

Efficacy and safety of pharmacological treatments for patent ductus arteriosus closure: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of clinical trials and observational studies

Ettore Marconi, Alessandra Bettiol, Giuseppe Ambrosio, Vittorio Perduca, Alfredo Vannacci, Stefania Troiani, Carlo Dani, Alessandro Mugelli, Ersilia Lucenteforte

▶ To cite this version:

Ettore Marconi, Alessandra Bettiol, Giuseppe Ambrosio, Vittorio Perduca, Alfredo Vannacci, et al.. Efficacy and safety of pharmacological treatments for patent ductus arteriosus closure: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of clinical trials and observational studies. Pharmacological Research, 2019, 148, pp.104418. 10.1016/j.phrs.2019.104418 hal-02872346

HAL Id: hal-02872346 https://u-paris.hal.science/hal-02872346v1

Submitted on 25 Sep 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- 1 Title:
- 2 Efficacy and safety of pharmacological treatments for Patent Ductus Arteriosus closure: a
- 3 systematic review and network meta-analysis of clinical trials and observational studies

5 Authors:

4

- 6 Ettore Marconi^{1*}, PharmD, Alessandra Bettiol^{1*}, PhD, Giuseppe Ambrosio², MD, PhD, Vittorio
- 7 Perduca³, PhD, Alfredo Vannacci¹, MD, Stefania Troiani⁴, MD, Carlo Dani^{1,5}, MD, Alessandro
- 8 Mugelli¹, MD, Ersilia Lucenteforte⁶, PhD.

9

- 10 Affiliations:
- ¹ Department of Neurosciences, Psychology, Drug Research and Child Health (NEUROFARBA),
- 12 University of Florence, 50139, Florence, Italy.
- ² Division of Cardiology, University Hospital, Perugia, Italy
- ³ Laboratoire de Mathématiques Appliquées MAP5 (UMR CNRS 8145), Université Paris
- 15 Descartes, Paris, France
- ⁴ Division Neonatology, University Hospital, Perugia, Italy
- ⁵ Division of Neonatology, Careggi University Hospital of Florence, Florence, Italy
- ⁶ Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy
- * contributed equally

20

21

- **Corresponding author:**
- 22 Ersilia Lucenteforte, ScD, PhD, Assistant Professor
- 23 ersilia.lucenteforte@unipi.it
- 24 Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine University of Pisa
- 25 Via Savi, 10 56126 Pisa, Italy

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

ABSTRACT

Efficacy and safety profiles of different pharmacological interventions used to treat patent ductus arteriosus (PDA) are relatively unexplored. Integrating the findings of randomized clinical trials (RCTs) with those from observational studies may provide key evidence on this important issue. We aimed at estimating the relative likelihood of failure to close the PDA, need for surgical closure, and occurrence of adverse events among preterm and full-term infants treated with indomethacin, ibuprofen, or acetaminophen, placebo, or no treatment including both RCTs and observational studies. We searched PubMed, Embase, and the Register of Controlled Trials from inception to October 30, 2018. We first estimated proportions of subjects with failure to close the PDA, subjects in whom surgical closure was performed after pharmacological treatment, death, and subjects with selected adverse events (AEs). These estimates were obtained using frequentist random-effect meta-analysis of arm-specific proportions. We then compared active drugs with each other and with control (either placebo or no treatment) by summarizing results at the end of treatment reported in the papers, regardless of number of administration(s), dose, route and type of administration, and study design and quality. We also summarized primary outcome results separately at first, second and third cycles of treatment. These estimates were obtained using Bayesian random-effects network meta-analysis for mixed comparisons, and frequentist random-effect pairwise meta-analysis for direct comparisons. We included 64 RCTs and 24 observational studies including 14,568 subjects (5339 in RCTs and 9229 in observational studies, 8292 subjects received indomethacin, 4761 ibuprofen, 574 acetaminophen, and 941 control (including placebo or no intervention). The proportion of subjects with failure to close the PDA was 0.24 (95% Confidence Interval, CI: 0.20, 0.29) for indomethacin, 0.18 (0.14, 0.22) for ibuprofen, 0.19 (0.09, 0.30) for acetaminophen, and 0.59 (0.48, 0.69) for

53	control . At end of treatment, compared to control, we found inverse associations between all active
54	drugs and failure to close PDA (for indomethacin Odds Ratio, OR, was 0.17 [95% Credible
55	Interval, CrI: 0.11-0.24], ibuprofen 0.19 [0.12-0.28], and acetaminophen 0.15 [0.09-0.26]), without
56	differences among active drugs. We showed inverse associations between effective drugs and need
57	for surgical closure, as compared to control (for indomethacin OR was 0.28 [0.15-0.50], ibuprofen
58	0.30 [0.16-0.54], and acetaminophen 0.19 [0.07-0.46]), without differences among drugs.
59	Indomethacin was directly associated with intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH) (1.27; 1.00, 1.62)
60	compared to ibuprofen, and to oliguria as compared to ibuprofen (3.92; 1.69, 9.82) or
61	acetaminophen (10.8; 1.86, 93.1).
62	In conclusion, active pharmacological treatment, with indomethacin, ibuprofen, or acetaminophen,
63	is inversely associated with failure to close the PDA compared to non-treatment. Quality of
64	evidence was moderate, high and low, respectively. Ibuprofen should be preferred to indomethacin
65	to avoid occurrence of IVH or oliguria, acetaminophen should be preferred to indomethacin to
66	avoid oliguria.
67	
68	Keywords
69	adverse events; intraventricular hemorrhage; network meta-analysis; observational studies; oliguria;
70	patent ductus arteriosus.
71	
72	Chemical compounds
73	Chemical compounds studied in this article were: Indomethacin (PubChem CID: 3715); Ibuprofen
74	(PubChem CID: 1983); Paracetamol/Acetaminophen (PubChem CID: 1983)

Abbreviations

75

77 AEs: adverse events

78 BPD: bronchopulmonary dysplasia

- 79 CI: confidence interval
- 80 CrI: credible interval
- 81 ECHO: echocardiographic
- 82 IV: intravenous
- 83 IVH: intraventricular hemorrhage
- 84 NMA: network meta-analysis
- NSAIDs : non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
- 86 OR: odds ratio
- 87 PDA: patent ductus arteriosus
- 88 RCTs: randomized clinical trials

1. BACKGROUND

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

In fetal life, the ductus arteriosus connects the pulmonary artery to the aorta, playing a central role in the regulation of fetal circulation. At birth, when breathing begins, ductus arteriosus starts closing. However, failure to close or reopening can occur. This condition, defined as patent ductus arteriosus (PDA), has been associated in preterm infants with increased mortality and with major complications, including metabolic acidosis, renal failure, intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH), pulmonary hemorrhage, bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD), necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC), prolonged ventilator dependence, and heart failure[1]. PDA is one of the most common cardiovascular diseases in premature infants. It occurs in up to 33% and 65% in very low birthweight infants and extremely low birth-weight infants, respectively [2, 3]. Management of PDA is based on conservative treatments (i.e. fluid restriction, diuretics, etc.) while waiting for spontaneous closure [4], pharmacological therapy with cyclooxygenase inhibitors, and surgical closure [5]. A major issue in the management of patients with PDA is the choice of treatment, both in terms of timing and type of treatment. The most common options for pharmacological closure of PDA are indomethacin and ibuprofen. Indomethacin has been historically used as the main first-line therapy, but it has been associated with several adverse events (AEs) (i.e. renal insufficiency, NEC) [6]. As for ibuprofen, a recent meta-analysis demonstrated that it is as effective as indomethacin in closing PDA, with significantly lower gastrointestinal and renal AEs, and recommended it as first-line treatment [7]. More recently, acetaminophen has also been introduced in clinical practice for the management of PDA, mainly in infants with contraindications to cyclooxygenase inhibitors. According to a recent Cochrane systematic review, acetaminophen resulted comparable to ibuprofen in terms of efficacy, with a better safety profile [8]. However, this approach still awaits definitive validation due to a lack of data on long-term follow-up of acetaminophen-treated infants.

In 2018, a network meta-analysis (NMA) comparing the efficacy and safety of these three active principles was published [9] and concluded that high-dose oral ibuprofen represented the most effective pharmacotherapeutic option for PDA closure. However, that NMA included only RCTs. As randomized allocation protects against bias and confounding effects that can undermine the validity of the study, RCTs are the gold standard to evaluate drug efficacy. However, RCT design may have limitations. In particular, due to strict inclusion criteria, RCTs may not provide a representative picture of "real world" management of the disease. Moreover, RCTs, generally with short follow-up and small sample size, are often inadequate to evaluate drug safety because only frequent and acute AEs are usually assessed in these studies, whereas unknown, rare, and/or longterm latency AEs are difficult to detect due to insufficient length of follow up. Thus, observational studies may provide additional information also regarding safety. Another advantage of including non-randomized studies is that network meta-analysis including studies with both designs allow to improve density network and to connect disconnected drugs [10]. All these advantages may offer opportunities to provide more comprehensive evidence about the comparative safety and effectiveness of treatments. We conducted a systematic review and NMA of both RCTs and observational studies, using a Bayesian approach, for the comparison of the efficacy and safety profiles of the pharmacotherapeutic options available for PDA treatment, namely indomethacin, ibuprofen, and acetaminophen, with the aim of complementing current knowledge on this issue and contributing to evidence-based drug selection.

135

136

137

138

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

2. METHODS

The protocol for this systemic review and network meta-analysis has been registered in the PROSPERO database (CRD42016053487).

