fact that a large number of patients are clopidogrel non-responders.

More recent meta-analyses with DCI as their primary outcome report different effect estimates. The study by Cagnazzo et al., overall, failed to show a significant beneficial effect of AT on the occurrence of DCI and vasospasm; however, it conferred better functional outcomes and lower rates of mortality [44]. In the subgroup of patients with endovascular treatment, AT tended to be associated with a reduction of DCI. Despite the overall reduction of DCI not reaching statistical significance, neurologic functional outcome in patients who received platelet inhibitors was significantly better, and mortality was significantly lower. A caveat of their study involves including a study with pre-ictal aspirin use [43] and multiple counting from the same MASH and ISAT studies, which could have exaggerated the precision of the estimate in the wrong direction [38, 52, 53]. Our findings in post-ictal use of AT hence do not support those of Cagnazzo et al. as AT was indeed associated with reduced occurrence of DCI and both symptomatic and angiographic vasospasm in patients with aSAH, which also translated to improved functional outcomes and reduced in-hospital mortality rates. Our findings are similar to that of Snyder et al. [45] who focused only on the use of AT after aSAH, although had included a pre-ictal study [41]. These findings were also replicated in the subgroup analysis of cilostazol monotherapy. Notably, our subgroup analyses revealed that cilostazol monotherapy contributed most to the significant effect estimates of AT found in the primary analysis. Cilostazol is a unique antiplatelet agent that has been commercially available and can be readily repurposed for aSAH [54]. As a phosphodiesterase III inhibitor, it reversibly inhibits platelet aggregation and additionally possesses vasodilatory and antiproliferative properties on smooth muscles [55, 56]. The therapeutic response of cilostazol on DCI may hence be due to its multiple effects, in tandem, on the various pathways involved in DCI [55, 56].

Limitations

Limitations of our meta-analysis are a result of including retrospective and observational studies with notable heterogeneity between them. There was no standard time frame with different lengths of clinical follow-up in each study. In an effort to address inherent heterogeneity, subgroup analyses were performed, which allowed us to delineate the effect of individual antiplatelets and treatment modality. However, most of the ruptured aneurysms in our study were treated with cilostazol, so our subgroup analysis by types of AT in aSAH was limited by a small number of studies with considerable missing data. The influence of the dose of various AT could not be investigated because the available data did not allow further subgroup analysis. The lack of significant findings within the subgroups may be a function of a type 2 error, however. Finally, the majority of included studies were performed in Japan, and hence, the results of our findings could have been partly confounded by differences in genetic and environmental risk factors, limiting its external validity. Studies in non-Japanese populations are therefore warranted to further evaluate the role of AT, in particular cilostazol, as a potential neuroprotective agent for aSAH. Nonetheless, this updated work is the largest to date analyzing the use of AT among patients with aSAH, and its strength includes avoiding undue emphasis on individual studies, thus yielding risk estimates that are more reliable.

Conclusion

This updated meta-analysis reveals that in aSAH patients, post-ictal AT is associated with benefits in terms of rates of DCI, vasospasm, good functional outcomes, and in-hospital mortality without an increased risk of hemorrhagic events. Specifically, cilostazol monotherapy, an inhibitor of platelet aggregation, and cerebral vasodilator, contributed most consistently to the observed effect size. Future RCTs are needed to validate the role of AT.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10143-023-02120-2.

Author contribution All authors listed have made substantial, direct, and intellectual contribution to the work and approved it for publications. Keng Siang Lee: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis and investigation, writing — original draft preparation, writing — review and editing, visualization, and funding acquisition. Cheyenne Lee: writing — review and editing. Permesh S Dhillon: writing — review and editing and supervision. Ramez Kirollos: writing — review and editing and supervision. Vincent DW Nga: writing — review and editing and supervision. Tseng Tsai Yeo: writing — review and editing and supervision. Hans Henkes: writing — review and editing and supervision. Leonard LL Yeo: conceptualization, writing — review and editing, and supervision. Pervinder Bhogal: conceptualization, writing — review and editing, and supervision.

Funding Open access funding was conferred to Dr Keng Siang Lee by King's College London.

Data availability Supplementary file.

Declarations

The authors have no personal, financial, or institutional interest in any of the drugs, materials, or devices described in this article.

