
Safety and efficacy of left atrial appendage closure in cancer versus non-cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Muhammad Ahmed,¹ Fatima Muskan,¹ Mohsin Zaheer,¹ Manesh Kumar,¹ Sawera Gul,² Abdul Hadi Ansari,¹ Muhammad Sameer Jamal,¹ Muhammad Sohaib Asghar,³ M. Chadi Alraies,⁴ Shiny Teja Kolli,⁵ Praveen Kumar Komminni,⁵ Priya Hotwani,⁶ Vishal Reddy Bejugam⁵

¹Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto Medical College Lyari, Karachi, Pakistan

²Dow International Medical College, Karachi, Pakistan

³AdventHealth, Sebring, FL, USA

⁴Detroit Medical Center, DMC Heart Hospital, Detroit, MI, USA

⁵Department of Internal Medicine, Jacobi Medical Center/North Central Bronx, New York City, NY, USA

⁶Parkview Health, Fort Wayne, IN, USA

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Ahmed, Department of Internal Medicine, Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto Medical College Lyari, Karachi, Pakistan. E-mail: muhammadahmed5515@gmail.com

Key words: Left atrial appendage closure; cancer; atrial fibrillation; meta-analysis.




Figure S1. PRISMA flowchart.




Figure S2. Forest plot for bleeding complications after a leave-one-out analysis.

Table S1. Detailed search strategy used in each database.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| PubMed (n=41) | (Left atrial appendage occlusion OR left atrial appendage closure) AND (cancer OR neoplasm OR malignancy) |
| Scopus (n=103) | (Left atrial appendage occlusion OR left atrial appendage closure) AND (cancer OR neoplasm OR malignancy) |

Table S2. Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment for cohorts.

| | Study name | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | Hobohm <i>et al.</i> | Kumar <i>et al.</i> | Shabtaie <i>et al.</i> | Zhang <i>et al.</i> | Zweiker <i>et al.</i> |
| Selection (4) | | | | | |
| Representativeness of the exposed cohort | * | * | * | * | * |
| Selection of the non-exposed cohort | * | * | * | * | * |
| Ascertainment of exposure | * | * | * | * | * |
| Demonstration of the outcome of interest was not present at the start of the study | * | | | * | |
| Comparability (2) | | | | | |
| Comparability of cohorts based on the design or analysis | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Outcome (3) | | | | | |
| Assessment of outcome | * | * | * | * | * |
| Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur | * | * | * | * | * |
| Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts | * | * | * | * | * |
| Total (9) | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 |

*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers). **If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