2.1. Criteria for considering studies

- 141 Types of studies: We considered RCTs and observational studies. We considered full-text
- publications written in English, irrespective of date of publication.
- 143 Types of participants: We included studies performed on preterm infants (<37 weeks' gestational
- age), full term (≥37 weeks' gestational age), low-birth-weight (<2500 g), and normal-weight infants
- 145 (≥2500 g), with PDA diagnosed either clinically or by echocardiographic (ECHO) criteria in the
- neonatal period (<28 days).
- 147 Types of interventions: We considered studies employing any of the following pharmacological
- treatments: ibuprofen; indomethacin; acetaminophen; no active intervention. For each intervention,
- we considered:

- i) the active principle;
- ii) the route of administration: oral, intravenous (IV), or rectal;
- iii) the type of IV infusion: rapid infusion (bolus over 1 min), standard infusion (over 5-30 min),
- slow infusion (over 30-60 min), continuous infusion (CI, over 4-36 h);
- 154 iv) the type of administration: ECHO-guided administration (i.e. PDA status was verified after each
- administration; if PDA closured occurred, no further dose was administered) vs non-ECHO-guided
- administration (i.e. the whole course was administered independently of occurrence of PDA closure
- before the end of the course).
- v) cycle of treatment: number of times therapy was repeated, if any.
- vi) the following treatment dosage scheme:
- For indomethacin:
- Low dose (total intake ≤0.30 mg/kg; max duration of treatment: 3 days): 0.1 mg/kg x 3
- doses, every 12 or 24 h; 0.15 mg/kg x 2 doses at 12-h interval; 1 dose of 0.2 mg/kg.
- Intermediate dose (total intake between 0.40 and 0.70 mg/kg; max duration of
- treatment: 3 days): 0.2 mg/kg x 3 doses every 12 or 24 h; 0.2 mg/kg x 1 dose + 0.1

- mg/kg x 2 doses every 12 or 24 h; 0.2 mg/kg x 1 dose + 0.25 mg/kg x 2 doses every 12
 or 24 h; 0.2 mg/kg x 2 doses at 24- h interval; 0.25 mg/kg x 2 doses at 24-h interval.
 - High dose (total intake >0.70 mg/kg): 0.30 mg/kg x 3 doses at 24-h interval (schedule intervals not further specified).
 - Prolonged treatment (total intake of 0.60-0.80 mg/kg; duration of treatment: 6-7 days):
 0.1 mg/kg x 6 doses at 24-h interval; 0.1 mg/kg x 7 doses at 24-h interval; 0.15 mg/kg x
 2 doses at 12-h interval + 0.1 mg/kg x 5 doses at 24-h interval).

• For ibuprofen:

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

- Low dose: 1 dose of ibuprofen 10 mg/kg.
- Intermediate dose (total intake of 20 mg/kg): 10 mg/kg x 1 dose + 5 mg/kg x 2 doses, every 12 or 24 h.
 - High dose (total intake between 30-40 mg/kg): 20 mg/kg x 1 dose + 10 mg/kg x 2 doses, every 12 or 24 h; 10 mg/kg x 3 doses, at 24-h interval.

• For acetaminophen:

- Intermediate dose (total intake <200 mg/kg; duration 3-4 days): 15 mg/kg every 6 h for 3 days (tot: 195 mg/kg); 20 mg/kg x 1 dose + maintaining doses of 7.5 mg/kg every 6 h for 4 days (145 mg/kg); 10 mg/kg every 6 h for 3 days (tot: 130 mg/kg).
- Prolonged treatment (total intake >400 mg/kg; duration 7 days): 15 mg/kg every 6 h for 7 days (tot: 435 mg/kg).
- All these parameters were analyzed separately in subgroup analysis.
- Types of outcome measures: We assessed benefits and harm of pharmacological interventions by
 evaluating the following outcomes: failure to close PDA (according to ECHO criteria and/or
 clinical evaluation) as primary outcome; need for surgical PDA closure, death, and occurrence of
 selected AEs, as secondary outcomes. AEs were defined as any untoward medical occurrence, or
 death, not necessarily having a causal relationship with treatment. Based on biological plausibility

and expert clinical consensus, we considered the following AEs: NEC, Intestinal perforation, Gastrointestinal bleeding, BPD, IVH, Periventricular leukomalacia, and Oliguria.

2.2. Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches: We searched PubMed and Embase from inception to October 30, 2018 for studies comparing two or more of the above interventions on infants with PDA. To identify additional trials, we also searched ClinicalTrials.gov. Full search strategies are available in *Appendix 1*. Briefly, two search themes were combined using the Boolean operator "AND": the first theme about drugs (i.e. Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs - NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ibuprofen, indomethacin), and the second theme about condition (i.e. patent ductus arteriosus).

Papers selection: EndNote Basic software was used to manage the records retrieved from the searches. Two authors (EM, AB) independently identified studies for inclusion by screening titles and abstracts yielded from the search. We retrieved the full-text of all articles that at least one of the review authors had identified for potential inclusion. We selected studies for inclusion on the basis of review of full-text articles. Discrepancies were resolved through consensus.

2.3. Data extraction and management

- Two authors (EM, AB) independently extracted the following data:
- Treatment data: active principle; route of administration; type of IV infusion (when
 appropriate); ECHO- or non-ECHO-guided administration; cycles of treatment; dosage.
- Outcome data: number of randomized participants and number of participants included in the
 analysis (for RCTs); number of participants with events for binary outcomes; definition of
 outcomes, if appropriate.
- 214 3. Data on potential effect modifiers: participants' characteristics, such as age, gender; assessment215 of bias risk.

4. Other data: study design; year of publication; country in which participants were recruited; follow-up time; funding sources.

Assessment of risk of bias: To assess the risk of bias of RCTs, we followed the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* [11]. Specifically, we assessed risk of bias for the following domains: selection (random sequence generation; allocation concealment); performance (blinding of participants and personnel); detection (blinding of outcome); attrition (incomplete outcome data); reporting (selective reporting); other unclear bias. To assess the risk of bias of observational studies, we followed the *Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale* [12]. Specifically, for cohort studies, we assessed risk of bias for the following domains: selection (representativeness of the exposed cohort; selection of the non-exposed cohort; ascertainment of exposure; lack of definition of pre-defined end-point); comparability; outcome (assessment of

outcome; appropriate length of follow-up; adequacy of follow-up of cohorts).

2.4. Data analysis

We first estimated proportions of subjects with failure to close the PDA, subjects in whom surgical closure was performed after pharmacological treatment, deaths, and subjects with selected AEs. We defined proportion as number of subjects reporting the selected events divided by total number of subjects. We considered studies comparing two active drugs or one drug with control (placebo or no treatment), and studies comparing the same drugs at different doses, routes or types of administration, and types of infusion. We conducted a random effect frequentist meta-analysis of arm-specific proportions using the arcsine transformation for arm-specific proportions, the 95% Clopper-Pearson Confidence Interval, CI, for arm-specific CI, the inverse variance method for pooling the overall proportion, and the DerSimonian-Laird method for estimation of the between-study variance. We used the "metaprop" routine within the META R package [13]. Results are presented as pooled proportions with 95% Confidence Interval (CI).

We then compared drugs with each other and with control by meta-analyzing studies that comparing two active drugs or one drug with control (placebo or no treatment) and by considering results reported at the end of the treatment (i.e. last cycle of treatment) regardless of route and type of administration, type of infusion, dose, and study design and quality. Thus, we did not consider studies comparing the same drugs at different doses, routes or types of administration, and types of infusion). We also considered separately the first, second, and third cycle of treatment for failure to close PDA, and compared route and type of administration, type of infusion, and dose within active principle for failure to close PDA and need of surgical closure. We performed a network metaanalysis with the aim of simultaneously analyzing direct comparisons of interventions within studies (subject of conventional pairwise meta-analysis), and indirect comparisons across studies. If the efficacy of two interventions (A and B) is to be compared but no studies comparing them are available, indirect evidence can be obtained by studying either A or B versus a common comparator. When both direct and indirect evidence were available (mixed comparison), the information was combined. The network maps show which interventions are directly compared with each other and depict how much information is available for each drug and for each comparison. For mixed-treatment comparison, we performed a random-effect NMA within a Bayesian framework using the GeMTC (Generate Mixed Treatment Comparisons) R package (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gemtc) [14]. We simultaneously ran four chains with different arbitrarily-chosen initial values, with a variance scaling factor of 2.5. Convergence and lack of autocorrelation were checked and confirmed after 20,000 iterations with thinning interval equal to 1, followed by 50,000 iterations to estimate parameters. We used default noninformative values for priors, and default values for the likelihood and link functions (suitable for the data). Results are presented as Odds Ratios (ORs) and their 95% Credible Intervals (CrIs), the Bayesian equivalent to Confidence Intervals (CIs). For direct comparisons, we performed a random-effects pairwise meta-analysis within the frequentist approach using the Mantel-Haenszel method for

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

- pooling, continuity correction of 0.5 in studies with zero cell frequencies, and the DerSimonian-268 269 Laird method for estimation of the between-study variance. We used the routine "metabin" within 270 the META R package (https://CRAN.R- project.org/package=meta) [13]. Results are presented as 271 ORs and their 95% CIs. We assessed heterogeneity in meta-analyses of arm-specific proportions and in pairwise meta-272 273 analyses of direct comparisons with the Cochrane O test. 274 We assessed inconsistency in network meta-analysis with node-splitting analysis. We assessed robustness of results by performing subgroup analysis by study design (RCTs versus 275 276 observational studies). 277 We assessed similarity between RCTs and observational studies by comparing pairwise metaanalyses of direct comparisons limited to RCTs with those limited to observational studies. 278 279 A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. 280 281 3. RESULTS 282 The reference flow is summarized in the study flow diagram (Fig. 1). We identified 5,395 283 references through electronic searches of PubMed (n=1760), Embase (n=3590) and 284 ClinicalTrials.gov (n=45). After removing 1592 duplicates, 3803 references were screened. We 285 excluded 3275 irrelevant references by reading titles and abstracts. We retrieved 528 full-text references, of which 437 were excluded as detailed in Figure 1. In total, 88 references met inclusion 286 criteria, 64 were RCTs [15-78] and 24 observational studies [79-102]. All observational studies 287 288 included had a cohort design. The intervention strategies of the 88 included studies are reported in Appendix 2. 289
 - Data on efficacy outcome, defined as failure to close PDA, were available for 83 studies (63 RCTs, 20 observational studies), and 59 studies (46 RCTs, 13 observational studies) compared two or more interventions (*Appendix 3*). Data about the need for PDA surgical closure were available for 54 studies (36 RCTs, 18 observational studies), and 34 studies (22 RCTs, 12 observational studies)

291

292

observational studies); 42 studies (30 RCTs, 12 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of death; 39 studies (28 RCTs, 11 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of NEC; 14 studies (7 RCTs, 7 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of intestinal perforation; 17 studies (14 RCTs, 3 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of gastrointestinal bleeding; 29 studies (21 RCTs, 8 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of BPD; 34 studies (26 RCTs, 8 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of IVH; 14 studies (11 RCTs, 3 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of periventricular leukomalacia; and 12 studies (9 RCTs, 3 observational studies) compared two or more interventions in terms of oliguria.

Overall, 14,568 subjects were investigated (5339 in RCTs and 9229 in observational studies).