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format,

Neurosurgical Review (2023) 46:221

as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

- Lee KS et al (2021) Radiological surveillance of small unruptured intracranial aneurysms: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression of 8428 aneurysms. Neurosurg Rev 44(4):2013–2023
- 2. Lee KS et al (2022) The evolution of intracranial aneurysm treatment techniques and future directions. Neurosurg Rev 45(1):1–25
- Connolly ES et al (2012) Guidelines for the management of aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/american Stroke Association. Stroke 43(6):1711–1737
- Allen GS et al (1983) Cerebral arterial spasm--a controlled trial of nimodipine in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage. N Engl J Med 308(11):619–624
- Gathier CS et al (2018) Induced hypertension for delayed cerebral ischemia after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a randomized clinical trial. Stroke 49(1):76–83
- Vergouwen MD, Ilodigwe D, Macdonald RL (2011) Cerebral infarction after subarachnoid hemorrhage contributes to poor outcome by vasospasm-dependent and -independent effects. Stroke 42(4):924–929
- Budohoski KP et al (2014) The pathophysiology and treatment of delayed cerebral ischaemia following subarachnoid haemorrhage. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 85(12):1343–1353
- Hop JW et al (2000) Randomized pilot trial of postoperative aspirin in subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurology 54(4):872–878
- Juvela S, Hillbom M, Kaste M (1991) Platelet thromboxane release and delayed cerebral ischemia in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage. J Neurosurg 74(3):386–392
- Juvela S et al (1991) Angiographic vasospasm and release of platelet thromboxane after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Stroke 22(4):451–455
- Ohkuma H et al (1991) Role of platelet function in symptomatic cerebral vasospasm following aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Stroke 22(7):854–859
- Nagahama Y et al (2018) Dual antiplatelet therapy in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: association with reduced risk of clinical vasospasm and delayed cerebral ischemia. J Neurosurg 129(3):702–710
- Darkwah Oppong M et al (2019) Post-treatment antiplatelet therapy reduces risk for delayed cerebral ischemia due to aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Neurosurgery 85(6):827–833
- Page MJ et al (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 372:n71
- 15. Vergouwen MD et al (2010) Definition of delayed cerebral ischemia after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage as an outcome event in clinical trials and observational studies: proposal of a multidisciplinary research group. Stroke 41(10):2391–2395
- Lee KS et al (2022) Tenets for the proper conduct and use of meta-analyses: a practical guide for neurosurgeons. World Neurosurg 161:291–302.e1

- 17. Lunny C et al (2021) Managing overlap of primary study results across systematic reviews: practical considerations for authors of overviews of reviews. BMC Med Res Methodol 21(1):140
- Greenhalgh T, Peacock R (2005) Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: audit of primary sources. BMJ 331(7524):1064–1065
- Schwarzer G et al (2019) Seriously misleading results using inverse of Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation in meta-analysis of single proportions. Res Synth Methods 10(3):476–483
- 20. Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J (2021) Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.2. Cochrane
- Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I (2005) Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample. BMC Med Res Methodol 5(1):13
- 22. Wan X et al (2014) Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. BMC Med Res Methodol 14(1):135
- Guyatt GH et al (2008) GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 336(7650):924–926
- 24. Al-Mufti F et al (2021) Impact of pre-ictal antiplatelet therapy use in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Clin Neurol Neurosurg 211:107022
- 25. Bruder M et al (2018) Continuous acetylsalicylic acid treatment does not influence bleeding pattern or outcome of aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a matched-pair analysis. World Neurosurg 113:e122–e128
- 26. Ditz C et al (2021) Effects of post-interventional antiplatelet therapy on angiographic vasospasm, delayed cerebral ischemia, and clinical outcome after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a single-center experience. Neurosurg Rev 44(5):2899–2912
- 27. Kimura H et al (2015) Cilostazol administration with combination enteral and parenteral nutrition therapy remarkably improves outcome after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Acta Neurochir Suppl 120:147–152
- Matsuda N et al (2016) Effect of cilostazol on cerebral vasospasm and outcome in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Cerebrovasc Dis 42(1-2):97–105
- Nakatsuka Y et al (2017) Preventive effects of cilostazol against the development of shunt-dependent hydrocephalus after subarachnoid hemorrhage. J Neurosurg 127(2):319–326
- Sebök M et al (2022) Prehemorrhage antiplatelet use in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage and impact on clinical outcome. Int J Stroke 17(5):545–552
- Senbokuya N et al (2013) Effects of cilostazol on cerebral vasospasm after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a multicenter prospective, randomized, open-label blinded end point trial. J Neurosurg 118(1):121–130
- 32. Sugimoto K et al (2018) Cilostazol decreases duration of spreading depolarization and spreading ischemia after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Ann Neurol 84(6):873–885
- 33. Sun GU et al (2020) Dual antiplatelet treatment associated with reduced risk of symptomatic vasospasm and delayed cerebral ischemia in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. J Cerebrovasc Endovasc Neurosurg 22(3):134–140
- 34. Suzuki S et al (1989) Clinical study of OKY-046, a thromboxane synthetase inhibitor, in prevention of cerebral vasospasms and delayed cerebral ischaemic symptoms after subarachnoid haemorrhage due to aneurysmal rupture: a randomized double-blind study. Neurol Res 11(2):79–88
- Suzuki S et al (2011) Cilostazol improves outcome after subarachnoid hemorrhage: a preliminary report. Cerebrovasc Dis 32(1):89–93