Median follow-up was 18 (range 0.5-70) months for RCTs, and 53 (11-120) months for observational studies. With respect to intervention, 8292 subjects received indomethacin, 4761

3.1. Risk of bias

30 RCTs were judged at high risk of performance bias [15-18, 20, 21, 25-28, 30, 31, 35, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 53, 57, 59-62, 64, 70, 73, 74, 77], 11 at high risk of attrition bias [15, 22, 23, 31, 35, 44, 54, 56, 60, 62, 69], 12 at high risk of detection bias [18, 21, 26-28, 48, 53, 57, 61, 70, 73, 74], and three at high risk of selection bias (either considering randomization or allocation) [52, 54, 55] (*Appendix 4 and Appendix 5*). Nineteen studies were at high risk of bias in at least two items, 27 were at low/unclear risk of bias in all items, and two studies had low risk of bias in all items. Selective reporting bias was the least reported domain, with no studies judged at high risk. Considering observational studies, all 24 studies had a cohort design. Based on the *Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale* for this type of study design, 12 studies obtained a score of 9 out

ibuprofen, 574 acetaminophen, and 941 control, including placebo or no intervention.

_--

of 9 [79-81, 84, 89, 91, 93-95, 97, 99, 101], nine had a score of 8 [83, 85, 86, 88, 92, 96, 98, 100,

102], two studies a score of 7 [82, 87], and one a score of 6 [90] (*Appendix 6*).

322

323

320

321

3.2. Efficacy - failure to close PDA

The proportion of subjects with failure to close the PDA was 0.24 (95% CI: 0.20, 0.29) for 324 325 indomethacin, 0.18 (0.14, 0.22) for ibuprofen, 0.19 (0.09, 0.30) for acetaminophen, and 0.59 (0.48, 326 0.69) for control (*Table 1*). Fifty-nine studies compared the efficacy of different active principles to treat PDA (Fig. 2a). At last 327 328 cycle of treatment, we found an inverse association between active principles and failure to close 329 PDA as compared to control (OR was 0.17 [95% CI: 0.11, 0.24] for indomethacin, 0.19 [0.12, 0.28] 330 for ibuprofen, and 0.15 [0.09, 0.26] for acetaminophen), with no differences among them (*Table 2*). 331 All direct evidences contributing to the meta-analyses that showed the above significant ORs came 332 from RCTs: 2 studies for acetaminophen versus control, 6 studies for ibuprofen versus control, and 10 studies for indomethacin versus control (*Appendix 2*). The overall quality of these RCTs was 333 334 moderate for acetaminophen versus control (1 out of 2 studies was judged at high risk of 335 performance and detection bias, *Appendix 5*) and indomethacin versus control (6 out of 10 studies 336 were judged at high risk of selection or attrition or performance bias), and high for ibuprofen 337 versus control (1 out of 6 studies was judged at high risk of performance and detection bias). 338 Regarding cycle of treatment, we observed similar effectiveness of studied drugs for both the first and second pharmacological course (Table 2). Data for the third cycle were scanty and the control 339 340 arm was missing, thus, it was not possible to compare results of this cycle with those of the last 341 cycle of treatment. Direct comparisons confirmed the results of mixed comparisons. 342 When we limited analysis to RCTs (Appendix 7) these results were confirmed, as we found no association between failure to close PDA and different routes of administration, dosages or 343 344 procedures for indomethacin (Appendix 8) and ibuprofen (Appendix 9). No study tested different routes of administrations, dosages or procedures for acetaminophen. When we compared results of 345

346 direct comparisons from RCTs and observational studies (*Appendix 7*), similarity between study 347 designs was observed. 348 3.3. Need for surgical closure 349 The proportion of subjects in whom surgical closure was performed after pharmacological 350 351 treatment was 0.12 (95% CI: 0.10, 0.15) for indomethacin, 0.09 (0.06, 0.12) for ibuprofen, 0.03 352 (0.00, 0.15) for acetaminophen, and 0.18 (0.08, 0.31) for control (*Table 1*). Thirty-four studies compared the proportion of surgical PDA closure for different drugs (*Fig. 2b*). 353 354 Mixed comparisons showed inverse associations between active principles and need for surgical 355 closure as compared to control (OR was 0.28 [95%CrI: 0.15, 0.50] for indomethacin, 0.30 [0.16, 356 0.54] for ibuprofen, and 0.19 [0.07, 0.46] for acetaminophen), without significant differences 357 among drugs (Table 2). 358 Direct comparisons confirmed the results of mixed comparisons. These results were confirmed when we limited analysis to RCTs (Appendix 7), and we found no 359 360 association between surgical PDA closure and different routes of administrations, dosages or procedures of indomethacin (Appendix 8) and ibuprofen (Appendix 9). No study tested different 361 362 routes of administration, dosages or procedures of acetaminophen. 363 When we compared results of direct comparisons from RCTs and observational studies (*Appendix* 7), similarity between study designs was observed. 364 365 366 3.4. Safety The proportion of deaths ranged between 0.09 and 0.11 for acetaminophen, ibuprofen and 367 indomethacin, and it was 0.13 for control (*Table 1*). Many different AEs were reported in the 368 included studies (Appendix 3). 369 The proportions of subjects with NEC, intestinal perforation, gastrointestinal bleeding, and 370

periventricular leukomalacia were between 0.02 and 0.11 (*Table 1*). High proportions were

observed for BDP in subjects treated with indomethacin (0.39), ibuprofen (0.31), and control (0.29, 372 373 for IVH in subjects treated with indomethacin (0.17), ibuprofen or acetaminophen (0.12) or control (0.18), and for oliguria in subjects treated with indomethacin (0.20) or control (0.28). 374 375 No significant association was found for the above AEs and active principles, with the exception of IVH and oliguria (*Table 3*). Indomethacin was directly associated with IVH (OR=1.27; 95% CrI: 376 377 1.00, 1.62) as compared to ibuprofen, and with oliguria as compared to ibuprofen (3.92 [1.69, 9.82]) 378 or acetaminophen (10.8 [1.86, 93.31]). 379 These results were confirmed when we limited analysis to RCTs (Appendix 10). When we compared results of direct comparisons from RCTs and observational studies, similarity between 380 381 study designs was observed with exception of indomethacin vs ibuprofen (though p-values from heterogeneity test for subgroup differences were not significant) regarding death, intestinal 382 383 perforation and oliguria where direct RCT evidence produces pooled OR of 1.05 (0.69, 1.59) while 384 observational evidence 0.74 (0.63, 0.86) for death, 1.16 (0.44, 3.04) and 0.47 (0.35, 0.63) for

386

387

385

4. **DISCUSSION**

388 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first NMA that systematically assesses the efficacy and 389 safety of indomethacin, ibuprofen, and acetaminophen in closing PDA in preterm infants through 390 analysis of both RCTs and observational studies. 391 In our NMA, indomethacin, ibuprofen and acetaminophen had similar effect on failure to close the 392 PDA closure and decreasing the need for surgical closure, independent from the treatment cycle. 393 We can judge the superiority of ibuprofen over control with high quality of evidence (RCTs with overall high quality), the superiority of indomethacin over control with moderate quality of 394 395 evidence (RCTs with overall moderate quality), and the superiority of acetaminophen over control with low quality of evidence (only 2 RCTs with overall moderate). 396

intestinal perforation, 3.75 (1.74, 8.07) and 2.69 (0.79,9.10) for oliguria.

All routes of administration, dosages, and ECHO- or non-ECHO-guided administrations were found to have similar efficacy within the same medication. Occurrence of NEC, intestinal perforation, gastrointestinal bleeding and periventricular leukomalacia was low (below 0.11) among the three treatments. The most frequently reported AEs were BPD for indomethacin (0.39), ibuprofen (0.31), and control (0.29), IVH for indomethacin (0.17), ibuprofen or acetaminophen (0.12) and control (0.18), and oliguria (a proxy of acute renal failure) for indomethacin (0.20) and control (0.28). In the comparison analysis, we found a direct association between indomethacin and IVH compared to ibuprofen, and between indomethacin and oliguria compared to ibuprofen or acetaminophen, confirming its poorest safety profile. To date, only one NMA compared the efficacy and safety profiles of indomethacin, ibuprofen, and acetaminophen in closing PDA [9]. That NMA was performed only on RCTs, including 4802 infants, and concluded that a high dose of oral ibuprofen was associated with higher rates of PDA closure compared to standard dose of intravenous ibuprofen (OR 3.59; 95% CrI 1.64 -8.17) or indomethacin (2.35; 1.08-5.31). Moreover, no significant differences in the odds of mortality, NEC, IVH, and oliguria were found between pharmacological treatments and control groups. These results seem partly at variance with our findings, but actually they cannot be directly compared as our NMA was based on a much larger number of subjects, included observational studies as well, and evaluated the possible effect of administration route within drug. Furthermore, in the cited NMA, the superiority of a high dose of oral ibuprofen was mostly driven by the results of just three RCTs [22, 62, 103]; of note, those results cannot be easily translated into clinical practice due to limited availability of oral ibuprofen and, mainly, of limited use of high ibuprofen doses. On the other hand, our results are in partial agreement with a Cochrane review published in 2018 [7] concluding that ibuprofen is as effective as indomethacin in closing PDA while reducing the risk of NEC and transient renal insufficiency, and with another Cochrane review published in 2018 [104] concluding that paracetamol is as effective as ibuprofen in closing a PDA, with a possibly lower risk of gastrointestinal and renal AEs.

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

Pharmacological treatment of PDA has changed over recent decades with the introduction of ibuprofen and quite recently of acetaminophen as alternatives to the traditional approach based on indomethacin. The favorable results of acetaminophen may have a pharmacological explanation as it is now clear that, contrary to a long-held tenet, acetaminophen also inhibits cyclo-oxygenase, thus explaining its efficacy in favoring PDA closure [105]. Our study reinforces the notion that active pharmacological treatment is superior to non-treatment in decreasing the risks of unfavorable clinical conditions associated with PDA, such as an increase of pulmonary blood flow and edema, and a decrease of renal, mesenteric and cerebral perfusion. Similarly, by decreasing the need for surgical closure, effective pharmacological therapy avoids surgical risks and postoperative complications [106]. However, despite the higher rates of failure to close PDA, we observed that controls had similar mortality as well as similar risk of overall AEs in comparison with active treatments. On the other hand, it has been previously reported that the lack of improvement in preterm infants' outcomes in trials on PDA treatment may reflect several possible factors, such as the inaccurate assessment of hemodynamic significance of PDA in studied infants, and the 50-70% cross-over of placeboassigned infants to the active treatment group [107]. Thus, the "treatment" versus "no treatment" RCTs may not accurately capture the morbidity effects of PDA in preterm infants [108, 109]. The present study has some limitations. First, this NMA was based on the assumption that baseline clinical characteristics were largely similar among different studies comparing different medications. Variations in gestational age, birth weight, timing of treatment, comorbidities and cotreatments may have influenced our results. More important, the inclusion of both preterm and term infants in the review could substantially affect interpretation of results as the physiology, natural history and management of PDA are different in the two populations. Second, the no risk-adjusted estimates from the included observational studies may have influenced our results even if no differences were observed between results from RCTs and those from observational studies. Third,

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

448	limited sample size of studies evaluating specific AEs or types of intervention may have resulted in
449	imprecision in estimating proportions, precluding the derivation of meaningful inferences.
450	
451	5. CONCLUSIONS
452	In conclusion, our NMA confirms that pharmacological treatment with either indomethacin,
453	ibuprofen or acetaminophen is effective (with moderate, high and low quality of evidence,
454	respectively) in closing PDA and limiting PDA surgical closure in comparison with non-treatment.
455	Ibuprofen limits the risk of IVH and oliguria in comparison to indomethacin; acetaminophen pose
456	less risk of oliguria in comparison to indomethacin. We are confident that ongoing further RCTs,
457	comparing short-term effects on PDA closure and safety and long-term effects on
458	neurodevelopmental outcome, in preterm infants treated with ibuprofen or paracetamol will support
459	evidence-based neonatologists' prescription choices.
460	
461	Author Contributions
462	EM and AB contributed equally to the study.
463	EL had full access to all data and took responsibility for its integrity and the accuracy of its
464	analysis.
465	Study concept and design: GA, CD, AM, and EL.
466	Administrative, technical, or material support and acquisition of data: EM and AB.
467	Statistical analysis: VP and EL.
468	Drafting of the manuscript: EM, AB, and EL.
469	Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.
470	Study supervision: EL.
471	
472	Conflict of Interest Disclosures

EM, AB, VP, AV, ST, and EL have no conflict of interest to declare. GA has served as a consultant to Angelini. CD has served as scientific consultant for Orphan Europe. AM was a member of a Board Meeting by Angelini.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

481 References

- 482 [1] A. El-Khuffash, A.T. James, A. Cleary, J. Semberova, O. Franklin, J. Miletin, Late medical
- 483 therapy of patent ductus arteriosus using intravenous paracetamol, Archives of disease in childhood.
- 484 Fetal and neonatal edition 100(3) (2015) F253-6.
- 485 [2] A. Chiruvolu, M.A. Jaleel, Pathophysiology of patent ductus arteriosus in premature neonates,
- 486 Early human development 85(3) (2009) 143-6.
- 487 [3] B. Van Overmeire, S. Chemtob, The pharmacologic closure of the patent ductus arteriosus,
- 488 Seminars in fetal & neonatal medicine 10(2) (2005) 177-84.
- 489 [4] W.E. Benitz, Treatment of persistent patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants: time to accept
- 490 the null hypothesis?, Journal of perinatology : official journal of the California Perinatal
- 491 Association 30(4) (2010) 241-52.
- 492 [5] S. Prescott, J. Keim-Malpass, Patent Ductus Arteriosus in the Preterm Infant: Diagnostic and
- 493 Treatment Options, Advances in neonatal care : official journal of the National Association of
- 494 Neonatal Nurses 17(1) (2017) 10-18.
- 495 [6] L. Cooke, P. Steer, P. Woodgate, Indomethacin for asymptomatic patent ductus arteriosus in
- preterm infants, The Cochrane database of systematic reviews (2) (2003) CD003745.
- 497 [7] A. Ohlsson, R. Walia, S.S. Shah, Ibuprofen for the treatment of patent ductus arteriosus in
- 498 preterm or low birth weight (or both) infants, The Cochrane database of systematic reviews 9
- 499 (2018) CD003481.
- [8] A. Ohlsson, P.S. Shah, Paracetamol (acetaminophen) for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm or
- low-birth-weight infants, The Cochrane database of systematic reviews (3) (2015) CD010061.
- 502 [9] S. Mitra, I.D. Florez, M.E. Tamayo, L. Mbuagbaw, T. Vanniyasingam, A.A. Veroniki, A.M.
- 503 Zea, Y. Zhang, B. Sadeghirad, L. Thabane, Association of Placebo, Indomethacin, Ibuprofen, and
- Acetaminophen With Closure of Hemodynamically Significant Patent Ductus Arteriosus in Preterm
- Infants: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis, Jama 319(12) (2018) 1221-1238.
- 506 [10] C. Cameron, B. Fireman, B. Hutton, T. Clifford, D. Coyle, G. Wells, C.R. Dormuth, R. Platt,
- 507 S. Toh, Network meta-analysis incorporating randomized controlled trials and non-randomized
- 508 comparative cohort studies for assessing the safety and effectiveness of medical treatments:
- 509 challenges and opportunities, Systematic reviews 4 (2015) 147.
- 510 [11] J.P. Higgins, D.G. Altman, P.C. Gotzsche, P. Juni, D. Moher, A.D. Oxman, J. Savovic, K.F.
- 511 Schulz, L. Weeks, J.A. Sterne, G. Cochrane Bias Methods, G. Cochrane Statistical Methods, The
- 512 Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials, BMJ (Clinical research
- 513 ed.) 343 (2011) d5928.
- 514 [12] G. Wells, B. Shea, D. O'Connell, e. al., The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the
- Quality of Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-analyses. .
- 516 [13] G. Schwarzer, Package 'meta' General Package for Meta-Analysis, (2019).
- 517 [14] G. van Valkenhoef, J. Kuiper, Package 'gemtc' Network Meta-Analysis Using Bayesian
- 518 Methods, (2016).
- 519 [15] M. Akar, T.G. Yildirim, G. Sandal, S. Bozdag, O. Erdeve, N. Altug, N. Uras, S.S. Oguz, U.
- 520 Dilmen, Does ibuprofen treatment in patent ductus arteriosus alter oxygen free radicals in
- 521 premature infants?, Cardiology in the young (2016) 1-5.
- 522 [16] M.R. Alipour, M. Mozaffari Shamsi, S.M. Namayandeh, Z. Pezeshkpour, F. Rezaeipour, M.
- 523 Sarebanhassanabadi, The Effects of Oral Ibuprofen on Medicinal Closure of Patent Ductus
- Arteriosus in Full-Term Neonates in the Second Postnatal Week, Iranian journal of pediatrics 26(4)
- 525 (2016) e5807.
- 526 [17] M. Al-Lawama, I. Alammori, T. Abdelghani, E. Badran, Oral paracetamol versus oral
- 527 ibuprofen for treatment of patent ductus arteriosus, The Journal of international medical research
- 528 46(2) (2018) 811-818.
- 529 [18] H. Aly, W. Lotfy, N. Badrawi, M. Ghawas, I.E. Abdel-Meguid, T.A. Hammad, Oral Ibuprofen
- and ductus arteriosus in premature infants: a randomized pilot study, American journal of
- 531 perinatology 24(5) (2007) 267-70.

- [19] H. Amoozgar, M. Ghodstehrani, N. Pishva, Oral ibuprofen and ductus arteriosus closure in
- full-term neonates: a prospective case-control study, Pediatric cardiology 31(1) (2010) 40-3.
- [20] H.P. Asadpour N., Hamidi M., Malek Ahmadi M., Malekpour-Tehrani A., Comparison of the
- effect of oral acetaminophen and ibuprofen on patent ductus arteriosus closure in premature infants
- referred to hajar hospital in Shahrekord in 2016-2017, Journal of Clinical Neonatology 7(4) (2018) 7.
- 538 [21] N.R. Babaei H, Daryoshi H, Closure of patent ductus arteriosus with oral acetaminophen in
- preterm neonates: A randomized trial, Biomedical Research and Therapy 5(2) (2018) 11.
- 540 [22] M.M. Bagheri, P. Niknafs, F. Sabsevari, M.H. Torabi, B.B. Bijari, E. Noroozi, H. Mossavi,
- Comparison of oral acetaminophen versus ibuprofen in premature infants with patent ductus
- arteriosus, Iranian Journal of Pediatrics 26(4) (2016).
- 543 [23] B. Balachander, N. Mondal, V. Bhat, B. Adhisivam, M. Kumar, S. Satheesh, M. Thulasingam,
- Comparison of efficacy of oral paracetamol versus ibuprofen for PDA closure in preterms a
- prospective randomized clinical trial, The journal of maternal-fetal & neonatal medicine : the
- official journal of the European Association of Perinatal Medicine, the Federation of Asia and
- Oceania Perinatal Societies, the International Society of Perinatal Obstet (2018) 1-6.
- 548 [24] M.C. Bravo, F. Cabanas, J. Riera, E. Perez-Fernandez, J. Quero, J. Perez-Rodriguez, A.
- Pellicer, Randomised controlled clinical trial of standard versus echocardiographically guided
- ibuprofen treatment for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants: a pilot study, The journal of
- maternal-fetal & neonatal medicine : the official journal of the European Association of Perinatal
- Medicine, the Federation of Asia and Oceania Perinatal Societies, the International Society of
- 553 Perinatal Obstet 27(9) (2014) 904-9.
- 554 [25] K.B. Carmo, N. Evans, M. Paradisis, Duration of indomethacin treatment of the preterm patent
- ductus arteriosus as directed by echocardiography, The Journal of pediatrics 155(6) (2009) 819-
- 556 822.e1.
- 557 [26] A. Cherif, N. Khrouf, S. Jabnoun, C. Mokrani, M.B. Amara, N. Guellouze, S. Kacem,
- Randomized pilot study comparing oral ibuprofen with intravenous ibuprofen in very low birth
- weight infants with patent ductus arteriosus, Pediatrics 122(6) (2008) e1256-61.
- 560 [27] U. Chotigeat, K. Jirapapa, T. Layangkool, A comparison of oral ibuprofen and intravenous
- indomethacin for closure of patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants, Journal of the Medical
- Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet thangphaet 86 Suppl 3 (2003) S563-9.
- 563 [28] D. Dang, D. Wang, C. Zhang, W. Zhou, Q. Zhou, H. Wu, Comparison of oral paracetamol
- versus ibuprofen in premature infants with patent ductus arteriosus: a randomized controlled trial,
- 565 PloS one 8(11) (2013) e77888.
- 566 [29] C. Dani, V. Vangi, G. Bertini, S. Pratesi, I. Lori, F. Favelli, R. Ciuti, A. Bandinelli, C.
- Martano, P. Murru, H. Messner, F. Schena, F. Mosca, High-dose ibuprofen for patent ductus
- arteriosus in extremely preterm infants: a randomized controlled study, Clinical pharmacology and
- 569 therapeutics 91(4) (2012) 590-6.
- 570 [30] S.K. Dash, N.S. Kabra, B.S. Avasthi, S.R. Sharma, P. Padhi, J. Ahmed, Enteral paracetamol or
- 571 Intravenous Indomethacin for Closure of Patent Ductus Arteriosus in Preterm Neonates: A
- Randomized Controlled Trial, Indian pediatrics 52(7) (2015) 573-8.
- 573 [31] N. Demir, E. Peker, I. Ece, R. Balahoroglu, O. Tuncer, Efficacy and Safety of Rectal Ibuprofen
- 574 for Patent Ductus Arteriosus Closure in Very Low Birth Weight Preterm Infants, The journal of
- 575 maternal-fetal & neonatal medicine : the official journal of the European Association of Perinatal
- Medicine, the Federation of Asia and Oceania Perinatal Societies, the International Society of
- 577 Perinatal Obstet (2017) 1-21.
- 578 [32] Y.J. Ding, B. Han, B. Yang, M. Zhu, NT-proBNP plays an important role in the effect of
- 579 ibuprofen on preterm infants with patent ductus arteriosus, European review for medical and
- 580 pharmacological sciences 18(18) (2014) 2596-8.
- 581 [33] E.S.M. El-Farrash RA, El-Sakka AS, Ahmed MG, Abdel-Moez DG, Oral indomethacin versus
- oral ibuprofen for treatment of patent ductus arteriosus: a randomised controlled study in very low-