- Tokiyoshi K, Ohnishi T, Nii Y (1991) Efficacy and toxicity of thromboxane synthetase inhibitor for cerebral vasospasm after subarachnoid hemorrhage. Surg Neurol 36(2):112–118
- Toussaint LG et al (2004) Influence of aspirin on outcome following aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. J Neurosurg 101(6):921–925
- van den Bergh WM et al (2006) Randomized controlled trial of acetylsalicylic acid in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: the MASH study. Stroke 37(9):2326–2330
- 39. Yano K et al (1993) Preventive therapy against delayed cerebral ischaemia after aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage: trials of thromboxane A2 synthetase inhibitor and hyperdynamic therapy. Acta Neurochir 125(1-4):15–19
- Zanaty M et al (2020) Tirofiban protocol protects against delayed cerebral ischemia: a case-series study. Neurosurgery 87(5):E552–E556
- 41. Shimamura N et al (2020) Use of preprocedural, multiple antiplatelet medications for coil embolization of ruptured cerebral aneurysm in the acute stage improved clinical outcome and reduced thromboembolic complications without hemorrhagic complications. World Neurosurg 133:e751–e756
- Cohen J (1960) A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educ Psychol Meas 20(1):37–47
- 43. Juvela S (1995) Aspirin and delayed cerebral ischemia after aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. J Neurosurg 82(6):945–952
- 44. Cagnazzo F et al (2019) Antiplatelet therapy in patients with aneurysmal SAH: impact on delayed cerebral ischemia and clinical outcome. A meta-analysis. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 40(7):1201–1206
- 45. Snyder MH et al (2022) Antiplatelet therapy and delayed cerebral ischemia in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Neurosurg 137(1):95–107
- Dorhout Mees SM et al (2003) Antiplatelet therapy in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a systematic review. Stroke 34(9):2285–2289
- Dorhout Mees SM et al (2007) Antiplatelet therapy for aneurysmal subarachnoid haemorrhage. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(4):CD006184

- 48. Molyneux AJ et al (2005) International Subarachnoid Aneurysm Trial (ISAT) of neurosurgical clipping versus endovascular coiling in 2143 patients with ruptured intracranial aneurysms: a randomised comparison of effects on survival, dependency, seizures, rebleeding, subgroups, and aneurysm occlusion. Lancet 366(9488):809–817
- Dorhout Mees SM et al (2012) Occurrence and impact of delayed cerebral ischemia after coiling and after clipping in the International Subarachnoid Aneurysm Trial (ISAT). J Neurol 259(4):679–683
- 50. Li R et al (2021) In-hospital complication-related risk factors for discharge and 90-day outcomes in patients with aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage after surgical clipping and endovascular coiling: a propensity score-matched analysis. J Neurosurg:1–12
- 51. Borchert RJ et al (2022) P2Y12 inhibitors for the neurointerventionalist. Interv Neuroradiol 28(1):92–103
- 52. van den Bergh WM et al (2009) Effect of antiplatelet therapy for endovascular coiling in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. Stroke 40(6):1969–1972
- 53. van den Bergh WM et al (2009) Magnesium and aspirin treatment in patients with subarachnoid haemorrhage. Comparison of effects after endovascular and neurosurgical aneurysm occlusion. J Neurol 256(2):213–216
- Bhogal P, Brouwer PA, Makalanda HL (2016) Cilostazol: an antiplatelet agent for the neurointerventionist? J Neurointerv Surg 8(2):208–209
- Rogers KC, Oliphant CS, Finks SW (2015) Clinical efficacy and safety of cilostazol: a critical review of the literature. Drugs 75(4):377–395
- 56. Birk S et al (2004) The phosphodiesterase 3 inhibitor cilostazol dilates large cerebral arteries in humans without affecting regional cerebral blood flow. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 24(12):1352–1358

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.