- 583 birthweight infants, The journal of maternal-fetal & neonatal medicine : the official journal of the
- 584 European Association of Perinatal Medicine, the Federation of Asia and Oceania Perinatal
- Societies, the International Society of Perinatal Obstet 9(5) (2018) 8.
- 586 [34] A.E. El-Mashad, H. El-Mahdy, D. El Amrousy, M. Elgendy, Comparative study of the efficacy
- and safety of paracetamol, ibuprofen, and indomethacin in closure of patent ductus arteriosus in
- preterm neonates, European journal of pediatrics (2016).
- 589 [35] O. Erdeve, S. Yurttutan, N. Altug, R. Ozdemir, T. Gokmen, U. Dilmen, S.S. Oguz, N. Uras,
- Oral versus intravenous ibuprofen for patent ductus arteriosus closure: a randomised controlled trial
- in extremely low birthweight infants, Archives of disease in childhood. Fetal and neonatal edition
- 592 97(4) (2012) F279-83.
- 593 [36] S.H. Fakhraee, Z. Badiee, S. Mojtahedzadeh, M. Kazemian, R. Kelishadi, Comparison of oral
- 594 ibuprofen and indomethacin therapy for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants, Zhongguo dang
- dai er ke za zhi = Chinese journal of contemporary pediatrics 9(5) (2007) 399-403.
- 596 [37] W.M. Gersony, G.J. Peckham, R.C. Ellison, Effects of indomethacin in premature infants with
- patent ductus arteriosus: Results of a national collaborative study, Journal of Pediatrics 102(6)
- 598 (1983) 895-906.
- [38] S. Ghanem, M. Mostafa, M. Shafee, Effect of oral ibuprofen on patent ductus arteriosus in
- premature newborns, Journal of the Saudi Heart Association 22(1) (2010) 7-12.
- 601 [39] T. Gokmen, O. Erdeve, N. Altug, S.S. Oguz, N. Uras, U. Dilmen, Efficacy and safety of oral
- versus intravenous ibuprofen in very low birth weight preterm infants with patent ductus arteriosus,
- 603 The Journal of pediatrics 158(4) (2011) 549-554.e1.
- [40] C. Hammerman, M.J. Aramburo, Prolonged indomethacin therapy for the prevention of
- recurrences of patent ductus arteriosus, The Journal of pediatrics 117(5) (1990) 771-6.
- 606 [41] C. Hammerman, J. Glaser, M.S. Schimmel, B. Ferber, M. Kaplan, A.I. Eidelman, Continuous
- versus multiple rapid infusions of indomethacin: effects on cerebral blood flow velocity, Pediatrics
- 608 95(2) (1995) 244-8.
- 609 [42] C. Hammerman, I. Shchors, S. Jacobson, M.S. Schimmel, R. Bromiker, M. Kaplan, A. Nir,
- 610 Ibuprofen versus continuous indomethacin in premature neonates with patent ductus arteriosus: is
- the difference in the mode of administration?, Pediatric research 64(3) (2008) 291-7.
- 612 [43] P. Harkin, A. Harma, O. Aikio, M. Valkama, M. Leskinen, T. Saarela, M. Hallman,
- Paracetamol Accelerates Closure of the Ductus Arteriosus after Premature Birth: A Randomized
- 614 Trial, The Journal of pediatrics 177 (2016) 72-77.e2.
- 615 [44] P. Kaapa, P. Lanning, M. Koivisto, Early closure of patent ductus arteriosus with indomethacin
- 616 in preterm infants with idiopathic respiratory distress syndrome, Acta paediatrica Scandinavica
- 617 72(2) (1983) 179-84.
- 618 [45] J.C. Khuwuthyakorn V, Silvilairat S, Tantiprapha W, Oral indomethacin versus oral ibuprofen
- for treatment of patent ductus arteriosus: a randomised controlled study in very low-birthweight
- 620 infants, Paediatr Int Child Health 38(8) (2018) 6.
- 621 [46] M. Kluckow, M. Jeffery, A. Gill, N. Evans, A randomised placebo-controlled trial of early
- treatment of the patent ductus arteriosus, Archives of disease in childhood. Fetal and neonatal
- 623 edition 99(2) (2014) F99-f104.
- 624 [47] A.N. Krauss, N. Fatica, B.S. Lewis, R. Cooper, H.T. Thaler, C. Cirrincione, J. O'Loughlin, A.
- 625 Levin, M.A. Engle, P.A. Auld, Pulmonary function in preterm infants following treatment with
- intravenous indomethacin, American journal of diseases of children (1960) 143(1) (1989) 78-81.
- 627 [48] P. Lago, T. Bettiol, S. Salvadori, I. Pitassi, A. Vianello, L. Chiandetti, O.S. Saia, Safety and
- 628 efficacy of ibuprofen versus indomethacin in preterm infants treated for patent ductus arteriosus: a
- 629 randomised controlled trial, European journal of pediatrics 161(4) (2002) 202-7.
- 630 [49] P. Lago, S. Salvadori, F. Opocher, S. Ricato, L. Chiandetti, A.C. Frigo, Continuous infusion of
- 631 ibuprofen for treatment of patent ductus arteriosus in very low birth weight infants, Neonatology
- 632 105(1) (2013) 46-54.

- [50] J. Lee, V.S. Rajadurai, K.W. Tan, K.Y. Wong, E.H. Wong, J.Y.N. Leong, Randomized trial of
- prolonged low-dose versus conventional-dose indomethacin for treating patent ductus arteriosus in
- very low birth weight infants, Pediatrics 112(2 I) (2003) 345-350.
- 636 [51] Y.J. Lin, C.M. Chen, V.K. Rehan, A. Florens, S.Y. Wu, M.L. Tsai, Y.T. Kuo, F.K. Huang,
- T.F. Yeh, Randomized Trial to Compare Renal Function and Ductal Response between
- 638 Indomethacin and Ibuprofen Treatment in Extremely Low Birth Weight Infants, Neonatology
- 639 111(3) (2016) 195-202.
- [52] L.R. Ment, W. Oh, R.A. Ehrenkranz, A.G. Philip, B. Vohr, W. Allan, C.C. Duncan, D.T. Scott,
- 641 K.J. Taylor, K.H. Katz, et al., Low-dose indomethacin and prevention of intraventricular
- hemorrhage: a multicenter randomized trial, Pediatrics 93(4) (1994) 543-50.
- [53] F. Mosca, M. Bray, M. Lattanzio, M. Fumagalli, C. Tosetto, Comparative evaluation of the
- effects of indomethacin and ibuprofen on cerebral perfusion and oxygenation in preterm infants
- with patent ductus arteriosus, The Journal of pediatrics 131(4) (1997) 549-54.
- [54] M.D. Mullett, T.W. Croghan, D.Z. Myerberg, Indomethacin for closure of patent ductus
- arteriosus in prematures, Clinical pediatrics 21(4) (1982) 217-220.
- [55] R.M. Nestrud, D.E. Hill, R.W. Arrington, A.G. Beard, W.T. Dungan, P.Y. Lau, J.B. Norton,
- R.I. Readinger, Indomethacin treatment in patent ductus arteriosus. A double-blind study utilizing
- indomethacin plasma levels, Developmental pharmacology and therapeutics 1(2-3) (1980) 125-36.
- [56] J. Neu, R.L. Ariagno, J.D. Johnson, P.T. Pitlick, R.S. Cohen, C.L. Beets, P. Sunshine, A
- double blind study of the effects of oral indomethacin in preterm infants with patent ductus
- arteriosus who failed medical management, Pediatric pharmacology (New York, N.Y.) 1(3) (1981)
- 654 245-9.
- 655 [57] M.Y. Oncel, S. Yurttutan, O. Erdeve, N. Uras, N. Altug, S.S. Oguz, F.E. Canpolat, U. Dilmen,
- Oral paracetamol versus oral ibuprofen in the management of patent ductus arteriosus in preterm
- infants: a randomized controlled trial, The Journal of pediatrics 164(3) (2014) 510-4.e1.
- 658 [58] J. Patel, I. Roberts, D. Azzopardi, P. Hamilton, A.D. Edwards, Randomized double-blind
- controlled trial comparing the effects of ibuprofen with indomethacin on cerebral hemodynamics in
- preterm infants with patent ductus arteriosus, Pediatric research 47(1) (2000) 36-42.
- 661 [59] M. Pezzati, V. Vangi, R. Biagiotti, G. Bertini, D. Cianciulli, F.F. Rubaltelli, Effects of
- indomethacin and ibuprofen on mesenteric and renal blood flow in preterm infants with patent
- ductus arteriosus, The Journal of pediatrics 135(6) (1999) 733-8.
- 664 [60] E. Pistulli, A. Hamiti, S. Buba, A. Hoxha, N. Kelmendi, G. Vyshka, The Association between
- Patent Ductus Arteriosus and Perinatal Infection in A Group of Low Birth Weight Preterm Infants,
- 666 Iranian journal of pediatrics 24(1) (2014) 42-8.
- 667 [61] S. Pourarian, N. Pishva, A. Madani, M. Rastegari, Comparison of oral ibuprofen and
- indomethacin on closure of patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants, Eastern Mediterranean
- health journal = La revue de sante de la Mediterranee orientale = al-Majallah al-sihhiyah li-sharq al-
- 670 mutawassit 14(2) (2008) 360-5.
- 671 [62] S. Pourarian, F. Takmil, S. Cheriki, H. Amoozgar, The Effect of Oral High-dose Ibuprofen on
- Patent Ductus Arteriosus Closure in Preterm Infants, American journal of perinatology 32(12)
- 673 (2015) 1158-63.
- 674 [63] J.M. Rennie, R.W. Cooke, Prolonged low dose indomethacin for persistent ductus arteriosus of
- prematurity, Archives of disease in childhood 66(1 Spec No) (1991) 55-8.
- 676 [64] P.G. Rhodes, M.G. Ferguson, N.S. Reddy, J.A. Joransen, J. Gibson, Effects of prolonged
- versus acute indomethacin therapy in very low birth-weight infants with patent ductus arteriosus,
- 678 European journal of pediatrics 147(5) (1988) 481-4.
- [65] P. Rudd, P. Montanez, K. Hallidie Smith, M. Silverman, Indomethacin treatment for patent
- ductus arteriosus in very low birthweight infants: Double blind trial, Archives of Disease in
- 681 Childhood 58(4) (1983) 267-270.
- 682 [66] C. Sangtawesin, V. Sangtawesin, W. Lertsutthiwong, W. Kanjanapattanakul, M. Khorana, J.K.
- Ayudhaya, Prophylaxis of symptomatic patent ductus arteriosus with oral ibuprofen in very low

- birth weight infants, Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet thangphaet 91
- 685 Suppl 3 (2008) S28-34.
- 686 [67] I.R. Sosenko, M.F. Fajardo, N. Claure, E. Bancalari, Timing of patent ductus arteriosus
- treatment and respiratory outcome in premature infants: a double-blind randomized controlled trial,
- 688 The Journal of pediatrics 160(6) (2012) 929-35.e1.
- [68] B.H. Su, H.C. Lin, H.Y. Chiu, H.Y. Hsieh, H.H. Chen, Y.C. Tsai, Comparison of ibuprofen
- and indometacin for early-targeted treatment of patent ductus arteriosus in extremely premature
- infants: a randomised controlled trial, Archives of disease in childhood. Fetal and neonatal edition 93(2) (2008) F94-9.
- 693 [69] B.H. Su, C.T. Peng, C.H. Tsai, Echocardiographic flow pattern of patent ductus arteriosus: a
- guide to indomethacin treatment in premature infants, Archives of disease in childhood. Fetal and neonatal edition 81(3) (1999) F197-200.
- 696 [70] P.H. Su, J.Y. Chen, C.M. Su, T.C. Huang, H.S. Lee, Comparison of ibuprofen and
- indomethacin therapy for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants, Pediatrics international:
- official journal of the Japan Pediatric Society 45(6) (2003) 665-70.
- [71] S. Supapannachart, A. Limrungsikul, P. Khowsathit, Oral ibuprofen and indomethacin for
- 700 treatment of patent ductus arteriosus in premature infants: a randomized trial at Ramathibodi
- Hospital, Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand = Chotmaihet thangphaet 85 Suppl 4 (2002) S1252-8.
- 703 [72] O. Tammela, R. Ojala, T. Iivainen, V. Lautamatti, M.L. Pokela, M. Janas, M. Koivisto, S.
- 704 Ikonen, Short versus prolonged indomethacin therapy for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm
- 705 infants, The Journal of pediatrics 134(5) (1999) 552-7.
- 706 [73] B. Van Overmeire, I. Follens, S. Hartmann, W.L. Creten, K.J. Van Acker, Treatment of patent
- ductus arteriosus with ibuprofen, Archives of disease in childhood. Fetal and neonatal edition 76(3)
- 708 (1997) F179-84.
- 709 [74] B. Van Overmeire, K. Smets, D. Lecoutere, H. Van De Broek, J. Weyler, K. De Groote, J.P.
- 710 Langhendries, A comparison of ibuprofen and indomethacin for closure of patent ductus arteriosus,
- 711 New England Journal of Medicine 343(10) (2000) 674-681.
- 712 [75] B. Van Overmeire, H. Van de Broek, P. Van Laer, J. Weyler, P. Vanhaesebrouck, Early versus
- 713 late indomethacin treatment for patent ductus arteriosus in premature infants with respiratory
- 714 distress syndrome, The Journal of pediatrics 138(2) (2001) 205-11.
- 715 [76] S. Yadav, S. Agarwal, A. Maria, A. Dudeja, N.K. Dubey, P. Anand, D.K. Yadav, Comparison
- of oral ibuprofen with oral indomethacin for PDA closure in Indian preterm neonates: a randomized
- 717 controlled trial, Pediatric cardiology 35(5) (2014) 824-30.
- 718 [77] B. Yang, X. Gao, Y. Ren, Y. Wang, Q. Zhang, Oral paracetamol vs. oral ibuprofen in the
- 719 treatment of symptomatic patent ductus arteriosus in premature infants: A randomized controlled
- trial, Experimental and therapeutic medicine 12(4) (2016) 2531-2536.
- 721 [78] V. Zanardo, S. Vedovato, P. Lago, D. Piva, D. Faggian, L. Chiozza, Effects of ibuprofen and
- indomethacin on urinary antidiuretic hormone excretion in preterm infants treated for patent ductus
- arteriosus, Fetal diagnosis and therapy 20(6) (2005) 534-9.
- 724 [79] M. Bhatt, A. Petrova, R. Mehta, Does treatment of patent ductus arteriosus with
- cyclooxygenase inhibitors affect neonatal regional tissue oxygenation?, Pediatric cardiology 33(8)
- 726 (2012) 1307-14.
- 727 [80] B. Brunner, M. Hoeck, E. Schermer, W. Streif, U. Kiechl-Kohlendorfer, Patent ductus
- arteriosus, low platelets, cyclooxygenase inhibitors, and intraventricular hemorrhage in very low
- birth weight preterm infants, The Journal of pediatrics 163(1) (2013) 23-8.
- 730 [81] N.M. Chan, C.W. Law, K.F. Kwan, Ibuprofen versus indomethacin treatment of patent ductus
- 731 arteriosus: comparative effectiveness and complications, Hong Kong medical journal = Xianggang
- 732 yi xue za zhi 20(3) (2014) 205-12.

- 733 [82] C. Dani, C. Poggi, I. Cianchi, I. Corsini, V. Vangi, S. Pratesi, Effect on cerebral oxygenation of
- paracetamol for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants, European journal of pediatrics 177(4)
- 735 (2018) 533-539.
- 736 [83] N.K. de Vries, F.K. Jagroep, A.S. Jaarsma, N.J. Elzenga, A.F. Bos, Continuous indomethacin
- infusion may be less effective than bolus infusions for ductal closure in very low birth weight
- infants, American journal of perinatology 22(2) (2005) 71-5.
- 739 [84] D. Dersch-Mills, B. Alshaikh, A.S. Soraisham, A. Akierman, K. Yusuf, Effectiveness of
- 740 Injectable Ibuprofen Salts and Indomethacin to Treat Patent Ductus Arteriosus in Preterm Infants:
- 741 Observational Cohort Study, The Canadian journal of hospital pharmacy 71(1) (2018) 22-28.
- 742 [85] L.V. Dornelles, A.L. Corso, R.D.C. Silveira, R.S. Procianoy, Comparison of two dose
- 743 regimens of ibuprofen for the closure of patent ductus arteriosus in preterm newborns, Jornal de
- 744 Pediatria 92(3) (2016) 314-318.
- 745 [86] F. Ekici, B. Atasay, A. Gunlemez, N. Nacar, E. Tutar, S. Atalay, Z. Eyileten, A. Uysalel, S.
- Arsan, Management of patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants, Anadolu kardiyoloji dergisi :
- 747 AKD = the Anatolian journal of cardiology 6(1) (2006) 28-33.
- 748 [87] N.O. ElHassan, T.M. Bird, A.J. King, P.B. Ambadwar, R.D. Jaquiss, J.R. Kaiser, J.M.
- Robbins, Variation and comparative effectiveness of patent ductus arteriosus pharmacotherapy in
- extremely low birth weight infants, Journal of neonatal-perinatal medicine 7(3) (2014) 229-35.
- 751 [88] V. Fanos, D. Benini, G. Verlato, G. Errico, L. Cuzzolin, Efficacy and renal tolerability of
- 752 ibuprofen vs. indomethacin in preterm infants with patent ductus arteriosus, Fundamental & clinical
- 753 pharmacology 19(2) (2005) 187-93.
- 754 [89] B.A. Filkins, K.E. Gregory, R.M. Insoft, Efficacy and safety of single course versus multiple
- doses of ibuprofen lysine for the treatment of patent ductus arteriosus, Journal of Neonatal-Perinatal
- 756 Medicine 4(2) (2011) 155-161.
- 757 [90] B.C. Gulack, M.M. Laughon, R.H. Clark, M.N. Sankar, C.P. Hornik, P. Brian Smith,
- 758 Comparative effectiveness and safety of indomethacin versus ibuprofen for the treatment of patent
- ductus arteriosus, Early Human Development 91(12) (2015) 725-729.
- 760 [91] M.J. Heo, O.S. Lee, S.C. Lim, Comparative evaluation for the use of oral ibuprofen and
- 761 intravenous indomethacin in Korean infants with patent ductus, Archives of pharmacal research
- 762 35(9) (2012) 1673-83.
- 763 [92] L.I. Katakam, C.M. Cotten, R.N. Goldberg, C.N. Dang, P.B. Smith, Safety and effectiveness of
- 764 indomethacin versus ibuprofen for treatment of patent ductus arteriosus, American journal of
- 765 perinatology 27(5) (2010) 425-9.
- 766 [93] A. Kushnir, J.M. Pinheiro, Comparison of renal effects of ibuprofen versus indomethacin
- during treatment of patent ductus arteriosus in contiguous historical cohorts, BMC clinical
- 768 pharmacology 11 (2011) 8.
- 769 [94] C.H. Lee, H.N. Chen, L.Y. Tsao, C.C. Hsiao, M.L. Lee, Oral ibuprofen versus intravenous
- 770 indomethacin for closure of patent ductus arteriosus in very low birth weight infants, Pediatrics and
- 771 neonatology 53(6) (2012) 346-53.
- 772 [95] N. Linder, R. Bello, A. Hernandez, C. Rosen, E. Birk, L. Sirota, Y. Pushkov, G. Klinger,
- 773 Treatment of patent ductus arteriosus: indomethacin or ibuprofen?, American journal of
- 774 perinatology 27(5) (2010) 399-404.
- 775 [96] A. Malikiwi, C. Roufaeil, K. Tan, A. Sehgal, Indomethacin vs ibuprofen: comparison of
- efficacy in the setting of conservative therapeutic approach, European journal of pediatrics 174(5)
- 777 (2015) 615-20.
- 778 [97] Y. Mekkhayai, C. Sornsuvit, K. Preedisripipat, S. Pongpittayut, Effectiveness and safety of
- high dose oral ibuprofen versus standard dose for treatment of preterm infants with patent ductus
- arteriosus, International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences 7(10) (2015) 338-341.
- 781 [98] O. Olukman, S. Calkavur, G. Ercan, F. Atlihan, T. Oner, V. Tavli, N. Kultursay, Comparison
- of oral and intravenous Ibuprofen for medical closure of patent ductus arteriosus: which one is
- 783 better?, Congenital heart disease 7(6) (2012) 534-43.

- 784 [99] G. Rosito, K. Sum, N. Chorne, Comparison of two neonatal indomethacin protocols: efficacy
- and outcome for patent ductus arteriosus closure, Journal of clinical pharmacy and therapeutics
- 786 35(5) (2010) 589-92.
- 787 [100] M. Satar, H. Yapicioglu, N. Narli, N. Ozbarlas, O. Kucukosmanoglu, E. Tutak, Is oral
- indomethacin effective in treatment of preterm infants with patent ductus arteriosus?, The Turkish
- 789 journal of pediatrics 46(2) (2004) 137-41.
- 790 [101] S. Sivanandan, V. Bali, A. Soraisham, A. Harabor, M. Kamaluddeen, Effectiveness and safety
- of indomethacin versus ibuprofen for the treatment of patent ductus arteriosus in preterm infants,
- 792 American Journal of Perinatology 30(9) (2013) 745-750.
- 793 [102] P.C. Tsao, S.J. Chen, C.F. Yang, Y.S. Lee, M.J. Jeng, W.J. Soong, P.C. Lee, J.H. Lu, B.
- Hwang, R.B. Tang, Comparison of intravenous and enteral indomethacin administration for closure
- of patent ductus arteriosus in extremely-low-birth-weight infants, Journal of the Chinese Medical
- 796 Association : JCMA 73(1) (2010) 15-20.
- 797 [103] H.N. Fesharaki, FS; Asbaq, PA; Amini, E; Sedaqat, M, Different doses of ibuprofen in the
- 798 treatment of patent ductus arteriosus: A randomized clinical trial, Tehran University Medical
- 799 Journal 70(8) (2012) 488-193.
- 800 [104] A. Ohlsson, P.S. Shah, Paracetamol (acetaminophen) for patent ductus arteriosus in preterm
- or low birth weight infants, The Cochrane database of systematic reviews 4 (2018) CD010061.
- 802 [105] M. Ouellet, M.D. Percival, Mechanism of acetaminophen inhibition of cyclooxygenase
- isoforms, Archives of biochemistry and biophysics 387(2) (2001) 273-80.
- 804 [106] D.E. Weisz, L. Mirea, E. Rosenberg, M. Jang, L. Ly, P.T. Church, E. Kelly, S.J. Kim, A. Jain,
- 805 P.J. McNamara, P.S. Shah, Association of Patent Ductus Arteriosus Ligation With Death or
- Neurodevelopmental Impairment Among Extremely Preterm Infants, JAMA pediatrics 171(5)
- 807 (2017) 443-449.

- 808 [107] A. El-Khuffash, D.E. Weisz, P.J. McNamara, Reflections of the changes in patent ductus
- arteriosus management during the last 10 years, Archives of disease in childhood. Fetal and
- 810 neonatal edition 101(5) (2016) F474-8.
- 811 [108] R.I. Clyman, Patent ductus arteriosus, its treatments, and the risks of pulmonary morbidity,
- 812 Seminars in perinatology 42(4) (2018) 235-242.
- 813 [109] R.I. Clyman, M. Liebowitz, J. Kaempf, O. Erdeve, A. Bulbul, S. Hakansson, J. Lindqvist, A.
- Farooqi, A. Katheria, J. Sauberan, J. Singh, K. Nelson, A. Wickremasinghe, L. Dong, D.C.
- Hassinger, S.W. Aucott, M. Hayashi, A.M. Heuchan, W.A. Carey, M. Derrick, E. Fernandez, M.
- 816 Sankar, T. Leone, J. Perez, A. Serize, P.-T.T. Investigators, PDA-TOLERATE Trial: An
- 817 Exploratory Randomized Controlled Trial of Treatment of Moderate-to-Large Patent Ductus
- Arteriosus at 1 Week of Age, The Journal of pediatrics 205 (2019) 41-48 e6.

820 Figure legends

- **Figure 1.** Study flow diagram, retrieved on October 30, 2018.
- Figure 2. Direct comparisons of interventions among included studies evaluating a) failure to close PDA, n=59studies; and b) the need for surgical intervention, n=34 studies).
 - Node size is proportional to the number of direct treatment comparisons which include that node, edge size is proportional to the number of direct treatment comparisons.
 - a) Failure to close the PDA (2 studies compared acetaminophen with indomethacin, 10 with ibuprofen, and 2 with control; 31studies compared indomethacin with ibuprofen, and 10 with control; 6 studies compared ibuprofen with control).
 - b) Need for surgical closure (1 study compared acetaminophen with indomethacin, 3 with ibuprofen; 23 studies compared indomethacin with ibuprofen, and 6 with control; 3 studies compared ibuprofen with control).

of selected adverse events stratified according to intervention. Number of study-arms proportion^a (95% CI) Failure to close PDA Indomethacin 64 0.24(0.20, 0.29)Ibuprofen 76 0.18(0.14, 0.22)Acetaminophen 13 0.19 (0.09, 0.30) Control 18 0.59(0.48, 0.69)Need of surgical closure Indomethacin 45 0.12 (0.10, 0.15) Ibuprofen 52 0.09(0.06, 0.12)Acetaminophen 3 0.03 (0.00, 0.15) 9 Control 0.18 (0.08, 0.31) **Death** Indomethacin 46 0.11 (0.10, 0.13) Ibuprofen 50 0.10(0.08, 0.12)Acetaminophen 8 0.09 (0.04, 0.17) Control 12 0.13(0.09, 0.19)**Necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC)** Indomethacin 42 0.08(0.06, 0.11)Ibuprofen 53 0.06(0.05, 0.08)Acetaminophen 10 0.05 (0.01, 0.11) Control 8 0.03(0.01, 0.05)**Intestinal perforation** Indomethacin 16 0.02 (0.01, 0.04) Ibuprofen 21 0.03(0.01, 0.04)Control 3 0.02 (0.00, 0.08) **Gastrointestinal bleeding** Indomethacin 20 0.11(0.06, 0.17)Ibuprofen 27 0.04 (0.02, 0.07) Acetaminophen 6 0.03(0.00, 0.09)Control 4 0.04 (0.00, 0.19) Bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD) Indomethacin 23 0.39 (0.32, 0.46) Ibuprofen 32 0.31 (0.24, 0.39) 0.08 (0.02, 0.17) 7 Acetaminophen 8 Control 0.29 (0.13, 0.48) Intraventricular haemorrhage (IVH) Indomethacin 30 0.17 (0.14, 0.22) Ibuprofen 40 0.12 (0.10, 0.15) Acetaminophen 10 0.12 (0.06, 0.19) Control 6 0.18(0.07, 0.33)Periventricular leukomalacia Indomethacin 15 0.06(0.04, 0.09)

Ibuprofen	14	0.06 (0.04, 0.08)	
Acetaminophen	4	0.05 (0.00, 0.17)	
Control	3	0.04 (0.01, 0.08)	
Oliguria			
Indomethacin	17	0.20 (0.14, 0.28)	
Ibuprofen	27	0.03 (0.01, 0.06)	
Acetaminophen	3	0.08 (0.02, 0.19)	
Control	1	0.28 (0.13, 0.47)	

^a Estimates obtained by random effect meta-analysis of arm-specific proportions using the arcsine transformation for arm-specific proportions, the 95% Clopper-Pearson Confidence Interval for armspecific Confidence Intervals, the inverse variance method for pooling, and the DerSimonian-Laird method for between-study variance. CI: Confidence Interval

Table 2. Comparison of active principles and controls on failure to close PDA and need for surgical PDA closure, overall and stratified according to cycle of treatment.

Failure to close PDA			
Last cycle			
Indomethacin	0.88 (0.71, 1.11), 31 studies ¹	$1.22 (0.54, 2.74), 2 \text{ studies}^2$	0.17 (0.13 , 0.24), 10 studies ³
0.89 (0.68, 1.17)	Ibuprofen	1.02 (0.72, 1.44), 10 studies ⁴	0.27 (0.11 , 0.64) ^a ,6 studies ⁵
1.09 (0.66, 1.79)	1.22 (0.77, 1.91) ^b	Acetaminophen	0.07 (0.00, 2.18) °, 2 studies ⁶
0.17 (0.11, 0.24)	0.19 (0.12, 0.28)	0.15 (0.09, 0.26)	Control
1st cycle			
Indomethacin	0.77 (0.64 , 0.93), 26 studies ⁷	1.11 (0.41, 3.06), 2 studies ⁸	0.16 (0.12 , 0.22), 8 studies ⁹
0.78 (0.63, 0.98)	Ibuprofen	1.19 (0.88, 1.60), 10 studies ¹⁰	0.18 (0.04, 0.72) ^d , 4 studies ¹¹
0.97 (0.66, 1.41)	1.25 (0.89, 1.73)	Acetaminophen	1.15 (0.02 , 0.88), 2 studies ¹²
0.15 (0.11, 0.21)	0.19 (0.13, 0.28)	0.15 (0.10, 0.25)	Control
2nd cycle	_		
Indomethacin	1.15 (0.79, 1.69), 12 studies ¹³	1.10 (0.47, 2.53), 1 study ¹⁴	1.14 (0.09, 0.22), 2 studies ¹⁵
1.26 (0.84, 1.99) ^d	Ibuprofen	1.24 (0.81, 1.89), 6 studies ¹⁶	-
1.82 (0.94, 3.81)	1.45 (0.79, 2.72) ^e	Acetaminophen	0.01 (0.00, 0.06), 1 study ¹⁷
0.08 (0.03, 0.20) ^f	0.07 (0.02, 0.17)	$0.04 (0.01, 0.12)^{g}$	Control
3rd cycle			
Indomethacin	1.87 (0.55, 6.36), 3 studies ¹⁸	-	
2.52 (0.51, 25.61)	Ibuprofen	0.44 (0.02, 12.01), 1 study ¹⁹	
1.854e-06 (1.376e-21, 5.77)	6.921e-07 (5.88e-22, 1.71)	Acetaminophen	
Need for surgical PDA ligation	20		0.00 (0.10 0.00) 1 1 22
Indomethacin	0.90 (0.80, 1.00), 23 studies ²⁰	$1.10 (0.47, 2.53), 1 \text{ study}^{21}$	0.35 (0.15 , 0.79), 6 studies ²²
0.92 (0.79, 1.12)	Ibuprofen	$1.66 (0.80, 3.47), 3 \text{ studies}^{23}$	$0.32 (0.04, 2.26), 3 \text{ studies}^{24}$
1.48 (0.76, 3.30)	1.59 (0.81, 3.50)	Acetaminophen	-
0.28 (0.15, 0.50)	0.30 (0.16, 0.54)	0.19 (0.07, 0.46)	Control

Data are reported as odds ratios (ORs) and 95% credible intervals for mixed comparisons and 95% confidence intervals for direct ones. Mixed ORs are shown in the triangle below the diagonal and direct ORs are shown in the triangle above the diagonal. Significant results are in bold.

^ap-value for heterogeneity =0.01; ^bp-value for inconsistency=0.02; ^cp-value for heterogeneity =0.001; ^dp-value for inconsistency=0.04; ^ep-value for inconsistency=0.04; ^fp-value for inconsistency=0.03

^{1[18, 27, 34, 36, 42, 45, 48, 51, 53, 58, 59, 61, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78-81, 84, 86, 88, 91, 93-96, 101]; 2[30, 34]; 3[37, 40, 44, 47, 52, 54-56, 65, 75]; 4[17, 20, 22, 23, 28, 33, 34, 57, 76, 82]; 5[16, 19, 32, 38, 66, 67]; 6[21, 43]; 7[18, 27, 34, 36, 42, 45, 48, 51, 53, 58, 59, 61, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 79, 81, 84, 86, 88, 91, 94-96, 101]; 8[30, 34]; 9[37, 47, 52, 54-56, 65, 75]; 10[17, 20, 22, 23, 28, 33, 34, 57, 76, 82]; 11[16, 19, 32, 38, 66]; 12[21, 43]; 13[34, 36, 42, 48, 68, 76, 81, 91, 95, 96, 101]; 14[34]; 15[37, 40]; 16[17, 22, 23, 28, 33, 34]; 17[21]; 18[36, 81, 91]; 19[17]; 20[34, 42, 45, 48, 51, 68, 70, 73, 74, 76, 78, 80, 81, 84, 86-90, 92, 93, 96, 101]; 21[34]; 22[40, 46, 54, 55, 65, 75]; 23[33, 34, 57]; 24[38, 66, 67].}

Table 3. Comparison of different active principles on occurrence of selected adverse events.

Death			
Indomethacin	0.77 (0.67 , 0.89), 23 studies ¹	$0.97 (0.32, 2.91), 1 \text{ study}^2$	$0.55 (0.29, 1.07), 8 \text{ studies}^3$
0.85 (0.70, 1.10)	Ibuprofen	1.07 (0.62, 1.86), 6 studies ⁴	$0.62 (0.26, 1.44), 3 \text{ studies}^5$
0.94 (0.55, 1.68)	1.11 (0.65, 1.88)	Acetaminophen	6.40 (0.75, 54.78), 1 study ⁶
0.51 (0.29, 0.85)	0.60 (0.34, 0.99)	0.54 (0.25, 1.10)	Control
Necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC)			
Indomethacin	1.08 (0.85, 1.38), 23 studies ⁷	2.72 (0.94, 7.89), 2 study ⁸	1.43 (0.41, 4.93), 4 studies ⁹
1.16 (0.88, 1.62)	Ibuprofen	0.99 (0.57, 1.71), 8 studies ¹⁰	1.45 (0.39, 5.45), 3 studies ¹¹
1.40 (0.77, 2.76)	1.20 (0.68, 2.22)	Acetaminophen	$0.35 (0.01, 8.96), 1 \text{ study}^{12}$
1.39 (0.55, 3.55)	1.19 (0.45, 3.05)	1.00 (0.34, 2.93) ^a	Control
Intestinal perforation			
Indomethacin	0.51 (0.38 , 0.68), 11 studies ¹³		0.98 (0.06, 16.09), 1 study ¹⁴
0.58 (0.36, 1.11)	Ibuprofen		0.51 (0.10, 2.53), 2 studies ¹⁵
0.37 (0.06, 2.26)	0.63 (0.10, 3.61)	-	Control
Gastrointestinal bleeding			
Indomethacin	1.03 (0.61, 1.76), 8 studies ¹⁶	2.28 (0.12, 43.14) ^a , 2 studies ¹⁷	$0.77 (0.11, 5.41), 3 \text{ studies}^{18}$
0.87 (0.39, 2.07)	Ibuprofen	3.51 (1.36, 9.08), 5 studies ¹⁹	3.01 (0.96, 9.42), 1 studiy ²⁰
2.56 (0.79, 11.29)	2.94 (0.94, 11.81)	Acetaminophen	-
1.58 (0.22, 9.79)	1.82 (0.25, 10.48)	0.61 (0.05, 4.62)	Control
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD)			
Indomethacin	0.89 (0.81 , 0.99), 15 studies ²¹	-	$0.67 (0.40, 1.11), 4 \text{ studies}^{22}$
0.86 (0.71, 1.02)	Ibuprofen	$1.20 (0.56, 2.54), 6 \text{ studies}^{23}$	$1.05 (0.18, 6.25), 3 \text{ studies}^{24}$
1.21 (0.62, 2.46)	1.40 (0.74, 2.82)	Acetaminophen	$0.47 (0.15, 1.55), 1 \text{ study}^{25}$
0.70 (0.44, 1.08)	0.81 (0.51, 1.28)	0.58 (0.27, 1.17)	Control
ntraventricular haemorrhage (IVH)			
Indomethacin	1.25 (1.01 , 1.56), 19 studies ²⁶	1.32 (0.52, 3.34), 2 studies ²⁷	$0.92 (0.05, 18.05), 2 \text{ studies}^{28}$
1.27 (1.00, 1.62)	Ibuprofen	$0.98 (0.58, 1.64), 8 \text{ studies}^{29}$	$0.92 (0.47, 1.82), 3 \text{ studies}^{30}$
1.27 (0.78, 2.08)	0.99 (0.63, 1.60)	Acetaminophen	$0.53 (0.16 \ 1.81), 1 \ \text{study}^{31}$
1.00 (0.54, 1.83)	0.79 (0.44, 1.39)	0.80 (0.40, 1.53)	Control
Periventricular leukomalacia			
Indomethacin	$0.83 (0.53, 1.30), 7 \text{ studies}^{32}$	$0.82 (0.27, 2.54), 1 \text{ studies}^{33}$	2.58 (0.48, 13.85), 1 study ³⁴
0.90 (0.53, 1.61)	Ibuprofen	$0.88 (0.28, 2.71), 3 \text{ studies}^{35}$	1.91 (0.53, 6.82), 2 studies ³⁶
0.79 (0.27, 2.35)	0.88 (0.29, 2.60)	Acetaminophen	-
2.24 (0.70, 7.99)	2.48 (0.80, 8.53)	2.85 (0.63, 14.18)	Control

Oliguria

Indomethacin	3.29 (1.80 , 6.00), 9 studies ³⁷	-	-
3.92 (1.69, 9.82)	Ibuprofen	$2.45 (0.63, 9.54), 2 \text{ studies}^{38}$	-
10.81 (1.86, 93.31)	2.75 (0.57, 18.38)	Acetaminophen	0.71 (0.19, 2.68), 1 study ³⁹
7.62 (0.42, 188.2)	1.94 (0.12, 40.50)	0.69 (0.07, 7.24)	Control

Data are reported as odds ratios (ORs) and 95% credible intervals for mixed comparisons and 95% confidence intervals for direct ones. Mixed ORs are shown in the columns (i.e. in the triangle below the diagonal with the treatments) and direct ORs are shown in the rows (i.e. in the triangle above the diagonal). Significant results are in bold.

^a p-value for heterogeneity=0.01

 1[27, 36, 42, 45, 48, 51, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87-90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 101]; 2[30]; 3[40, 44, 46, 47, 54, 55, 65, 75]; 4[17, 23, 28, 33, 57, 82]; 5[38, 66, 67]; 6[43]; 7[27, 34, 36, 42, 45, 48, 51, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87, 89, 91-94, 96, 101]; 8[30, 34]; 9[40, 46, 54, 75]; 10[17, 23, 28, 33, 34, 57, 77, 82]; 11[38, 66, 67]; 12[43]; 13[48, 68, 73, 74, 81, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 101]; 14[75]; 15[38, 67]; 16[34, 45, 68, 70, 73, 81, 94, 101]; 17[30, 34]; 18[46, 54, 65]; 19[28, 33, 34, 57, 76]; 20[66]; 21[27, 45, 48, 51, 68, 71, 74, 78, 81, 87, 89, 90, 93, 96, 101]; 22[40, 44, 46, 75]; 23[17, 23, 28, 33, 77, 82]; 24[38, 66, 67]; 25[43]; 26[27, 34, 36, 45, 51, 53, 68, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 81, 87, 89, 92, 93, 96, 101]; 27[30, 34]; 28[40, 75]; 29[17, 23, 28, 33, 34, 57, 77, 82]; 30[38, 66, 67]; 31[43]; 32[45, 48, 68, 70, 74, 87, 93]; 33[30]; 34[75]; 35[17, 28, 82]; 36[38, 67]; 37[45, 48, 53, 68, 73, 74, 88, 91, 94]; 38[28, 77]; 39[43].